ECPGR Working Group

FORAGES

Progress report for the period June 2006 – June 2008

I. RESULTS			
a. Comparison of workplan (milestones) versus results obtained			
Workplan (milestones)	Which results have been obtained?	Which aims/goals have not been (fully) reached?	Completeness ratio (%)
1. Sharing of responsibilities a): Definition of holders of primary collections through 6 steps (see attachment) for DB:s *Dactylis*, *Festuca*, *Lolium*, *Medicago*, *Phleum*, *Poa* and *Trifolium*	Depending on DB as follows: Steps 2 and 3 have only partly been completed, and substantial progress in steps 4 and 5 was limited to the *Poa* and *Phleum* databases	The main reason for the limited extent of data flow (to complete all the 6 steps) between gene bank curators, WG members and CCDB managers probably was that gene bank curators had focused their efforts on delivering data to their National Focal Points for EURISCO. However, when CCDB managers download data from EURISCO, the forage specific descriptors including ORIGINALITY, PRIMCOLL and EFC get lost because they are not included in the EURISCO descriptors.	50 %
1. Sharing of responsibilities b): Data up-date of CFDB:s	8 out of the 23 Central Forage DB:s have been updated during the report period	See above	35 %
2. Confirmation of safety-duplication	Survey on the safety duplication capacities carried out and published in Meeting reports.		100 %

3. Collaboration for projects: *Medicago* core collection project	GENMEDIC proposal prepared by Jan Nedelnik in collaboration with Vladimir Meglic and submitted June 2006 to EC870/2004	Proposal passed threshold level for funding but was put in reserve list 2006	100 % for preparation of the proposal/ 0% for funding
4. Modifications of preferred and acceptable standards for regeneration	Based on the findings of the ICONFORS project the regeneration standards were up-dated 2007. An updated list of standards will be published in the Meeting report		100 %

b. Contribution to the four ECP/GR priorities for Phase VII

1. Characterization/evaluation (including modern technologies)

Characterization and evaluation activities have been carried out on the national and regional basis. WG Forages aims to look for solution to include C&E data in the central forage databases. Modern DNA-technologies have been utilizes in some of the diversity analyses that have been reported in the WG meetings.

2. Task sharing

Sharing of responsibilities has been a task with a highest priority of the WG. The WG has defined a work plan including a 6-step procedure that should lead to assignment of accessions as belonging to the European Collection through 'primary collection holder (PRIMCOLL)'. The progress has been moderate due to focus on EURISCO tasks elsewhere.

3. *In situ*/on-farm conservation and development

In situ/on farm conservation of forage species is on the agenda of the WG and national experiences have been presented on meetings. Thus conservation practices have been disseminated amongst WG members. Also issue on how to make information about *in situ* conservation accessible in databases has been raised. In situ/on-farm conservation will be one of the priority issues in the next ECPGR phase through relevant project co-operation.

4. Documentation and information

Central Forage Databases have been central priority during the whole phase. At the moment there are 23 DB:s. Documentation aims both to benefit access and task-sharing of forage genetic resources in Europe.

c. Relevance (regional / international)

Did your work and/or outputs have inter-regional dimension? (if it did, give precisions)
Yes, many of the forage collection activities have been organized as international bilateral or multilateral joint activities (e.g. joint collecting missions, research projects, databases, quality management of maintenance for forage PGR) within Europe. Contacts established within the WG have been the basis for these activities.

d. Lessons learnt (recommendations)

Which lessons learnt are also relevant for other Working Groups?
Documentation of central crop databases in relation to other European documentation activities e.g. EURISCO should be coordinated better in order to gain progress.

II. ANALYSIS

a. Bottlenecks

What were the experienced bottlenecks?	How do you plan to solve the bottlenecks?
WG had a very ambitious work plan concerning sharing of responsibilities. The limited dataflow between DB managers and data providers was a clear bottleneck. Partly due to the fact that gene bank curators had focused their efforts on delivering data to their National Focal Points for EURISCO instead of CFDB:s. Also changes of database managers in many of the participating institutions slowed the work.	During the next phase it should be studied whether merging of various CFDB:s would be efficient. ECPGR secretariat could also look for ways to commit the involved institutions to support the respective DB managers in their work. The role of CFDB managers in view of other initiatives like EURISCO and AEGIS should be backed more prominently by the ECPGR steering committee.

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

Resources for cross-cutting issues between WG:s as an external budget for short-term needs (e.g. meetings) to be applied during the whole planning phase.

c. External resources needed (collaboration, external funding)

Funding for research activities on the European basis as the consequence of the AGRIGENRES –program termination.
Since many of the ECPGR activities are done in-kind it is important that the home institutions support the work sufficiently.

WG Forages:Definition of primary holder of accessions

Step	Action	Responsible	Interaction with
1	Add MOS data to accession data in genebank (ORIGINALITY descriptor)	Genebank curators	
2	Per genus, deliver national datasets containing MOS info to CCDBs	WG member	Genebank curators, CCDB managers
3	Incorporate MOS info in CCDBs and assign preliminary value for primary holder (PRIMCOLL)	CCDB manager	
4	Identify cases needing clarification (multiple samples sharing highest level of Originality), propose	CCDB manager	Genebank curators, ev. WG members
5	Obtain approval of assumption of responsibility as primary holder for list of predefined accessions	CCDB manager	Genebank curators, ev. WG members
6	Assign values (Yes/No) to EFC descriptor field where situation is clear	CCDB manager	