

**Prairie Recommending Committee for Pulse and Special Crops (PRCPSC)  
Meeting Minutes – Voting**

**Wednesday, March 4, 2026 1:30 PM  
KC201, Kinnear Centre, Banff, Alberta**

**1. Call to order at 1:36 PM**

**2. Motion to approve the 2026 Meeting Agenda - Voting**

*Motion:* To approve the Agenda as presented

*Moved by:* Mark Olson

*Seconded by:* Ana Vargas

**3. Welcome, Introductions & Attendance**

**Attendance:** Robyne Davidson, Parthiba Balasubramanian, Ana Vargas, Anteneh Feyissa, Bob Tyler, Benzon Lorenzana, Charlotte Greenshields, Dale Risula, Dennis Lange, Derek Mohr, Gene Arganosa, Glenn Logan, Jaenet ter Schure, Jaret Horner, Jessa Hughes, Jodi Souter, Joey Vanneste, Kendra Meier, Kirstin Bett, Laurie Friesen, Lorena Pahl, Lyle Depauw, Manjula Bandara, Mark Olson, Mark Kok, Michael Gill, Nathan Penner, Nicholas Larkin, Ning Wang, Pete Giesbrecht, Sherrilynn Phelps, Tom Warkentin, Adam Unruh, Brianna Chouinard, Jeff Bertholet, Heather Ryan, Aslyn Kropp, Cory Solheim, Greg Stamp, Justin Ritco, Noah Jendrasheske, Raul Chandnani, Shannon Whyte, Stacey Wagenhoffer, Tatiana Henry

- 55 voting members on the PRCPSC committee.
- 29 members present and 10 e-ballots = 39. Quorum achieved.

**4. Committee Recognition Letter from the CFIA**

PRCPSC is a recognized committee with the CFIA, with authorization renewed on an annual basis. The letter of authorization was received from CFIA and covers the period of October 1, 2025 to September 30, 2026.

*Motion:* To accept the CFIA letter as received.

*Moved by:* Nathan Penner

*Seconded by:* Derek Mohr

**5. Approval of 2025 Meeting Minutes**

*Motion:* To approve 2025 meeting minutes as posted

*Moved by:* Laurie Friesen

*Seconded by:* Kendra Meier

**6. Business arising from the 2025 Minutes**

No business arising from last year's minutes

**7. Update membership list**

Membership list was posted on the password protected section of the website and briefly discussed. Members were asked to send any updated information to Robyne Davidson.

## 8. PRCPSC positions up for election (announcement only)

### Executive Committee

|                 |   |                |
|-----------------|---|----------------|
| Robyne Davidson | Secretary – Recommending Committee          | March 31, 2026 |
| Dale Risula     | Chair Disease Evaluation Team               | March 31, 2026 |
| Lindsay Wang    | Chair Quality Evaluation Team               | March 31, 2028 |
| Jessa Hughes    | Chair Breeding and Agronomy Evaluation Team | March 31, 2026 |

### Contract Registration Committee

|            |                     |                |
|------------|---------------------|----------------|
| Derek Mohr | Agronomy Evaluation | March 31, 2026 |
|------------|---------------------|----------------|

## 9. Voting procedures

- Voting guidelines - *Outlined by* Robyne Davidson
- Based on our current Operating Procedures, only members of the three Evaluation Teams are allowed to vote.
- Associate Members do not participate in the voting.
- Voting is valid only when a quorum is present. The quorum for Committee meetings is fifty percent (50%) of the voting members.
- It is expected that all members will vote impartially.
- Voting for candidate cultivars is by secret ballot.
- The Chair is permitted to actively participate in the discussions and is entitled to vote.
- A simple majority will constitute a positive recommendation.
- In the event of a tie, a revote will be conducted in which the Chair will not cast a vote.

## 10. Voting on candidate cultivars

**DRY BEAN candidate lines (6)** – Voting results in Appendix A.

1. **L21PS782** – Pinto bean – Agriculture and Agrifood Canada, Lethbridge, Alberta

Presented by Parthiba Balasubramanian

*Moved / seconded by:* Parthiba Balasubramanian / Laurie Friesen to support the recommendation for registration of the pinto dry bean line L21PS782.

**Support:** 38      **Object:** 0      **Abstain:** 1      **Result:** Supported

Breeding and Agronomy: Support

Breeding and Agronomy comments:

- Yield is higher than the check AAC Expedition, lower than the check Island
- Maturity is slightly later than Island, earlier than AAC Expedition

- Plant height is similar to the checks
- Days to flower is earlier than the checks
- Lodging resistance is better than the checks

Disease: Support

Disease comments:

- Resistant to both races of Anthracnose, similar to the checks AAC Expedition and Island
- Susceptible to Common Bacterial Blight, same as the checks
- Severity and incidence of White Mold is similar to the checks

Quality: Support

Quality comments:

- Seed weight is higher than the checks AAC Expedition and Island
- Seed color is brighter than Island, similar to AAC Expedition, slightly duller. Seed is less oxidized than Island
- Seed size is similar, slightly smaller than the checks
- Seed shape is similar to the checks
- Hydration coefficient is similar to the checks
- Texture and drained weight is similar to the checks
- Canning and cooking quality is similar to AAC Expedition, better than Island
- The number of hard seeds is less than Island, more than AAC Expedition

## 2. **L21YL271** – Yellow bean – Agriculture and Agrifood Canada, Lethbridge, Alberta

Presented by Parthiba Balasubramanian

*Moved / seconded by:* Jaenet ter Schure / Derek Mohr to support the recommendation for registration of the yellow dry bean line L21YL271.

**Support:** 38

**Object:** 0

**Abstain:** 1

**Result:** Supported

Breeding and Agronomy: Support

Breeding and Agronomy comments:

- Yield is similar, slightly higher than the checks
- Maturity is 1 day earlier than the checks
- Plant height is shorter than AAC Y012, similar to AAC Y073
- Days to flower is 1 day earlier than the checks
- Lodging resistance is similar to the checks

Disease: Support

Disease comments:

- Susceptible to both races of Anthracnose, similar to the checks AAC Y012 and AAC Y073
- Susceptible to Common Bacterial Blight, same as the checks

- Severity and incidence of white mold is similar to the checks

Quality: Support

Quality comments:

- Seed weight is higher than the check AAC Y012, similar to the check AAC Y073
- Seed color is similar to AACY073, more yellow than AACY012
- Seed shape is similar to the checks
- Seed size is similar to Y073, slightly larger than Y012
- Hydration coefficient is similar to the checks
- Canning and cooking quality are similar to the checks
- Texture and drained weight similar to the checks
- The number of hard seeds is higher than the checks but is above 1.8 so is good

3. **6329CBB-4-1** – Pinto bean – Crop Development Centre, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan

Presented by Kirsten Bett

*Moved / seconded by:* Kirsten Bett / Nick Larkan to support the recommendation for registration of the pinto dry bean line 6329CBB-4-1.

**Support:** 38

**Object:** 0

**Abstain:** 1

**Result:** Supported

Breeding and Agronomy: Support

Breeding and Agronomy comments:

- Yield is considerably higher than the check CDC WM-3
- Maturity is 3 days later than the check
- Plant height is taller than the check
- Days to flower is slightly later than the check
- Lodging resistance is better than the check
- Pod clearance is better than the check

Disease: Support

Disease comments:

- Resistant to both races of Anthracnose, similar to the checks CDC WM-1 and Island
- Severity and incidence of white mold is similar to the checks

Quality: Support

Quality comments:

- Seed weight is higher than the check CDC WM-3
- Seed size and shape are similar to the check
- Seed color is similar to the check
- Seed shape is similar to the check
- Hydration coefficient is slightly lower than the check
- Canning and cooking quality are similar to the check, texture is firmer than the check, drained weight is similar to the check
- The number of hard seeds is higher than the check

4. **6390CBB-3-2**– Great northern bean – Crop Development Centre, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan

Presented by Kirsten Bett

*Moved / seconded by:* Kirsten Bett / Kendra Meier to support the recommendation for registration of the pinto dry bean line 6390CBB-3-2.

**Support:** 36      **Object:** 1      **Abstain:** 2      **Result:** Supported

Breeding and Agronomy: Support

Breeding and Agronomy comments:

- Yield is slightly lower than the check AAC Whitehorse
- Maturity is similar to the check
- Plant height slightly shorter than the check
- Lodging resistance is similar to the check
- Pod clearance is better than the check

Disease: Support

Disease comments:

- Line is segregating for resistance to Anthracnose, similar to the check AAC Whitehorse, which is susceptible
- Severity and incidence of White Mold is similar to the checks

Quality: Support

Quality comments:

- Seed weight is higher than the check AAC Whitehorse
- Seed size is similar to the check
- Seed color is similar to the check, slightly less white.
- Seed shape is similar to the check
- Hydration coefficient is lower than the check
- Canning and cooking quality are similar to the checks, has a firmer texture than the checks, drained weight is higher than the check.
- The number of hard seeds is higher than the check

5. **AGH1416-1-1-1**– Kidney bean – Agriculture and Agrifood Canada, Morden, Manitoba

Presented by Parthiba Balasubramanian on behalf of Anfu Hou

*Moved / seconded by:* Parthiba Balasubramanian / Michael Gill to support the recommendation for registration of the kidney dry bean line AGH1416-1-1-1.

**Support:** 36      **Object:** 0      **Abstain:** 3      **Result:** Supported

Breeding and Agronomy: Support

Breeding and Agronomy comments:

- Yield is higher than the check Red Hawk
- Maturity is earlier than the check
- Plant height is taller than the check
- Lodging resistance is lower than the check
- Pod clearance is better than the check

Disease: Support

Disease comments:

- Resistant to Anthracnose Race 73, susceptible to Race 105, similar to the check Red Hawk
- Susceptible to Common Bacterial Blight, same as the checks
- Severity and incidence of White Mold is higher than the check

Quality: Support

Quality comments:

- Seed weight is higher than the check Red Hawk
- Seed color is similar to the check, slightly less red
- Seed size is similar to the check
- Seed shape is similar to the check
- Hydration coefficient is similar to the check
- Canning and cooking quality are similar to the check, has a firmer texture than the check, the drained weight is similar to the check
- The number of hard seeds is higher than the check

6. **S16-48-1-2-4-3** – Black bean – Agriculture and Agrifood Canada, Morden, Manitoba

Presented by Parthiba Balasubramanian on behalf of Anfu Hou

*Moved / seconded by:* Parthiba Balasubramanian / Mark Olson to support the recommendation for registration of the black dry bean line S16-48-1-2-4-3.

**Support:** 36

**Object:** 0

**Abstain:** 3

**Result:** Supported

Breeding and Agronomy: Support

Breeding and Agronomy comments:

- Yield is higher than the checks Eclipse and CDC Blackstrap
- Maturity is later than the checks
- Plant height is taller than the checks
- Lodging resistance is similar to the checks
- Pod clearance is lower than the checks

Disease: Support

Disease comments:

- Susceptible to both races of Anthracnose, similar to the checks Eclipse and CDC Blackstrap

- Susceptible to Common Bacterial Blight, same as the checks
- Severity and incidence of White Mold is similar to the checks

Quality: Support

Quality comments:

- Seed weight is higher than the check Eclipse, lower than the check CDC Blackstrap
- Seed color is similar to the checks
- Seed size is similar to the check Eclipse, slightly smaller than CDC Blackstrap
- Seed shape is similar to the checks
- Hydration coefficient is similar to the checks
- Canning and cooking quality are similar to the checks, has a similar texture to CDC Blackstrap, less firm than Eclipse, drained weight is higher than the checks
- The number of hard seeds is higher than the checks

**FIELD PEA candidate lines (5)** – Voting results in Appendix A.

7. **CDC 7078-2** – Green pea – Crop Development Centre, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan

Presented by Tom Warkentin

*Moved / seconded by:* Tom Warkentin / Pete Giesbrecht to support the recommendation for registration of the green field pea line CDC 7078-2.

**Support:** 39      **Object:** 0      **Abstain:** 0      **Result:** Supported

Breeding and Agronomy: Support

Breeding and Agronomy comments:

- Seed yield is higher than the check CDC Limerick, lower than the check CDC Forest
- Vine length is similar to the checks
- Maturity is similar to the checks
- Lodging is better than the checks

Disease: Support

Disease comments:

- This line is resistant to powdery mildew
- Mycosphaerella blight susceptibility is better than the checks CDC Limerick and CDC Forest
- Fusarium wilt and root rot susceptibility is similar to the checks

Quality: Support

Quality comments:

- Seed weight is higher than the check CDC Limerick, lower than the check CDC Forest
- Seed color is similar to the checks
- Seed size is similar to CDC Limerick, smaller than CDC Forest
- Seed shape is similar to the checks

- Bleaching is similar to the check CDC Limerick, better than CDC Forest
- Green color intensity is similar to CDC Limerick, higher than CDC Forest
- Protein content is lower than the checks but is fine for a green variety
- Percent seed coat breakage is higher than the checks

8. **PG8807** – Yellow pea – Pulse Genetics, Winkler, Manitoba

Presented by Pete Giesbrecht

*Motion* to accept inclusion of supplemental data *by* Pete Geisbracht. *Seconded by* Jaenet ter Schure. Motion carried by a vote of 33 in favor, 0 opposed.

*Moved / seconded by:* Pete Giesbrecht / Nathan Penner to support the recommendation for registration of the yellow field pea line PG8807.

**Support:** 37      **Object:** 7      **Abstain:** 1      **Result:** Supported

Breeding and Agronomy: Support

Breeding and Agronomy comments:

- Seed yield is slightly lower than the checks CDC Spectrum and AAC Profit
- Internal data from Manitoba shows 103% of CDC Spectrum
- Vine length is longer than the checks
- Maturity is similar to the checks
- Lodging is higher than the checks

Disease: Support

Disease comments:

- This line is resistant to powdery mildew
- Mycosphaerella blight susceptibility is similar to the checks CDC Spectrum and AAC Profit
- Fusarium wilt and root rot susceptibility is similar to the checks

Quality: Support

Quality comments:

- Seed weight is lower than the checks CDC Spectrum and AAC Profit
- Seed color is similar to the checks
- Seed size is similar to AAC Profit, smaller than CDC Spectrum
- Seed shape is similar to the checks
- Protein content is lower than the checks
- Percent seed coat breakage is higher than CDC Spectrum, lower than AAC Profit

9. **DL997-84** – Yellow pea – DLSeeds, Winnipeg, Manitoba

Presented by Derek Mohr

*Moved / seconded by:* Derek Mohr / Robyne Davidson to support the recommendation for registration of the yellow field pea line DL997-84.

**Support:** 34      **Object:** 5      **Abstain:** 0      **Result:** Supported

Breeding and Agronomy: Support

Breeding and Agronomy comments:

- Seed yield is lower than the check CDC Spectrum, higher than the check AAC Profit
- Vine length is longer than CDC Spectrum, shorter than AAC Profit
- Maturity is similar to the checks
- Lodging is the same as AAC Profit, higher than CDC Spectrum

Disease: Support

Disease comments:

- This line is resistant to powdery mildew
- Mycosphaerella blight susceptibility is similar to the checks CDC Spectrum and AAC Profit
- Fusarium wilt and root rot susceptibility is similar to the checks

Quality: Support

Quality comments:

- Seed weight is higher than the checks CDC Spectrum and AAC Profit
- Seed color is similar to the checks
- Seed size is similar to CDC Spectrum, slightly larger than AAC Profit
- Seed shape is similar to the checks
- Protein content is higher than the checks
- Percent seed coat breakage is higher than CDC Spectrum, similar to AAC Profit

10. **DL2000-3** – Yellow pea – DLSeeds, Winnipeg, Manitoba

Presented by Derek Mohr

*Moved / seconded by:* Derek Mohr / Nathan Penner to support the recommendation for registration of the yellow field pea line DL2000-3.

**Support:** 23      **Object:** 16      **Abstain:** 0      **Result:** Supported

Breeding and Agronomy: Support

Breeding and Agronomy comments:

- Seed yield is lower than the checks CDC Spectrum and AAC Profit
- Vine length is the same as CDC Spectrum, shorter than AAC Profit
- Maturity is the same as the checks
- Lodging is better than AAC Profit, similar to CDC Spectrum

Disease: Support

Disease comments:

- This line is resistant to powdery mildew
- Mycosphaerella blight susceptibility is similar to the checks CDC Spectrum and AAC Profit
- Fusarium wilt and root rot susceptibility is similar to the checks

Quality: Do Not Support

Quality comments:

- Seed weight is higher than the checks CDC Spectrum and AAC Profit
- Seed color is similar to the checks
- Seed size is larger than the checks
- Seed shape is similar to the checks
- Protein content is higher than the checks
- Percent seed coat breakage is higher than the checks

#### 11. **DL2000-9** – Yellow pea – DLSeeds, Winnipeg, Manitoba

Presented by Derek Mohr

*Moved / seconded by*: Derek Mohr / Jessa Hughes to support the recommendation for registration of the yellow field pea line DL2000-9.

**Support**: 33

**Object**: 6

**Abstain**: 0

**Result**: Supported

Breeding and Agronomy: Support

Breeding and Agronomy comments:

- Seed yield is similar to the checks CDC Spectrum and AAC Profit
- Vine length is longer than the checks
- Maturity is slightly later than the checks
- Lodging is higher than the checks

Disease: Support

Disease comments:

- This line is resistant to powdery mildew
- Mycosphaerella blight susceptibility is similar to the checks CDC Spectrum and AAC Profit
- Fusarium wilt and root rot susceptibility is similar to the checks

Quality: Support

Quality comments:

- Seed weight is higher than the checks CDC Spectrum and AAC Profit
- Seed color is similar to the checks
- Seed size is larger than the checks
- Seed shape is similar to the checks
- Protein content is higher than the checks
- Percent seed coat breakage is higher than the checks

**LENTIL candidate lines (6)** – Voting results in Appendix A.

12. **8587-1-H2-13-bk** – Black lentil – Crop Development Centre, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan

Presented by Ana Vargas

*Motion* to accept inclusion of supplemental data *by* Anna Vargas. *Seconded by* Mark Olson. Motion carried by a vote of 25 in favor, 0 opposed.

*Moved / seconded by:* Ana Vargas / Jessa Hughes to support the recommendation for registration of the black lentil line 8587-1-H2-13-bk.

**Support:** 37      **Object:** 2      **Abstain:** 0      **Result:** Supported

Breeding and Agronomy: Support

Breeding and Agronomy comments:

- Yield is higher than the checks CDC Maxim and Indian Head
- Height is taller than the checks
- Days to flower is later than CDC Maxim
- Maturity is similar to the checks, 1 day later than CDC Maxim, earlier than Indian Head
- Lodging is similar to the checks

Disease: Support

Disease comments:

- Ascochyta blight scores were similar to the checks CDC Maxim and Indianhead, better than CDC Maxim
- Anthracnose scores for race 1 and 0 were similar to the checks, a bit better than CDC Maxim

Quality: Support

Quality comments:

- Seed weight is higher than the check Indian Head, lower than the check CDC Maxim
- Seed size is larger than the check Indianhead
- Seed shape is similar to the check Indianhead
- Seed diameter is larger than Indian head, smaller than CDC Maxim
- Seed thickness is thicker than Indianhead, thinner than CDC Maxim
- Seed coat color is similar to the check, black with a blue tone, red cotyledon

13. **8627-1-H2-4** – Black lentil – Crop Development Centre, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan

Presented by Ana Vargas

*Motion* to accept inclusion of supplemental data *by* Ana Vargas. *Seconded by* Jaenet ter Schure. Motion carried by a vote of 26 in favor, 0 opposed.

*Moved / seconded by:* Ana Vargas / Kirsten Bett to support the recommendation for registration of the black lentil line 8627-1-H2-4.

**Support:** 36      **Object:** 2      **Abstain:** 1      **Result:** Supported

Breeding and Agronomy: Support

Breeding and Agronomy comments:

- Yield is higher than the checks CDC Maxim and Indian Head
- Height is taller than the checks
- Days to flower is later than CDC Maxim
- Maturity is later than CDC Maxim, similar to Indian Head
- Lodging is lower than CDC Maxim

Disease: Support

Disease comments:

- Ascochyta blight scores were similar to the checks CDC Maxim and Indianhead
- Anthracnose scores for race 1 and 0 were similar to the checks

Quality: Support

Quality comments:

- Seed weight is similar to the check Indian Head, lower than the check CDC Maxim
- Seed size is larger than the check Indianhead
- Seed shape is similar to the check Indianhead
- Seed diameter is larger than Indian head, smaller than CDC Maxim
- Seed thickness is thicker than Indianhead, thinner than CDC Maxim
- Seed coat color is similar to the check, black with a blue tone, green cotyledon

14. **CDC23.10S** – French green lentil – Crop Development Centre, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan

Presented by Ana Vargas

*Motion* to accept inclusion of supplemental data *by* Ana Vargas. *Seconded by* Kirsten Bett. Motion carried by a vote of 28 in favor, 0 opposed.

*Moved / seconded by:* Ana Vargas / Laurie Friesen to support the recommendation for registration of the French green lentil line CDC23.10S.

**Support:** 39      **Object:** 0      **Abstain:** 0      **Result:** Supported

Breeding and Agronomy: Support

Breeding and Agronomy comments:

- Yield is higher than the checks CDC Marble and CDC QG-4
- Height is slightly taller than the checks
- Days to flower is similar to the checks
- Maturity is similar to CDC QG-4, earlier than CDC Marble
- Lodging is lower than CDC Marble, similar to CDC QG-4

Disease: Support

Disease comments:

- Ascochyta blight scores were similar to the checks CDC Marble and CDC QG-4
- Anthracnose scores for race 1 and 0 were similar to the checks

Quality: Support

Quality comments:

- Seed weight is similar to the check CDC Nimble, larger than the checks CDC QG-4 and CDC Marble
- Seed size is similar to the checks
- Seed shape is similar to the checks
- Seed diameter is similar to CDC Nimble, larger than CDC QG-4 and CDC Marble
- Seed thickness is similar to CDC Marble and CDC QG-4
- Seed coat color is similar to CDC Marble, green cotyledon

15. **CDC24.03** – small red lentil – Crop Development Centre, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan

Presented by Ana Vargas

*Moved / seconded by:* Ana Vargas / Jaret Horner to support the recommendation for registration of the small red lentil line CDC24.03.

**Support:** 39

**Object:** 0

**Abstain:** 0

**Result:** Supported

Breeding and Agronomy: Support

Breeding and Agronomy comments:

- Yield is higher than the check CDC Nimble
- Height is taller than the check
- Days to flower is similar to the check
- Maturity is similar to the check
- Lodging is lower than the check

Disease: Support

Disease comments:

- Ascochyta blight scores were better than the check CDC Nimble
- Anthracnose scores for race 1 were similar to the check, slightly better

Quality: Support

Quality comments:

- Seed weight is higher than the check CDC Nimble
- Seed size is similar to the check
- Seed shape is similar to the check
- Seed diameter is larger than CDC Nimble
- Seed thickness is thicker than CDC Nimble
- Seed coat color is similar to the check, slightly more green,

16. **LAK19-0001** – large green lentil – Limagrain Cereals Research Canada, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan

Presented by Jaenet ter Schure

*Moved / seconded by:* Jaenet ter Schure / Laurie Friesen to support the recommendation for registration of the large green lentil line LAK19-0001.

**Support:** 36      **Object:** 2      **Abstain:** 1      **Result:** Supported

Breeding and Agronomy: Support

Breeding and Agronomy comments:

- Yield is higher than the check CDC Lima
- Height is taller than the check
- Days to flower is similar to the check
- Maturity is same as the check
- Lodging is higher than the check

Disease: Support

Disease comments:

- Ascochyta blight scores were similar to the check CDC Lima
- Anthracnose scores for race 1 were similar to the check

Quality: Support

Quality comments:

- Seed weight is similar to the check CDC Lima
- Seed size is similar to the check
- Seed shape is similar to the check
- Seed diameter is similar to the check
- Seed thickness is the same as the check
- Seed coat color is similar to the check

17. **LAL19-0005** – small red lentil – Limagrain Cereals Research Canada, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan

Presented by Jaenet ter Schure

*Moved / seconded by:* Jaenet ter Schure / Kendra Meier to support the recommendation for registration of the small red lentil line LAL19-0005.

**Support:** 36      **Object:** 2      **Abstain:** 1      **Result:** Supported

Breeding and Agronomy: Support

Breeding and Agronomy comments:

- Yield is higher than the check CDC Nimble

- Height is similar to the check
- Days to flower is later than the check
- Maturity is later than the check
- Lodging is slightly lower than the check

Disease: Support

Disease comments:

- Ascochyta blight scores were similar to the check CDC Nimble
- Anthracnose scores for race 1 were better than the check

Quality: Support

Quality comments:

- Seed weight is higher than the check CDC Nimble
- Seed size is similar to the check
- Seed shape is less uniform than the check
- Seed diameter is larger than the check
- Seed thickness is thicker than the check
- Seed coat color is darker than the check

### FABA BEAN candidate line (1) – Voting results in Appendix A.

18. **RS-HGI** – Low Tannin. Low vicine-convicine faba bean - Harvest Genetics International, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan

Presented by Jessa Hughes

*Moved / seconded by*: Jessa Hughes / Ana Vargas to support the recommendation for registration of the low tannin faba bean line RS-HGI.

**Support:** 35      **Object:** 3      **Abstain:** 1      **Result:** Supported

Breeding and Agronomy: Support

Breeding and Agronomy comments:

- Yield is lower than the checks Navi, similar to the check DL Nevado
- Height is shorter than Navi, taller than DL Nevado
- Days to flower is similar to the checks
- Maturity is earlier than the checks
- Lodging is slightly better than the checks

Disease: Support

Disease comments:

- Susceptible to Chocolate spot, same as the checks
- Disease ratings also reflect susceptibility to Alternaria and Stemphylium leaf spots, similar to the checks

Quality: Support

Quality comments:

- Seed weight is lower than the checks Navi and DL Nevado
- Seed size is smaller than the checks
- Seed shape is similar to the checks
- Protein content is slightly higher than Navi, lower than DL Nevado
- Seed coat color is similar to Navi, brighter than DL Nevado
- Seed has 7% perforated damage
- Vicine level is 0.05%, Convicine level is 0.03%

**11. Final ballot counting including E-ballots**

Dennis Lange, Sherrilyn Phelps, Laurie Friesen and Robyne Davidson counted the paper and e-ballots.

**12. Results of voting on candidate cultivars report**

All candidate lines were recommended for support

**13. PRCPSC Annual Meeting – Thursday, March 5 at 8:00 am in KC201, Banff Centre**

**14. Adjourn**

*Motion* to adjourn: Nick Larkan

Meeting adjourned at 4:01 PM

**Prairie Recommending Committee for Pulse and Special Crops (PRCPSC)  
Annual Meeting Minutes**

**Thursday, March 5, 2026 8:00 AM  
KC201, Kinnear Centre, Banff, Alberta**

**1. Call to order at 8:03 AM**

**2. Motion to approve the Meeting Agenda – Annual Meeting**

*Motion:* To approve the agenda as presented

*Moved by:* Gene Arganosa                      *Seconded by:* Tom Warkentin

**3. Welcome and Attendance**

**Attendance:** Robyne Davidson, Parthiba Balasubramanian, Ana Vargas, Anteneh Feyissa, Bob Tyler, Benzon Lorenzana, Charlotte Greenshields, Dale Risula, Dennis Lange, Derek Mohr, Gene Arganosa, Glenn Logan, Jaenet ter Schure, Jaret Horner, Jessa Hughes, Jodi Souter, Joey Vanneste, Kendra Meier, Kirstin Bett, Laurie Friesen, Lorena Pahl, Lyle Depauw, Manjula Bandara, Mark Olson, Michael Gill, Nathan Penner, Nicholas Larkin, Ning Wang, Pete Giesbrecht, Sherrilynn Phelps, Tom Warkentin  
Adam Unruh, Brianna Chouinard, Jeff Bertholet, Teketel Haile  
Aslyn Kropp, Cory Solheim, Noah Jendrasheske, Nick Petruic, Raul Chandnani, Shannon Whyte, Stacey Wagenhoffer, Tatiana Henry

**4. Review of Wednesday afternoon Voting Meeting results**

The voting results from the Wednesday afternoon meeting were presented to the committee. All lines were approved for registration.

*Motion:* To destroy the paper and e-ballots

*Moved by:* Sherrilyn Phelps                      *Seconded by:* Gene Arganosa

**5. Update the membership list**

The members of the PRCPSC were asked to send any changes to their contact information to Robyne Davidson.

**6. First Call for Nominations to replace PRCPSC committee positions up for renewal**

**Executive Committee**

|                 |   |                |
|-----------------|---|----------------|
| Robyne Davidson | Secretary – Recommending Committee          | March 31, 2026 |
| Dale Risula     | Chair Disease Evaluation Team               | March 31, 2026 |
| Lindsay Wang    | Chair Quality Evaluation Team               | March 31, 2028 |
| Jessa Hughes    | Chair Breeding and Agronomy Evaluation Team | March 31, 2026 |

## **7. Changes to the Membership**

The Membership list was reviewed.

Members were removed that:

- Have not attended the meetings for 3 consecutive years
- Have retired or changed positions
- At their request
- At the request of a committee member
- Contact was lost

If a person is attending the meetings for the first time, and wants to become a member, they were asked to identify the committee that they would be most interested in participating on and make the request to be added to the membership.

New members were recommended by a current committee member and added.

Members were moved among committees and membership status to strengthen each as required.

Mark Olson *made a motion* to amend the membership list to include the newly added members and remove members as identified. *Seconded by:* Sherrilyn Phelps.

## **8. Update from Breeding (Hughes), Disease (Risula) and Quality (Wang) Evaluation Team Chairs**

### Breeding and Agronomy Evaluation:

Jessa Hughes *gave a report* from the Breeding and Agronomy Evaluation Team meeting held Tuesday morning, March 3<sup>rd</sup> at 9:00 AM.

### Disease Evaluation:

Dale Risula *gave a report* from the Disease Evaluation Team meeting held on Tuesday morning, March 3<sup>rd</sup> at 11:00 AM.

### Quality Evaluation:

Robyne Davidson *gave a report* from the Quality Evaluation Team meeting held on Tuesday morning, March 3<sup>rd</sup> at 10:00 AM.

Charlotte Greenshields *made a motion* to accept the Evaluation Team reports  
*Seconded by* Jaenet ter Schure.

## **9. Update from Contract Registration Committee (Mohr, Arganosa, Davidson)**

Nothing to report.

**10. Update from the Bean Workers Group and Ratify the 2025 Bean Cooperative report**

The minutes from the Bean Workers meeting on Tuesday and an update on the 2025 Bean Cooperative Report were *presented by* Dennis Lange.

Dennis *made a motion* to accept the 2025 Dry Bean Cooperative reports. *Seconded by* Jaenet ter Schure.

**11. Update from the Pea Workers Group and Ratify the 2025 Field Pea Cooperative report**

The minutes from the Pea Workers meeting on Tuesday and an update on the 2025 Pea Cooperative Report were *presented by* Tom Warkentin.

Tom *made a motion* to accept the 2025 Field Pea Cooperative report. *Seconded by* Sherilynn Phelps.

**12. Update from the Lentil Workers Group and Ratify the 2025 Lentil Cooperative report and the 2025 LCRC PLRRT Cooperative Report**

The minutes from the Lentil Workers meeting on Tuesday and an update on the 2025 Lentil Cooperative Report were *presented by* Ana Vargas.

Ana *made a motion* to accept the 2025 Lentil Cooperative report. *Seconded by* Dennis Lange.

An update on the 2025 LCRC PLRRT Report was *presented by* Jaenet ter Schure.

Jaenet *made a motion* to accept the 2025 LCRC PLRRT report. *Seconded by* Sherrilyn Phelps.

**13. Update from the Faba bean Workers Group and Ratify the 2025 Faba bean Cooperative report**

The minutes from the Faba bean Workers meeting on Tuesday and an update on the 2025 Faba bean Cooperative Report was *presented by* Ana Vargas.

Ana *made a motion* to accept the 2025 Faba bean Cooperative report. *Seconded by* Nick Larkan.

**14. Ratify the Buckwheat report**

No report.

## 15. Update 2026 Cooperative Registration Trial Guidelines for all crops

A reminder to Coop Trial Coordinators to update the crop cooperative trial guidelines and the check varieties and send them to Parthiba Balasubramanian.

These will be incorporated in the PRCPSC Operating Procedures.

## 16. Ratify the Updated PRCPSC Operating Procedures document

There was a discussion on the lack of quorum at the Winnipeg meeting in 2025 and members not attending meetings.

Sherrilyn Phelps *made a motion* to change the PRCPSC quorum to 50% of the registered members in any given year. *Seconded by* Jaenet ter Schure.

- Motion was voted on. There were 8 In favor, 22 Opposed. Motion was defeated.

Discussion around quorum continued with comments about how we maintain quorum, how decisions affect member attendance and member responsibility to the Evaluation Teams and Voting.

Joey Vanneste *made a motion*: Any voting member who misses 2 consecutive regular meetings, unless the absence is approved by the Chair, shall be moved to Associate Member *Seconded by* Noah Jendrasheske.

- Motion was voted on. There were 33 In favor, 1 Opposed. Motion passed.

The Secretary will send out an email to the Evaluation Team Chairs prior to the 2027 meeting in Saskatchewan reminding them to prepare a summary for the committee ahead of time, send it out and request feedback. Members will be reminded of their responsibility to the committees to provide input.

There was a concern that members that send eballots are not considering the discussions of the Evaluation Teams and committee discussions when they send their vote.

It was discussed that the understanding is that the voting members are doing their due diligence and reading through the documents before they send the eballot.

Mark Olson *made a motion* to accept the changes to the 2026 PRCPSC Operating Procedures as stated by committee members and worker groups and ratify the document as changes are confirmed. *Seconded by*: Gene Arganosa.

## 17. Second call for nominations to replace PRCPSC committee positions up for renewal

### Executive Committee

|                 |   |                |
|-----------------|---|----------------|
| Robyne Davidson | Secretary – Recommending Committee          | March 31, 2026 |
| Dale Risula     | Chair Disease Evaluation Team               | March 31, 2026 |
| Lindsay Wang    | Chair Quality Evaluation Team               | March 31, 2028 |
| Jessa Hughes    | Chair Breeding and Agronomy Evaluation Team | March 31, 2026 |

**Contract Registration Committee**

Derek Mohr

Agronomy Evaluation

March 31, 2026

Gene Arganosa *nominated* Robyne Davidson to remain the Secretary of the PRCPSC Executive Committee. Robyne accepted

Gene Arganosa *nominated* Dale Risula to remain Chair of the Disease Evaluation Team. Dale accepted.

- Dennis Lange said he would be a back up for Dale if he is unable to fulfill the 3-year commitment.

Gene Arganosa *nominated* Jessa Hughes to remain Chair of the Breeding and Agronomy Evaluation team. Jessa accepted.

Gene Arganosa *nominated* Derek Mohr to remain on the Contract Registration Committee for Agronomy Evaluation. Derek accepted.

Gene Arganosa *nominated* Ning Wang to become Chair of the Quality Evaluation Team. Ning declined.

Robyne Davidson *nominated* Kendra Meier to become Chair of the Quality Evaluation Team. Kendra accepted.

**18. Third Call for Nominations and election of personnel.**

**Executive Committee**

Robyne Davidson

Secretary – Recommending Committee

March 31, 2026

Dale Risula

Chair Disease Evaluation Team

March 31, 2026

Lindsay Wang

Chair Quality Evaluation Team

March 31, 2028

Jessa Hughes

Chair Breeding and Agronomy Evaluation Team

March 31, 2026

**Contract Registration Committee**

Derek Mohr

Agronomy Evaluation

March 31, 2026

Gene Arganosa *made a motion* to vote in all newly nominated 2027 Executive Committee members. *Seconded by* Dennis Lange.

**19. Other business**

**19.1. Heirloom and Heritage Varieties:**

CFIA sent a document relative to the Seed Regulatory Modernization (SRM) process. As a part of that they are asking for input from the Recommending Committees on how best to implement a reasonable regulatory pathway for Heritage and Heirloom varieties of crops currently listed in Part I of Schedule III.

A Heritage variety is a crop kind subject to variety registration that has been cancelled or will be that is 50 years or older, intended for small scale cultivation and was not cancelled for being detrimental to human or animal health and safety.

An Heirloom variety is a non-hybrid variety of a crop kind subject to variety registration that was never registered but was grown in Canada prior to 1970 and intended for small-scale cultivation.

The committee briefly read through the document lead by Parthiba.

Our feedback would be:

- There has to be a required test for faba bean registration to prove low vicine/convicine content.
- As faba bean is the only outcrossing pulse, that is only one we are really concerned about.
- The proponent of the variety must cover the cost for data and disease testing
- All registered lines must be tested for the same diseases as we currently test for to protect the industry
- We recognize that the requirements could be different for each commodity
- “Small scale” must be defined. If the scale is very small, we have no objection and it wouldn’t matter to the industry if there was susceptibility.
- There are currently lots of small-scale crops (ie. black lentil) being growing illegally
- These varieties can be grown, just can’t be sold into the industry
- As they will not have a classification through the CGC, they will be graded very low.
- There was also a suggestion to just move these varieties to Part III.
  
- The committee will request a 30-day extension to provide feedback to CFIA
  
- Ana Vargas will respond to the CFIA on behalf of faba bean
- Ana Vargas will respond to the CFIA on behalf of lentil as well. If anyone has any feedback on lentil, send it to Ana. She will also communicate with Sabine Banniza.
- Dennis Lange will respond to the CFIA on behalf of dry bean
- Tom Warkentin will respond to the CFIA on behalf of field pea. If anyone has any comments to add for field pea, send to Tom
  
- Robyne will update the membership ASAP and send it to Parthiba so he can send the CFIA information to the committee

## 19.2. SLIDO

There was a discussion on using SLIDO for the Evaluation Team meetings and Committee Voting.

There was agreement that voting should be impartial in all meetings. A suggestion was made to appoint people other than the Chair of each meeting to coordinate SLIDO voting.

Noah Jendrasheske volunteered.

In 2027 we will utilize SLIDO for all meetings and have paper ballots available as a backup.

### **19.3. Lentil disease checks**

It was proposed that common checks be used across all market classes for disease ratings.

Discussion followed with the following comments:

- As it is right now there are many checks for disease testing with checks for each market class leading to a lot of disease ratings in the tables.
- It would make disease screening more efficient if there were less check
- One encompassing resistant and one encompassing susceptible
- We could align with wheat where there is 1 resistant, 1 susceptible and 1 intermediate
- Are the ratings actually significantly different from the standard check?
- There is always an agronomy check, that is tested for disease, can we compare to that?
- Some committee members would like some clarification if we need so many checks.
  
- Some members feel that checks need to be included for each market class
- There are so many classes of lentil and disease response varies so much
- Perhaps we could organize the tables according to market class and sub-categorize the checks in the tables for clarity
- The ratings are also sometimes based on MR, not on number ratings and they should be based on numbers.
  
- Ana Vargas will talk to pathologists involved with pulse crops, connect with Jaenet ter Schure and discussion will continue

### **19.4. Lentil seed coat and cotyledon color**

- Joey Vanneste with the Canadian Grain Commission spoke to the lentil seed coat and cotyledon colours given the two black seed coat lentils, one with a green cotyledon and one with a red cotyledon being submitted for registration this year.
- As described in the Official Grain Grading Guide, lentils are designated into two classes: Lentils - red and Lentils - other than red
- The method of determining the class of a lentil is by cotyledon colour only and does not consider seed coat color
- Joey shared that the Pulses Advisory Committee met in February 2026 where discussions took place to address concerns around red cotyledon lentils with differing seed coat colours, such as black.
- Red cotyledon lentils with differing seed coat colors would not be assessed as a contrasting class in the current definition within the Official Grain Grading Guide.

- Considerations for these types of concerns were brought forward at recent meetings and members of the committee are currently seeking feedback on these discussions.
- Information will be shared at upcoming standard committee meetings in March/April 2026.
- More information to follow

**19.5. Common seed source for Cooperative and Private testing**

It was proposed that the seed source for all field pea and lentil testing be from a common source in 2027 for consistency.

This was agreed upon and will depend on making sure seed from a common source is available.

**20. Meeting location, venue and dates**

|             |                    |              |           |
|-------------|--------------------|--------------|-----------|
| <b>2027</b> | February 22 – 25th | Saskatchewan | Saskatoon |
| <b>2028</b> | February - March   | Winnipeg     | Manitoba  |

**21. Adjourn**

Nick Larkan *made the motion* to adjourn the meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 11:38 AM.

## Appendix A

### 2026 PGDC – PRCPSC Candidate Voting Results

#### Dry bean (6 lines)

| Line # | Name           | Type           | Support | Object | Abstain |
|--------|----------------|----------------|---------|--------|---------|
| 1      | L21PS782       | pinto          | 38      |        | 1       |
| 2      | L21YL271       | yellow         | 38      |        | 1       |
| 3      | 6329CBB-4-1    | pinto          | 38      |        | 1       |
| 4      | 6390CBB-3-2    | great northern | 36      | 1      | 2       |
| 5      | AGH1416-1-1-1  | kidney         | 36      |        | 3       |
| 6      | S16-48-1-2-4-3 | black          | 36      |        | 3       |

#### Field Pea (5 lines)

| Line # | Name      | Type   | Support | Object | Abstain |
|--------|-----------|--------|---------|--------|---------|
| 7      | CDC7078-2 | green  | 39      |        |         |
| 8      | PG8807    | yellow | 37      | 7      | 1       |
| 9      | DL997-84  | yellow | 34      | 5      |         |
| 10     | DL2000-3  | yellow | 23      | 16     |         |
| 11     | DL2000-9  | yellow | 33      | 6      |         |

#### Lentil (6 lines)

| Line # | Name            | Type         | Support | Object | Abstain |
|--------|-----------------|--------------|---------|--------|---------|
| 12     | 8587-1-H2-13-bk | black        | 37      | 2      |         |
| 13     | 8627-1-H2-4     | black        | 36      | 2      | 1       |
| 14     | CDC23.10S       | french green | 39      |        |         |
| 15     | CDC24.03        | small red    | 39      |        |         |
| 16     | LAK19-0001      | large green  | 36      | 2      | 1       |
| 17     | LAL19-0005      | small red    | 36      | 2      | 1       |

#### Faba bean (1 line)

| Line # | Name   | Type       | Support | Object | Abstain |
|--------|--------|------------|---------|--------|---------|
| 18     | RS-HGI | low tannin | 35      | 3      | 1       |

## Appendix B

### Prairie Recommending Committee for Pulses and Special Crops Executive 2027

| <u>Name</u> | <u>Role</u> | <u>Term Expiration Date</u> |
|-------------|-------------|-----------------------------|
|-------------|-------------|-----------------------------|

#### Executive

|                          |   |                |
|--------------------------|---|----------------|
| Parthiba Balasubramanian | Chair - Recommending Committee              | March 31, 2028 |
| Robyne Davidson          | Secretary - Recommending Committee          | March 31, 2029 |
| Dale Risula              | Chair Disease Evaluation Team               | March 31, 2029 |
| Kendra Meier             | Chair Quality Evaluation Team               | March 31, 2029 |
| Jessa Hughes             | Chair Breeding and Agronomy Evaluation Team | March 31, 2029 |

#### Contract Registration Committee

|                 |                     |                |
|-----------------|---------------------|----------------|
| Derek Mohr      | Agronomy Evaluation | March 31, 2029 |
| Gene Arganosa   | Quality Evaluation  | March 31, 2028 |
| Robyne Davidson | Disease Evaluation  | March 31, 2027 |

#### Bean Workers Meeting

|              |       |                |
|--------------|-------|----------------|
| Dennis Lange | Chair | March 31, 2027 |
|--------------|-------|----------------|

#### Pea Workers Meeting

|               |       |                |
|---------------|-------|----------------|
| Tom Warkentin | Chair | March 31, 2027 |
|---------------|-------|----------------|

#### Faba bean Workers Meeting

|            |       |                |
|------------|-------|----------------|
| Ana Vargas | Chair | March 31, 2028 |
|------------|-------|----------------|

#### Lentil Workers Meeting

|                |       |                |
|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Sabine Banniza | Chair | March 31, 2027 |
|----------------|-------|----------------|

#### Buckwheat Workers Meeting

|               |       |                |
|---------------|-------|----------------|
| Cam Stockford | Chair | March 31, 2028 |
|---------------|-------|----------------|