

# ECPGR *In Situ* Network <sup>1</sup>

## On-farm Task Force Progress report for the period June 2006 – June 2008

<b>I. RESULTS</b>			
<b>a. Comparison of workplan (milestones) versus results obtained</b>			
Workplan (milestones)	Which results have been obtained?	Which aims/goals have not been (fully) reached?	Completeness ratio (%)
<b>Milestone 1</b> Revise the list of organizations involved in on farm conservation	A list of contact organizations involved in on-farm conservation activities, including full address and type of crop(s) managed is being prepared on the basis of information gathered by the TF members. Information is available on the TF dedicated web page.	Not all TF members have contributed yet.	5%
<b>Milestone 2</b> <b><u>Documentation:</u></b> a) Finalize the minimum descriptors list for the documentation of on-farm conservation and management activities  b) Produce a list of published literature + grey literature, on developed model(s) to establish local or regional historical inventories, based on information collected	a) A minimum descriptors list for the documentation of on-farm conservation and management activities and landrace collection in the farm was prepared, discussed, tested and published on the web.  b) Model(s) to be used to establish local or regional historical inventories, based on information collected, were presented at the Stagerlitz and Ljubiana meeting	Not all TF members have contributed yet.	

<sup>1</sup> Note the In Situ Network activities have largely been focused on on-farm conservation because (a) landraces are the most threatened element of agro-biodiversity in Europe, and (b) crop wild relative (CWR) conservation has been particularly target by two EC funded projects PGR Forum and AEGRO.



<p><b>Milestone 5</b>  <b>Information on developed methodologies for the conservation of traditional varieties.</b></p>	<p>A presentation on information on developed methodologies for the conservation of traditional varieties (including information on: people, institutions, non-governmental organizations, local communities, farmers involved in and carrying out such activities, as well as on crops maintained on-farm) was presented at Ljubljana</p>		<p>100%</p>
<p><b>Milestone 6</b>  <b>Reports on relevant on-farm activities in their country.</b></p>	<p>Poster presentation on relevant on farm conservation activities (including information on people, institutions, non-governmental organizations, local communities carrying out this kind of work) were presented at Ljubljana</p>		<p>100% (For those countries where information were available)</p>
<p><b>Milestone 7</b>  <b>Public awareness:</b>  a) Produce a publication on case studies   b) Produce a 'European landrace conservation' paper(s) in IPGRI technical bulletin</p>	<p>Five case studies on on farm conservation of different crops have already been published on the web site.  Leaflets models to be used for enhancing further awareness on on farm conservation issues were also prepared and presented at Ljubljana.</p> <p>A publication 'European landrace conservation' with the contribution of the task force members and other researcher/stakeholders is being prepared and will be finalized by the end of 2008.</p> <p>Outside the proposed workplan, a workshop on 'Home garden conservation' was organised in connection with the TF meeting in Ljubljana: Reports from researchers, gardener seed clubs, and NGOs in European countries were presented and will be published with the contribution of two Italian Institutions (CRA Istituto per la Frutticoltura, Ciampino, Rome and</p>	<p>It will be in progress, until a relevant number of cases will build data for evidence practice. In addition quite a number of new country delegates have adhered to the TF only last year</p> <p>In progress (it will be completed at the end of 2008)</p>	<p>20%</p> <p>50%</p>

	ARSSA, Agency for Agricultural Development of Abruzzi Region). A press conference followed in Rome which yielded international attention.		
<b>b. Contribution to the four ECP/GR priorities for Phase VII</b>			
1. Characterization/evaluation (including modern technologies) Not among the tasks of the group.			
2. Task sharing Sharing of responsibilities has been a task with a highest priority of the WG.			
3. <i>In situ</i> /on-farm conservation and development On-farm conservation of crop landraces is the entire <i>raison d'être</i> of the WG			
4. Documentation and information To produce a descriptor list for the documentation of on-farm conservation and management activities was a task of the group (see above). A new version of it was jointly proposed by Romania and Italy, then circulated to the Task Force for further comment and approval. The present version is available on line at: <a href="http://www.ecpgr.cgiar.org/Networks/Insitu_onfarm/Docs/OnfarmDescr_DRAFT271107.pdf">http://www.ecpgr.cgiar.org/Networks/Insitu_onfarm/Docs/OnfarmDescr_DRAFT271107.pdf</a> It is a double purpose descriptor list that can also be used to collect passport information on landraces in exploration and collection missions. The descriptor list was tested in missions carried out on the Apuseni mountains. Although completed, it remains open for further refinement and suggestions by the TF.			
<b>c. Relevance (regional / international)</b>			
Did your work and/or outputs have inter-regional dimension? (if it did, give precisions) Yes, many of the TF activities have been organized as international bilateral or multilateral joint activities within Europe. Contacts established within the ECPGR WGs have been the basis for these activities. In particular the following cooperation activities with other projects and ECPGR groups have been established <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The AEGRO project (EC N°870/2004 n.057).</li> <li>• The DIVERSEEDS project.</li> <li>• The ECP/GR <i>Brassica</i> working group (in defining areas of particular relevance for landrace conservation).</li> </ul> It was also recommended by the TF a close collaboration with <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The EURISCO,</li> <li>• The EPGRIS and</li> </ul> The AEGIS projects.			
<b>d. Lessons learnt (recommendations)</b>			
Which lessons learnt are also relevant for other Working Groups? To gain progress more information of on farm activities at country level is needed. Awareness about the importance of on farm conservation should be increased.			

<b>II. ANALYSIS</b>	
<b>a. Bottlenecks</b>	
What were the experienced bottlenecks?	How do you plan to solve the bottlenecks?
<p>None in particular.</p> <p>However, it should be noted that there is a general lack of information within each countries since on farm conservation activities are quite fragmented.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the TF is quite a young group. After an initial 'exploratory' meeting in 2000, it met only two times in 2006 and immediately afterwards in 2007. In such a short time it has been difficult for each country delegate to gather information of on farm conservation issues in their respective countries as well as to build up that net of personal relationships that (in absence of projects funded from other sources) makes things work properly.</p> <p>In addition changes of country delegates occurred and quite a number of new country delegates have adhered to the TF only last year.</p>	<p>To increase awareness about the importance of on farm conservation and to allow initiatives to root in each country will improve results in the future. We are strongly involved in increasing awareness about on farm and in garden conservation importance at country level.</p>
<b>b. Internal support needed (Secretariat, Steering Committee, other Working Groups, etc.)</b>	
<p>Resources for cross-cutting issues between WGs as an external budget for meetings to be applied during the whole planning phase.</p> <p>Support in finding appropriate funding schemes for projects.</p> <p>Continuous update of the TF dedicated page.</p>	
<b>c. External resources needed (collaboration, external funding)</b>	
<p>Since many of the ECPGR activities are done in-kind it is important that also home institutions support the work sufficiently.</p> <p>Funding search for research activities (such as 1. analysis of European diversity maintained on farm and in gardens, of its richness, its environmental, cultural, social and economic values and services, 2. formulation of appropriate conservation strategies to ensure that rich agro-ecosystems continue to exist in the future. 3. exploration of potential markets for products coming from landraces as a means of ensuring the sustainable use of diversity) and inventories on the European basis is strongly needed.</p> <p>Cooperation with sociologists, economists and farmer organization/s, as put in evidence at Ljubljana, is also strongly needed.</p>	



**c. Relevance (regional / international)**

Did your work and/or outputs have inter-regional dimension? (if it did, give precisions)

All Network activities have equal value outside of Europe and we would encourage other regions to apply the methodologies development but also to provide feedback on their implementation.

**d. Lessons learnt (recommendations)**

Which lessons learnt are also relevant for other Working Groups?

- That working collaboratively with other networks can enhance the value of both networks results.
- That funding is a serious limitation on Network activities.
- That turn-over of WG membership and sheer membership numbers may limit Network activities if the Network is to be fully inclusive.

**II. ANALYSIS**

**a. Bottlenecks**

What were the experienced bottlenecks?

- Difficulty in involving all WG members in activities
- Difficulty in locating funding support for activities

How do you plan to solve the bottlenecks?

- Encourage joint publications / grant applications, web-site interaction
- Seek Secretariat advice

**b. Internal support needed (Secretariat, Steering Committee, other Working Groups, etc.)**

- Assistance in locating funding for Network related projects from the Secretariat.
- Facilitate intra-WG communication
- Production of website for Genetic Reserve WG

**c. External resources needed (collaboration, external funding)**

It is relatively straight forward to think of appropriate projects that require implementation, but the largest bottle-neck is a source of adequate funding and this is totally limiting.