



European Cooperative Programme for Plant Genetic Resources (ECPGR)

Minutes of the 2nd ECPGR Executive Committee meeting Maccarese, Italy, 17-19 October 2011

Present: Alvina Avagyan (Armenia), Merja Veteläinen (Finland), Silvia Strajeru (Romania), Fernando Latorre (Spain), Geert Kleijer (Switzerland), Lorenzo Maggioni and Jan Engels (ECPGR Secretariat)

Agenda and presentations prepared for this meeting are available at:
http://www.ecpgr.cgiar.org/executive_committee/second_meeting.html

1. Terms of Reference (ToRs) of the Executive Committee (ExCo)

The Interim ToRs were discussed and a few changes were made. A final version was prepared for approval by the Steering Committee (SC) (see Annex 1).

2. Objectives of ECPGR

A new version was agreed, based on inputs received from SC members. Development of sections on output 6 (Secretariat), as well as the completion of the activities were postponed. A SC decision needs first to be made on a new structure and new budget. The result of the FP7 project proposal will also influence this document. A remarks column has been inserted to park some of the proposals made by the SC that will need to be reconsidered after the above decisions will have been made (see Annex 2).

3. Internal ECPGR operational structure

3.1 Networks and Working Groups

A number of potential options were listed:

1. No changes in Working Group (WG) and Network Coordinating Group (NCG) structure and decision process
2. No changes in structure, but tasks and goals defined more strictly according to new ECPGR goals
3. Minor changes in structure (such as the format of the NCGs) and tasks and goals defined more strictly according to new ECPGR goals
4. Adjustment of the structure and decision process to serve the new ECPGR goals (e.g. maintaining only crop-wise or thematic WGs, or both, or only task forces).

Additional elements to be considered: funding mechanism of all the existing groups; number of groups; nomination of experts; number of experts in each group; possibility to create specific fora for discussion of breeders and separate them from discussion on specific genebank technical issues (the present WGs discuss too broad range of issues to be interesting for respectively plant breeders or genebank curators).

Decision: It was decided to set up a Task Force (TF) that should develop an alternative structure. The TF's Terms of Reference were defined and names of members of the TF proposed (see below). The proposal should be circulated to the SC, asking for approval of the ToRs and

composition of the TF and a specific request for support by a country in case any of the national programmes could provide an expert in organization and management to advise the TF on management and organizational matters, at no additional cost for ECPGR.

ToRs of Task Force for operational structure

ECPGR needs to operate with a structure enabling the Programme to work effectively in terms of achieving its objectives, managing its resources and reporting about issues and achievements.

The SC establishes a Task Force (TF) aimed at proposing alternative options to the existing operational structure. The TF should consider the type and number of operational groups (i.e. Networks, Working Groups, Network Coordinating Groups, etc.) and managing bodies (i.e. Secretariat, Executive Secretary, Executive Committee and Steering Committee), the funding mechanism for operation of these groups, the mechanism for nomination of experts/members in these groups and other details of the groups' operations. The TF, which is recommended to represent the different needs and expectations of the various ECPGR member countries, is composed of the following members¹:

1. Bert Visser (leader)
2. Lorenzo Maggioni (*ex officio*)
3. Kulli Annamaa
4. Gordana Djuric

The TF is expected to be advised by a consultant specialized in management and organizational matters (including operational structures) and to complete a first draft of an alternative operational structure by the end of March 2012. The TF is expected to hold a 1-2 days meeting with the consultant. Members of the TF will be reimbursed for their travel only. The cost of the meeting should be charged to the ECPGR budget (Common Fund).

3.2 Secretariat

Upon consideration of the current tasks of the Secretariat (as listed in 14 points in the ECPGR Terms of Reference) and of its current strengths and weaknesses, as identified by the SC in its twelfth meeting report (Bratislava 2010), the following remarks were made:

- It should be possible to reduce the tasks of the Secretariat, especially points 9 to 14 of the above-mentioned ToRs, which are additional to the ordinary management of the Secretariat, require specific expertise and are time demanding.
- It is important to have a well-functional team in the Secretariat
- One of the options to overcome the weaknesses of the Secretariat would be to strengthen it (but this would reduce the funds available for network's activities)
- The Secretariat could strengthen its involvement in Task Forces and this could be highlighted and reported as scientific costs (not administrative costs).

Decision: It was concluded that two options should be considered, being 1) the *status quo*, and 2) a revised list of tasks, to be prepared by the Secretariat itself. The latter option should also include the option of the current Coordinating Secretariat developing into an Executive Secretariat.

3.3 Steering Committee and Executive Committee

The establishment of the ExCo was taken as a measure to overcome weaknesses of the SC, as identified in Bratislava 2010. It seems still too early to evaluate the effects of the ExCo.

3.4 Terms of Reference of ECPGR bodies

It was noted that the "ECPGR Coordinator", the "Executive Committee" and the "AEGIS Advisory Body" are not listed in the ECPGR ToRs, but their respective ToRs exist and are present on the ECPGR/AEGIS Web sites.

¹ Proposed names based on a balance between experience, age, gender, geographical origin, and with a record of reliability and commitment.

Decision: It will be necessary to check whether these ToRs remain valid when the new structure will be approved. Any action to update the ECPGR ToRs was therefore postponed.

4. Position of Executive Director/Executive Secretary

It was clarified that the two titles “Executive Director” and “Executive Secretary” are not necessarily distinct and therefore it might well be possible to just refer to an “Executive Secretary” position and to elaborate its possible ToRs, and to consider the pros and cons of creating such an Executive Secretary. Some initial remarks were made about the role of an Executive Secretary:

- The Secretary should not be a voting member of the SC or with the right to vote
- Ideally it should be covered by a person that is already well acquainted with the EC environment
- It could be a part-time position
- It is difficult to strengthen the Secretariat and remain cost-neutral, unless the tasks of the Secretariat are reduced
- Apart from the problem of the (additional) costs of such a position, there is also the risk of overlapping with the role of the Executive Committee and therefore, the respective responsibilities should be well thought out.

Decision: Options should be developed as part of the activity of the TF on operational structures, but also linking this issue to the options regarding the legal status, considering that each different legal status requires the establishment of specific roles/positions.

5. Options for legal status

Gerald Moore gave an overview of the possible options, starting from the assumption that the requirements for ECPGR would be: 1) A better defined structure; 2) A better defined status; 3) Separate identity; 4) Legal capacity to accept funds and run projects in its own right; 5) Separate legal personality. He advised that the more independent you are, the more it costs in time and energy and funds to operate, since it becomes necessary to set up own staff regulations, recruit people, prepare contracts, etc. However, it would also be possible to become independent in some aspects and not in others, in order to minimize costs, for instance by sub-contracting specific tasks to other organizations. Three options were presented:

- *Option 1 – to maintain present status*

It could be possible to give ECPGR its own structure, but not to give it its own identity (a policy document can be written regarding ECPGR, but this would only improve a little bit its identity). It would be a situation like IBPGR when it was part of FAO (in terms of its governance structure). There would be sub-options determining how much independency can be established. Option 1 fails to meet all of the requirements.

- *Option 2 – to become an international organization*

There would be various sub-options:

- a. Full international agreement: this meets all requirements, but it takes time, it is difficult and expensive.
- b. Simplified international agreement (such as the Trust did with FAO, it took 6 months to obtain the necessary legal status): this needs to be supplemented later by a Headquarter (HQ) agreement (to give privileges and immunities and legal capacity to operate - in the meantime it would be possible to operate under FAO status). It still requires a relatively long time and is difficult to achieve. All members of ECPGR would need to agree.
- c. Subsidiary body of EU: it could be quicker to obtain and possibly help in obtaining funds from the EC, but there may well be an issue for non-EU countries.
- d. Article XIV of FAO Constitution – full international agreement: quick and cheap, can give independence, remaining part of FAO with a (certain) degree of autonomy – don't need to worry about HQ agreement and staff operations – certain amount of control from FAO will

be there (budgetary and financial control – some donors are not eager to go through this control). In the case of the Trust, the donors did not agree to contribute funds under such structure. Financial support from FAO would need to be negotiated and this is not easy, but otherwise FAO could administer all your own funds. Need to talk to FAO Legal Council, have a sponsor at AGP and convince the DG.

- *Option 3 – national non-charitable corporation*

This option does not give an international status, but could provide tax exempt status, subject to national legislation, particularly with respect to labour law and also with regard to the mode of operation. Need a Head of the corporation, i.e. someone who can take more decisions, such as an Executive Secretary or Director.

In summary, it is possible to select areas of independence that are needed and to search for the corresponding legal status option. For instance, the Trust started by establishing its own identity, but staff was appointed by Bioversity or FAO.

It will be important to include in the options paper clear indications of what are the consequences of having a legal status, i.e. which staff positions need to be created as a consequence. It is necessary to check if all pros and cons of each option have been identified and complete the analysis with cost implications, as well as include the required practical steps for achieving each option.

Decision: Two options to be prepared in full detail, apart from the existing *status quo* option:

1. *status quo*
2. continuing the present status, but obtaining an own legal status
3. obtain full international agreement through a simplified procedure

6. Rules of procedure

Items that need to be developed were included in a draft list of rules of procedure.

Decision: G. Kleijer will develop a first draft by the end of February 2012, excluding for the moment rules and procedures that relate to the “Structure” and to the “Secretariat”.

7. Hosting arrangements

Two options should be considered, i.e. 1) remaining at Bioversity or 2) looking for a different host. Pros and cons should be listed and it should also be kept in mind that hosting, fund raising and legal status issues are interrelated.

A number of evaluation criteria were identified for the case of proceeding with an open tender for a host institute (i.e. in the case of option 2); different weights should be assigned to the individual criteria. It was noted that guidance on various aspects of public procurement, including guidelines on national and EU public procurement procedures can be found at http://www.etenders.gov.ie/guides/guides_list.aspx?Type=2.

Decision: Develop two options: 1) Remaining at Bioversity; 2) Tendering for a host institute.

8. Cost implications

It was agreed that the choice of the best options for the future cannot be cost neutral, unless there is a reduction of activities. There will be various elements that have a cost, if the SC will want to introduce them (such as the new Executive Secretary position, the legal status, the transfer to a different location, etc.). It was felt that there should be a cost estimate developed for every option.

It was agreed that the ExCo might reach a conclusion on and suggest to the SC a preferred combination of options. A neutral report will be sent to the SC, accompanied by a covering letter that could show the position/proposal that the ExCo will be prepared to defend at the SC meeting.

Among the principle elements that will need to be decided by the SC in order to choose the options are the indication of the percentage budget that can be assigned to the Secretariat and the percentage for activities, as well as a decision whether the various objectives of the Programme should have the same or different weight.

9. Time table

- The ECPGR Secretariat will start working on the Options Paper in December 2011 (the operational structure should be the starting point)
- The draft Options Paper should be ready by latest end of July 2012
- Submit the draft Options Paper for (electronic) comments to the SC at the beginning of August 2012
- Comments included and document finalized by the end of August 2012
- Meeting of ExCo in September 2012
- SC meeting in the second part of November 2012 (Vienna, Austria as the first option; to be confirmed). ExCo needs to prepare the agenda for the SC meeting, including some time allowance for discussion of WGs activities and progress of the Programme at large.

Order and time-frame of items to be prepared as well as additional observations:

1. ExCo Terms of Reference are ready (Annex 1 of these minutes)
2. ECPGR Objectives are almost ready and can be circulated to SC after cleaning (as Annex 2 of these minutes)
3. Operational structure and position of Executive Secretary (see ToRs of Task Force above) (first draft by end of March 2012, circulated to ExCo and then to Network Coordinators and to SC members – cost implications to be prepared at the end of the process and to be draft finalized by end of May 2012)
4. Rules of procedure (draft prepared by G. Kleijer by end of February 2012)
5. Legal status (draft prepared by Secretariat by end of April 2012)
6. Hosting arrangements (draft prepared by Secretariat by end of May 2012).

10. New ExCo member

Proposals were received to nominate Zofia Bulinska (Poland) in replacement of Silvia Strajeru. The members of the ExCo approved this proposal. It was agreed that G. Kleijer would send a letter to ask for her formal acceptance and then a message to the SC for approval of the proposed nomination.

11. Other business

The ECPGR Coordinator reported about:

- The joint meeting of ECPGR and the EU-funded PGR Secure project that was held in Palanga, Lithuania, in September 2011. The ECPGR Coordinator's travel report was circulated.
- An update on developments of EURISCO and its expected improvements.
- Financial status of ECPGR.

Jan Engels reported about the status of the preparation of the EC project proposal "Plant Gene Access" and the fact that it had not been possible to join forces with the botanic gardens.

Decisions: Upon consideration that the status of outstanding contributions is serious, with outstanding € 60,000 for Phase VII and outstanding € 565,000 for Phase VIII, it was decided that the use of the "Common Fund" that was established in Bratislava (2010) with savings made by the Networks would temporarily be frozen. Along the same lines, it was decided that the opportunity to hold a Leafy Vegetables WG meeting as an "Ad hoc" meeting, as proposed by its Chair, would be kept on hold and re-discussed at the next SC meeting in November 2012.

Annex 1. Interim Terms of Reference of the ECPGR Executive Committee

DRAFT – 30 November 2011

1. The Executive Committee consists of five members of the Steering Committee (SC), elected by the SC for a 5-year term of office and representing all European sub-regions (North, West, Central, East and South, in a broad sense), and ex officio the ECPGR Coordinator who will be without voting rights. To ensure continuity, one member of the Executive Committee is replaced by a new member on an annual basis. A re-election is possible only after a break-period of 5 years.
2. The Executive Committee elects a Chair among its members.
3. The Executive Committee proposes each year a new member of the same sub-region as that of the outgoing member, in consultation with the SC. This member will be elected by the SC.
4. The Executive Committee plans or executes the activities of ECPGR as decided upon by the SC.
5. The Executive Committee prepares the SC meetings supported by the ECPGR Secretariat.
6. The Executive Committee identifies strategic issues important for ECPGR and brings proposals to the attention of the SC.
7. The Executive Committee mandates the Secretariat in carrying out its decisions, offers guidance to the Secretariat and the Chair assumes the technical supervision of the ECPGR Coordinator.
8. The Executive Committee establishes short-term Task Forces (TFs) for well-defined topics as required and develops their Terms of Reference (ToRs). These TFs can be composed of one to five experts. The TFs report directly to the Executive Committee or may also report to the SC if so requested by the Executive Committee.
9. The Executive Committee reports on its activities and outputs to the Steering Committee at each Steering Committee meeting.
10. The Executive Committee members, especially the Chair, represent ECPGR to the external world.
11. The Executive Committee will meet when necessary. The decision to meet must be taken by the Executive Committee members on the proposal of the Chair. The minutes of these meetings will be sent to the members of the SC as appropriate.
12. The travel and lodging costs of the Executive Committee meetings will be covered by the ECPGR budget and are subject to available funds.
13. The Executive Committee can deal with financial issues up to 5000 euro.
14. Decisions of the Executive Committee are made by consensus and can also be taken by means of email when it is deemed necessary to do so.

Annex 2. Logframe of ECPGR (time frame: 2014-2018)

Objectives	Indicators	Important assumptions	Remarks
<p><u>Super Goal(s)</u></p> <p><i>Agrobiodiversity is secured; Food security is improved; Sustainability of food production has increased</i></p> <p><i>European agriculture has become more resilient to climate change; Stability and quality of EUR varieties have increased</i></p>			
<p><u>Goal</u> (Long-term goal to which ECPGR Contributes)</p> <p><i>National, sub-regional and regional programmes in Europe collaboratively, rationally and effectively conserve ex situ and in situ PGRFA, provide access and increase utilization</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of SMTAs signed - Number of accessions included in SMTAs - Number of accessions registered in EURISCO - Number of European Accessions registered as AEGIS accessions - Number of collections AQUAS-certified - Number of crops for which complementary <i>in situ</i> and <i>ex situ</i> conservation programmes exists - Number of contributing partners - Number of national and sub-regional programmes - Number of accessions included in breeding programmes/new varieties 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - An increasing number of ECPGR member countries sign AEGIS agreement - Funds for conservation, research and qualified personnel and researchers are available 	

Objectives	Indicators	Important assumptions	Remarks
<p>Purpose / Outcomes (attributable to ECPGR within one phase)</p>			
<p>1. AEGIS is operational and accessions in AEGIS are characterized and evaluated</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of accessions in AEGIS which are characterized and evaluated and included into EURISCO - Number of MoUs (% of EUR countries) - Number of Associate Membership Agreements (absolute numbers) - Feedback of users (based on outcome of survey) 		
<p>2. The functionality of EURISCO meets users' expectations and quantity and quality of data in EURISCO have been increased, including <i>in situ</i> and on-farm data</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of national inventories (NIs) regularly updated and uploaded to EURISCO - Number of <i>in situ</i>/on-farm data sets in EURISCO - C&E data available in EURISCO - Number of evaluation data added on annual basis - Degree of compatibility with the international information systems - Feedback of users (based on outcome of survey) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Countries invest into the establishment and/or improvement of data repositories for high-quality characterization and evaluation data - Countries are prepared to share their data 	

Objectives	Indicators	Important assumptions	Remarks
<p>3. <i>In situ</i> and on-farm conservation and management concepts are agreed</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agreement on ECPGR <i>in situ</i> concept(s) - To be developed, pending agreement on concept 		<p>Proposed indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of accessions conserved <i>in situ</i> and on-farm - Complementarity between <i>in situ</i> and <i>ex situ</i> conservation - Monitoring of conserved accessions <i>in situ</i>/on-farm - Satisfaction of researchers and farmers <p>Proposed assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Functioning cooperation between Ministries responsible for <i>in situ</i> management in each member country - Cooperation between stakeholders for on-farm conservation (government, genebanks, local communities, botanic gardens, farmers, NGOs) can be strengthened
<p>4. <i>Commitment and regular resources</i> of national governments is sustained or increased and commitments and resources of the EC, as well as of other potential donors towards ECPGR are increased</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cumulative funding obtained from EU or other donors on annual basis - Number of countries renewing ECPGR membership each Phase - Regular payment of membership contribution - Outstanding membership contributions submitted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ECPGR recognized by EU as a formal regional instrument of cooperation 	

Objectives	Indicators	Important assumptions	Remarks
5. Relations with users of germplasm are strengthened	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of joint activities/interactions between ECPGR (WGs, individuals) and research/breeding sectors or organizations and farmers - Number of evaluation/characterization projects implemented by users with genebank material - Number of germplasm requested by farmers, breeders and researchers - Number of breeders/users participating in ECPGR WG meetings - Number of new varieties including germplasm from genebanks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Users continue to demand and value diversity 	
6. Organizational structure and secretarial support are adequate to effectively sustain the operations of ECPGR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of permanent positions at Secretariat - Number of meetings of Executive Committee and Steering Committee 		
<u>Outputs (need to be completed with delivery date)</u>			
1. AEGIS			
1.1 Formalization of AEGIS membership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of AEGIS crop collections established and managed as AEGIS collections - Increased number of AEGIS member countries and associated members 		
1.2 AQUAS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - AQUAS agreed and operational 		
1.3 Mobilize funds to help European Genebanks becoming AQUAS-certified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Financial support for upgrading available 		

Objectives	Indicators	Important assumptions	Remarks
1.4 Establish and operate European Collection	- Number of European Accessions		
1.5 Capacity building of Associate Members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - AQUAS management procedures in place for collections maintained by Associate Members - Investments for training and infrastructure 	- Associate Members have capacities to support other Associate Members	
2. EURISCO			
2.1 All National Focal Points effectively update national inventories	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regular/yearly updates of national inventories provided to EURISCO contact points - Average number of updates/NI/year 		
2.2 Inclusion of C&E data in EURISCO – quality – coverage	- Number of C&E data sets in EURISCO		
2.3 Inclusion of <i>in situ</i> /on-farm data in EURISCO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Formats to effectively document <i>in situ</i> management information incorporated into EURISCO - Number and categories of <i>in situ</i> data sets in EURISCO 	- Structure of EURISCO is expanded for inclusion of <i>in situ</i> /on-farm data	

Objectives	Indicators	Important assumptions	Remarks
<p>3. <i>In situ</i></p>			<p>Proposed outputs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Establishment of inventories of potential <i>in situ</i> populations - Undertaking national genetic gap analysis of CWR species as a basis for the establishment of national CWR conservation plans - Establishment of reserves for targeted species (including complementarity with <i>ex situ</i> collections) - Incorporation of legislative protection of CWR species and genetic diversity at both national and European levels - Establishment of national LR inventories - Establishment and implementation of National LR conservation strategy <p>Proposed indicators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of national inventories established - Number of new reserves established with documented attention to CWR (measure at national and European scale)
<p>3.1 Draft concepts developed and discussed</p>			
<p>3.2-onwards To be developed after adoption of concepts (see proposals in remarks column 3.)</p>			

Objectives	Indicators	Important assumptions	Remarks
4. Resources			
4.1 Establish a strategy for the relation ECPGR – EC/EU	- Regular dialogue with EU		
4.2 Increased awareness of the value of PGRFA at all levels (decision-makers at National and EU level)	- Number of meetings organized with the EU to discuss PGRFA with decision-makers - Regular contributions to the programme		
4.3 Increased collaboration between ECPGR and ITPGRFA and FAO Commission	- MoU with Secretariat of ITPGRFA about regional role of ECPGR		
4.4 See remarks (to be discussed)			<p>Proposed output: Increased awareness of the value of PGRFA at all levels (Public and Users)</p> <p>Proposed indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of news items yearly in which PGRFA are covered - Level of awareness among public - Environmental Education Centres, Research Centres, advertisements, etc - Users support genebank programmes through monetary or non-monetary means - Number of annual transactions from genebanks to users (or, the reverse: requests) - Level of awareness among farmers, breeders, scientists - Workshops, seminars, advertisements, leaflets, etc.

Objectives	Indicators	Important assumptions	Remarks
5. Users			
5.1 Survey of the need for European characterization and evaluation programmes with high relevance to potential users	- C&E survey carried out		
5.2 Research partnerships established between genebanks and researchers as part of EU projects	- Number of research agreements/projects in which ECPGR countries participate - Number of ECPGR countries participating in EU projects		
5.3 Survey on expectations of users from genebanks (completed and recommendations discussed)	- Number of questionnaires distributed, returned and presented to public - Number of actions carried out as a result of survey		
5.4 Promotion of closer conservationist/breeder links and through those links enhance CWR diversity utilization			
5.5 Effective services to users are established	- Extent of accessions and information provided		
6. Secretariat			
6.1 – 6.4 Transition plan implemented (include the results of the transition plan here) (to be completed after decisions based on Options Paper)			

Objectives	Indicators	Important assumptions	Remarks
Activities (draft to be completed after decisions based on Options Paper)			
1.1.1 Compilation of generic operational standards (by end of 2011)			Indicator: Generic operational standards in place Assumptions: The majority of Associate Members (AMs) will be able to adopt the standards
1.1.2 Compilation of operational genebank manuals (by end of 2011)			Indicator: Number of manuals Assumptions: Associate members are capable to compile a genebank manual
1.1.3 Compilation of minimum standards per crop or crop group			Indicator: Number of crops or crop groups, where minimum standards have been established
1.1.4 Establishment of a record keeping system			Indicator: Number of AMs with record keeping system in place
1.1.5 Establishment of a reporting system			Indicator: Number of reports
1.1.6 Implementation of a monitoring system			
1.2.1 Identification by the AM, in consultation with the respective AEGIS Member, of eligible accessions to be proposed for registration as European Accessions			Indicator: Number of proposed European Accessions
1.2.2 Verification and where appropriate acceptance of the proposed European Accessions			
1.2.3 Managing of the European Accessions by the AMs in accordance with the principles of AEGIS			

Objectives	Indicators	Important assumptions	Remarks
1.3.1 AMs provide conservation-related services such as multiplication of accessions or conservation of accessions under specific conditions (e.g. <i>in vitro</i> , cryopreservation, etc.)			
1.3.2 AMs provide services for characterization, evaluation or phenotyping for other AMs			
1.4.1 Infrastructure.....			
1.4.2 Training.....			
2.1.1 Identification of the <i>ex situ</i> PGRFA in each country that are regarded as forming part of the national PGRFA system			
2.1.2 Strengthening of the national PGRFA network/programme – especially between NFP and PGRFA-holding institutes			
2.1.3 Training of NFPs (how to compile, maintain, update and upload NI)			
2.1.4 Capacity building at national level (hardware, software)			
2.2.1 Develop recommendations for the future of the CCDBs			
2.3.1 Network of NFPs for <i>in situ</i> and on-farm strengthened			
2.3.2 Identification of the <i>in situ</i> /on-farm PGRFA in each country that are regarded as forming part of the national PGRFA system			

Objectives	Indicators	Important assumptions	Remarks
2.3.3 Develop and agree on one common minimum standard for exchange of <i>in situ</i> and on-farm data, based on a draft, jointly prepared by the ECPGR Documentation and Information Network and the <i>In situ</i> and On-farm Conservation Network, and involving the relevant actors who in time will also be responsible for the compilation of the data			
2.3.4 To seek an agreement on these minimum standards between ECPGR, Bioversity International and FAO			
2.3.5 To create the incentives and required support for NFPs to develop NIs for <i>in situ</i> /on-farm			
2.3.6 Compilation of NIs for <i>in situ</i> /on-farm PGRFA			Indicator: Number of NIs for <i>in situ</i> /on-farm PGRFA
2.3.7 To expand the data structure of EURISCO for inclusion of <i>in situ</i> /on-farm data			
2.3.8 To develop a transfer mechanism for data from NIs to EURISCO			
2.3.9 To provide capacity building and training where necessary			
3.1.1 Prioritization of <i>in situ</i> species (crop wild relatives)			
3.1.2 Compilation of Red Lists for on-farm PGRFA			
3.1.3 Elaboration of <i>in situ</i> management plans			

Objectives	Indicators	Important assumptions	Remarks
3.1.4 Elaboration of on-farm management plans			
3.1.5 Establishment of a European coordination mechanism for <i>in situ</i> and on-farm conservation			
3.2.1 See 2.3.1.-2.3.9			
3.3.1 See 3.1.3			
4.1.1 Elaboration of risk assessment plan			
4.2.1 Develop a strategy paper			