

FRUITTREEDATA Project ‘kick-off’ meeting

07th December 2023 10:00-12:00 (CET)

Ms Teams

Meeting Minutes

Present

Partner 1 (Chair, GBR); Partners 2, 4-10, 13-16 (BEL, CHE, DEU, HUN, NLD, NOR, CZE, FRA, LVA, FIN, SVN, EST); Self-funded partners 1, 3 (DEU, CHE).

1. Apologies

Apologies were received from Partners 3, 11, 12 (ITA, ALB, FRA) and Self-funded partner 2 (FRA).

2. Introductions

All participants introduced themselves and the agenda was agreed.

3. Presentation on EURISCO and C&E data (Stephan Weise)

Stephan Weise presented a summary of systems in place for inclusion of phenotypic data in EURISCO. Key points:

- EURISCO is capable of including phenotypic data
 - “How to” documents and Ms Excel templates are available
 - Default is that National Focal Point is data uploader (but this can be delegated by NFP to genebanks)
 - All data are immediately made public.

4. C&E data curation

This was followed by discussion. Key points:

- Only ‘processed’ data can be included (raw data should be placed in archive repositories and these can be cited in EURISCO)
- Issues of replication need to be managed by the genebanks (an ‘accession’ in EURISCO equates to a single entry with ACCENUMB and passport data)
 - DOIs would allow linking of replicates
- MUNQ/PUNQ could be included as an ‘additional identifier’ and would be searchable (in time) and downloadable at present.
- All partners should curate their available C&E data for submission to EURISCO, subject to NFP approval, as part of the project (Expected product 3).

5. Holdings missing from EURISCO

Key points:

- Accessions were sometimes missing simply due to lack of time (for data curation) but also because of interpretations of ‘availability’
- Generally – “theoretical availability” should be used (i.e. to consider issues such as phytosanitary requirements, capacity and PVR restrictions to be temporary and navigable)
- All partners should aim to clarify the position of any ‘EURISCO relevant’ accessions in their country as part of the project (Expected product 2).

6. MUNQ and PUNQ

The importance of these (as a proxy DOI) to the Malus/Pyrus/Prunus Working Groups was noted. The proposed work was discussed. Key points:

- Partners might need to help INRAE to identify EURISCO listed material within their national MUNQ/PUNQ submissions in order to align codes
- An assessment of codes that are allocated in the MUNQ/PUNQ (and CHUNQ) tables, but not represented within the subset of EURISCO listed material, should be carried out within the project (Expected product 4). This could potentially include a list of alleles known to be missing from the EURISCO listed subset.
 - The assessment will not be exhaustive – and will be limited to project partners and their associated national accessions.

Data availability was discussed and (although not a direct objective of this project) it was noted that the availability would need to be managed for inclusion in EURISCO. Ideally, they would be citeable both for scientific rigour and to acknowledge efforts.

7. CCDBs

The CCDB work had been scheduled for discussion in an independent meeting since the relevant partners were unavailable. The primary objective would be to salvage EURISCO relevant data from PrunusDB and most likely to decommission all three CCDBs (Expected product 1).

8. Project administration

It was agreed that the 2-year timespan would be retained – with a view to start immediately and close the project prior to any scheme submission deadline in 2025. Partner 1 agreed to confirm an immediate start with ECPGR and to propose working deadlines within the project timeframe.

List of Participants

Matthew Ordidge

Marc Lateur

Markus Kellerhals

Andrea Patocchi

Monika Höfer

Zsuzsanna Békefi

Willem van Dooijeweert

Stein Harald Hjeltnes

Boris Krska

Hélène Muranty

Caroline Denancé

Gunars Lacis

Tuuli Haikonen

Gregor Osterc

Hedi Kaldmäe

Stephan Weise

Christina Kägi