

## Note on progress made by the ECPGR *Vitis* Working Group – Year 2015

T. Lacombe, February the 16<sup>th</sup> 2016

This note is presented referring to the ECPGR “Terms of Reference” (TR) for the period January 1<sup>st</sup> to December 31<sup>st</sup> 2015.

### 1 – Nomination of new *Vitis* WG Chair and communication with the members:

- Achievements made:
  - Contact with previous Chair and Vice Chair for continuity of work.
  - Contact with European *Vitis* database for continuity of work.
  - Meeting with ECPGR staff (E. Lipman) to understand the working process.
  - Contact with all the registered members.
- Difficulties encountered:
  - Email list of WG members not updated (solved).
  - Number of members per country very heterogeneous and not reflecting the efforts and real actions on grapevine genetic resources.
  - Other important actors absent in the WG.
  - Difficulty to understand if the ECPGR emails are sent only to chairs or to all members. Risk of double posting if Chairs transfer these emails (TR3).
  - Most of the members don't answer (TR3).
  - No possibility to organize a general meeting (at least once during the 2015-2018 period) of all the members of the WG (TR1, TR3, TR4, TR6). To my opinion, this is the biggest problem that I didn't know before accepting the Chair position. How to work with a group without the perspective meet this group at least once?
  - Official position of Vice Chair was a useful idea.
- Suggestions:
  - Kick-off meeting with ECPGR staff and all WG Chairs should be useful, especially for newcomers.
  - Homogenise the number of members per country, with basic rules.
  - Restore the position of Vice Chair.
  - Give a template for annual report of WG, for the Chair as well as for the members (TR 7).
  - Evaluating the Chair is normal, but in the same time, ECPGR should evaluate the members of WG, because how to go ahead if they don't answer?

### 2 – European *Vitis* database and VIVC database (TR1 pp):

- Achievements made:
  - German curator improved some functions (own funding)
  - Continuous update of VIVC database by German curator (own funding)
- Difficulties encountered:
  - No funding.
  - Now that European programs on grapevine genetic resources ended, almost all the partners don't update their data.
- Suggestions:
  - ?

### 3 – Preparation of project ideas and proposals for funding (TR 5)

- Achievements made:
  - Call of ECPGR funding scheme: all the *Vitis* WG members were invited to share their ideas. Then a consensus proposal was validated and Croatian members wrote the project in collaboration with the Chair and the other partners involved. The project “InWiGrape” was submitted and accepted.
  - Call of COST: the “Eugrape” project (Eurasian wild and bred grapevine diversity: facing changing climates and markets) involving all the grape genetic resources actors was coordinated by Università di Pisa (Italy) and submitted. Unfortunately it was not accepted.
  - Call of H2020-SFS-07b: the “Grape goes Erasmus” project (Leveraging the knowledge and use for high quality wine-making of local grape varieties across Europe) involving 21 public and private partners was coordinated by IMIDRA (Spain) and submitted. After a positive evaluation on first stage, it was not accepted on second stage of evaluation process.
- Difficulties encountered:
  - For ECPGR project:
    - Because not enough money available, only 12 partners can participate to the activity. This can be interpreted as 1) other partners are not concerned and/or 2) a core set of partners exists among the whole group. This also implies that the chair has to choose some partners rather than others, that is not comfortable.
    - ECPGR website problem during the submission of the project: everything was OK, including the confirmation of the submission (screen capture as proof) but our *Vitis* WG proposal was not taken into account. We realized this by change a long time afterwards. Fortunately our project was finally evaluated.
    - Time of response between evaluation and acceptance, too long and then overlapping with the next call. For one year project, it’s too long.
  - For other European calls: because ECPGR funding only aims at support (partial) meetings, the real work to perform on grapevine genetic resources must be funded by partners through own funding (limited) and project funding. From 1997 to 2014, several European projects were funded allowing significant progress for our community. Now that no new European project is accepted, despite significant efforts, network collaboration is only based on own funded voluntarism of very few partners. Majority of partners now are retiring into oneself national activities.
- Suggestions:
  - Allow a second possibility for ECPGR activity with at least twice more partners (24), funding (30000€) and time (2 years).
  - Solve the website bug for submission and shorten the delay of acceptance/rejection notification.