



General Assembly
Zagreb, 25 – 26 August, 2018

ERFP Ad Hoc Action ERFP SWOT

Elżbieta Martyniuk

The objective of the *Ad hoc* Action

- to to collect and analyse views of the National Coordinators on the current strategy and operation of the ERF in order to:
 - ✓ review the work of the ERF
 - ✓ identify its strengths, weaknesses, future opportunities and potential threats
 - ✓ identify the issues that require further discussion in the process of preparation of a new MultiYearProgramme of Work of the ERF.
- The budget of *Ad hoc* Action of 5.000 EURO to cover one physical meeting.

Membership of the group

Ad Hoc Action: the core group	
Czech Republic	Vera Matlova
France	Lorraine Puzin
Norway	Nina Sæther
Poland	Grazyna Polak
Slovenia	Danijela Bojkovski
SC Members	
Netherlands	Sipke-Joost Hiemstra
Austria	Beate Berger
Luxembourg	Jeanne Bormann
Serbia	Srdjan Stojanović
Slovakia	Jan Tomka
Sweden	Eva-Marie Stålhammar

General information: the process

Development of the draft survey for consultation with the Members	Chair, 5th April
Consultation on draft survey	April - early May
Launching the survey	Secretariat, 8 th May
Reminder	Secretariat, 23 th May
Follow up with NCs	Chair
Second reminder	Secretariat, 29 th May
First analysis of the surveys obtained, PP for discussion in Zagreb	Chair
Meeting of the Ad Hoc Action members, identification of the key outcomes of the survey	Zagreb, 15 th -16 th June
Preparation of the report for the General Assembly	Chair, 10 th August

	Friday, 15 th June 2018
11:00 – 13:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome and opening of the meeting • Election of Rapporteur • Presentation of the general results of the questionnaire (Part I. General information) • Discussion
14:00 – 16:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of the outcome of the questionnaire: Part II. ERFP evaluation: general issues
16:30 – 18:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of the outcome of the questionnaire: Part III. ERFP evaluation: support for the NCs
	Saturday, 16 th June 2018
8:30 – 10:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of the outcome of the questionnaire: Part IV. SWOT analysis
11:00 – 13:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summing up: recommendations/key proposals on future ERFP work and possible amendments of the MYPOW • Discussion on the paper based on the results of the Q

10+ hours



General Assembly, Zagreb, 25-26 August, 2018

General information: participation

- In total, 29 replies to the survey were obtained
- Two replies contained only NO answers and were removed
- Two replies were duplicates, so four of them were discharged
- 25 replies (respectively: 15 + 5 + 5)
were complete and subject to further analysis
- 19 replies to the survey indicated respondents
- 6 replies to the survey were anonymous

10. What is your general evaluation of the importance of the ERF as a platform of the NCs?

Options	Number of replies	%
Extremely important	10	40
Very important	10	40
Important	5	20
Quite useful	-	
Not so important	-	

11. Do you consider the current ERFp organizational structure (WGs, Task Forces and *Ad hoc* action) as:

Options	Number of replies	%
Very useful – to be maintained	17	68
Very useful – but need to be further developed/improved	8	32
Require substantial changes	-	

- Involvement of national experts (not NCs only) in WGs and Task Forces and Ad Hoc Actions should be promoted;
- WGs and TFs should have clear goals and clear expected outputs;
- More activities through Ad hoc Actions should be promoted;

11. Do you consider the current ERFPP organizational structure (WGs, Task Forces and *Ad hoc* action) as:

- Need for external communication expert (website, social media, etc.), supported by core communication group
- Less and more active expert/ participants in groups to be more effective
- Suggestions for further development: enhance the role of the WGs as advisory bodies of the ERFPP, (specific proposals / guidelines etc that are developed through the WGs, after approval from assembly are forwarded further as ERFPP proposals)
- more active contribution of participating candidates, professional assistance by the (a permanent) secretariat (work load too high for certain areas)
- creation of a permanent secretariat office and revision of ERFPP service costs
- include and encourage active participation and membership
- More information prior to major decision making should be sent to NCs



Zagreb, June 15-16, 2018

Our goal:

to develop recommendations
for the next MYPOW

Key issues for discussion at the General Assembly

- Permanent or rotational secretariat.
- Future funding of the secretariat.
- Continue with light structure or take steps towards a legal entity.
- The issue of ERFP being recognized as EU reference centre for endangered breeds.
- Combining *Task Force ABS* and *Task Force EU Matters* into one *Working group on policy*.



Key issues for discussion at the General Assembly

- Should we bring back the practice of providing short national annual reports on AnGR activities?
- Should we encourage implementation of more regional projects, financed by ERFP?

Key issues for discussion at the General Assembly

- How can we improve communication within the ERF network? (newsletter, web-portal, social media, on-line forum)?
- How can we improve external visibility of the ERF?
- How can we improve the operations and outputs of the ERF bodies?
- How can we enhance active participation from more countries: in general and as the members of ERF bodies?
- How can we enhance the number of countries that pay their country contribution to the ERF? Should we revise reimbursement policy in this respect?





Thank you

General Assembly, Zagreb, 25-26 August, 2018

Type of the Institution of the NC

Institution	Number of responses
government	13
research	12
education	3
farmers/breeders organizations	-
other	1

2. When have you been appointed as the NC?

Period	Number of responses	%
≤ 1997	1	4
1997 - 2007	6	24
2008 - 2014	10	40
≥ 2015	8	32

3. Have you been involved in the work of the NFP-AnGR before being appointed as the NC?

Period	Number of responses	%
Yes, for some time	6	24
Yes, shortly before	9	36
No	10	40

4. Are you personally involved in the work of any groups or bodies established by the ERFP?

ERFP bodies	Number of replies: MC	
	Yes	No
Steering Committee	7	18
WG Documentation and Information	11	14
WG Ex situ conservation	8	17
WG In situ conservation	6	19
Task Force ABS	6	19
Task Force EU matters	3	22
<i>Ad hoc</i> Actions	8	17
Others	2	23
No	6	19

4. Are you personally involved in the work of any groups or bodies established by the ERF P?

Comments

- My team and collaborators are involved, not me directly
- Leading the WG documentation and Information (2 terms 2011-2017), coordination and/or participation in ad hoc actions, supporting the work of ERF P Secretariat (2006-2010)

5. Are there experts from your country, others than you, participating in the work of any groups or bodies established by the ERFP?

ERFP bodies	Number of replies: MC	
	Yes	No
WG Documentation and Information	10	15
WG Ex situ conservation	12	13
WG In situ conservation	11	14
Task Force ABS	1	23
Task Force EU matters	3	22
<i>Ad hoc</i> Actions	3	22
Others	1	24
No	8	17

6. If your country is not represented in the ERFPP Working Groups /bodies what are the reasons for such situation?

- It is difficult to get people involved to convince persons to take on a task like being a member of a WG. It would be better if you within a country could spread this work on several hands. Researchers , who have the knowledge seem not to be so keen to take part.
- Lack of manpower
- Lack of human resources in National Focal Point
- Lack of personal capacities (planning to appoint 2 people this year (WG Documentation and WG Ex situ)
- Lack of resources and thereby lower priority than other national tasks about conservation and sustainable use of animal genetic resources. Part of cooperation through NordGen. Participates in Working Groups ad hoc.

6. If your country is not represented in the ERF Working Groups /bodies what are the reasons for such situation?

- Lack of human resources, less endangered breeds to be managed in a small country
- We are present in all bodies
- For some of them we did not candidate representatives, but some working groups or bodies are small groups with limited number of members.
- Lack of resources
- Very small pool of local individuals involved in AnGR
- There are some difficulties to attend ERF events, usually related to Representation Expenses

7. Are you involved, as the country representative/NC in the work of the ITWG-AnGR at the FAO?

Options	Number of replies	%
YES	18	72
NO	6	24
No reply	1	4

- Representing government in ITWG-AnGR as Member country/head of delegation
- Taking part in the meetings. Prepare the instruction with my ministry
- work on DADIS, case studies

7. Are you involved, as the country representative/NC in the work of the ITWG-AnGR at the FAO?

- ITWG member and observer
- Participation on regular meetings to inform/get involved relevant domestic bodies to solve current issues in AnGR
- My department participates somehow in the FAO activities
- Participation in the country's delegation at FAO
- **Attending ITWG** AnGR as observer, joining regional discussions
- I will be involved from this year
- Member of the ERG
- I am regularly informed and invited to participate ITWG meetings.

8. Are you involved, as the country representative (NC) in the intergovernmental work at the EU level?

Options	Number of replies	%
YES	9	36
NO	16	64

Government-based NC: 13

- Not all countries are EU Members
- Government staff usually represent the country at EU level. Advisory role as NC
- Partly, it can also be done of others, but we inform each other
- Only as a national expert
- EU-Commission working group Zootechnics

8. Are you involved, as the country representative (NC) in the intergovernmental work at the EU level?

- Only randomly according to the actual needs, especially the preparing of documents for official delegations
- WG and experts Groups in Commission and Council EU
- several expert groups (zootechnics, quality and promotion of agricultural products, ...)
- Contribute to the design of Pillar 2 funded agri- environmental schemes which often involves negotiation with EU officials

9. Does your country pay a contribution fee to the ERF?

Options	Number of replies	%
YES	24	96
NO	1	4

- 1 No: but „pays, but not every year”
- NCs not always sure about the timing:
 - No answer/ ??
 - Do not have this info
 - Probably from...
 - Since ... but irregularly
 - Since the beginning
 - I do not have this information, but I suppose since the beginning of the year 2000



Zagreb, June 15-16, 2018

Part II. ERFP evaluation: general issues

Questions 10 -18

10. What is your general evaluation of the importance of the ERFPP as a platform of the NCs?

Options	Number of replies	%
Extremely important	10	40
Very important	10	40
Important	5	20
Quite useful	-	
Not so important	-	

11. Do you consider the current ERFPP organizational structure (WGs, Task Forces and *Ad hoc* action) as:

Options	Number of replies	%
Very useful – to be maintained	17	68
Very useful – but need to be further developed/improved	8	32
Require substantial changes	-	

- Involvement of national experts (not NCs only) in WGs and Task Forces and Ad Hoc Actions should be promoted;
- WGs and TFs should have clear goals and clear expected outputs;
- More activities through Ad hoc Actions should be promoted;

11. Do you consider the current ERFP organizational structure (WGs, Task Forces and *Ad hoc* action) as:

- Need for external communication expert (website, social media, etc.), supported by core communication group
- Less and more active expert/ participants in groups to be more effective
- Suggestions for further development: enhance the role of the WGs as advisory bodies of the ERFP, (specific proposals / guidelines etc that are developed through the WGs, after approval from assembly are forwarded further as ERFP proposals)
- more active contribution of participating candidates, professional assistance by the (a permanent) secretariat (work load too high for certain areas)
- creation of a permanent secretariat office and revision of ERFP service costs
- include and encourage active participation and membership

More information prior to major decision making should be sent to NCs

12. Do you have any specific proposals regarding the governance structure of the ERFP?

Options	Number of replies	%
No, keep it as it is	14	56
Yes	7	28
I do not know	4	16

- The Secretariat works very well - with a new Secretariat some new ideas might come.
- **Permanent secretariat**
- **Transparent SC: The outcome of SC-Meetings (protocols) have to be communicated to the NCs via Email**

12. Do you have any specific proposals regarding the governance structure of the ERF?

- The top-down system could be modernised with less strict and formalised rules and a more participative, bottom-up system
- Enhance the role of the SC Committee by promoting the communication between the members of the SC and the NCs in total and particular with the regions that are represented. **NCs are informed on SC decisions (either by distributing the report directly or by notifying the NCs that the SC meeting report is in the intranet).**
- Maintain the clear difference between ad hoc actions and Task force, sometimes the boundaries are confused
- **Set up of a permanent secretariat (non-rotational basis); setting up ERF as an official legal body**
- The secretariat should have more people to handle the tasks carried out by the ERF

13. Do you have any specific proposals regarding the General Assembly of the ERF?

Options	Number of replies	%
No	13	52
Yes	12	48

- Keep 'business meeting ERF' short, and select specific topics annually for better interaction and exchange between NCs (incl. observers).
- The GA meeting are sometimes very long with lots of reporting from different Groups. Interesting - but not very often creating a discussion. If some of the material is sent out beforehand it might help the participants.
- Decisions for the assembly have to be communicated well before (>2 weeks) the Meeting. The assembly should be at the same place (town) as the EAAP Meeting and not in another part of the country.

13. Do you have any specific proposals regarding the General Assembly of the ERF?

- Find a way to involve more NCs during the year, prior to the General Assembly
- Organise small working groups in a creative and participative fashion during the Assembly
- Getting NCs more involved -more national experiences and problems presented - opportunity for NCs to choose topics for upcoming Assembly in advance
- It's good to joint the dates and venue to EAAP meetings
- Budget and workplan in the morning, followed by other reports, and decisions taken in the end of the day to have the opportunity to exchange among NCs and shape the final decisions and plans. In the same direction is also the proposal that the members of the SC are proposed in the assembly (not in advance).

13. Do you have any specific proposals regarding the General Assembly of the ERF?

- The above will enhance the substantial role of assembly as the decision body. Additional the policy on reimbursement for the annual assembly needs to be revised. Possible options:
 - 1) all NCs eligible to be reimbursed (in this option the fees per country should be increased - not very practical),
 - 2) all NCs are partially reimbursed (accommodation / dinner)
 - 3) only SCs members, leaders of ad hoc actions / TFs, or NCs presenting contributions from the work in their country can be reimbursedIn option 3. The SC decides well in advance before the assembly on which countries/contributions will be possible for the respective annual assembly .

13. Do you have any specific proposals regarding the General Assembly of the ERF?

- Put less weight / emphasis on the administrative part, put more focus on scientific issues and country reports by NCs
- Shorten the business part and organize specific topics interesting for NC
- More guidance on topical schemes such as the design and implementation of agricultural environmental schemes, genebanks etc.

14. Please identify at least three activities/initiatives of the ERF that you consider very successful

	Examples of succesful activities		
	Activity 1	Activity 2	Activity 3
Number of NCs providing examples	20	20	16
No examples	5	5	9

14. Please identify at least three activities/initiatives of the ERFP that you consider very successful

Successful activities	No of responses	%
The role and excellent work of the node manager EFABIS		
Initiative to start EUGENA (through WG Ex Situ)		
Ad hoc Actions which resulted in renewed ERFP website and EUGENA portal		
The different WG groups and task forces		
The back-to-back meetings of the WG and Task forces in June; they are important meeting points for exchange of information and knowledge.		
Ad hoc meetings before the ITWG-AnGR meeting		
Steering committee work		
EFABIS		
Establishing WG In Situ		
TF ABS - information and analysis		

14. Please identify at least three activities/initiatives of the ERFP that you consider very successful

Successful activities	No of responses	%
Eugena Network		
ITWG Preparation		
Any meeting: always a good way to share information		
sharing information on EU level (for instance work done on animal breeding regulation)		
Strong collaboration with FAO		
Established WG`s		
Task force		
Improvement of documentation of AnGR in Europe		
Establishment of EUGENA network		
Networking within the ERFP framework		
Getting NCs together		
Exchange of knowledge		

14. Please identify at least three activities/initiatives of the ERFPP that you consider very successful

Successful activities	No of responses	%
Supporting activities on international level		
communication with the EU		
involvement in grant schemes		
institution of WGs/TFs		
EUGENA		
EFABIS		
WG & TF		
Establishment of WGs and the work linked with EFABIS database and the EUGENA network		
Workshops that held in various countries (i.e. Cryopreservation Workshop, Paris 2003 / Conservation of livestock genetic resources by utilization Workshop, Reykjavik 2009 / Gene Banking and Cryopreservation Training Workshop, Lelystad 2010), Workshops		



Zagreb, June 15-16, 2018

14. Please identify at least three activities/initiatives of the ERFP that you consider very successful

Successful activities	No of responses	%
Scoping studies funded by ERFP that led to EU GENRES projects (870/04) EURECA / HERITAGESHEEP		
Working groups on in situ and ex situ conservation		
Setting up of a new webpage (still under construction)		
Linking up with other GRes networks, collaboration in H2020 project definition		
In situ conservation WG		
ERFP Task Force EU matters		
Task Force on Access and Benefit Sharing		
Preparation of the position papers for ITWG-AnGR		
Collaboration with FAO and better documentation		
collaboration with other networks		

14. Please identify at least three activities/initiatives of the ERFP that you consider very successful

Successful activities	No of responses	%
EUGENA memorandum of understanding		
Creation of new web site of ERFP - more informative		
Support of EFABIS		
strengthening the network		
exchange of experience		
exchange of information		
Lobbying EU Commission on a number of issues		
Annual meetings are a good opportunity to network with colleagues		
Efabis		
working group in-situ conservation		
ex-situ conservation working group		
Project SUBSIBREED		

15. Please identify activities/initiatives of the ERF P that you consider a failure or unnecessary

	Examples of unnecessary activities		
	Activity 1	Activity 2	Activity 3
Number of NCs providing examples	12	3	1
No examples	13	22	24

15. Please identify activities/initiatives of the ERF P that you consider a failure or unnecessary

Unnecessary activities	Number of responses	%
Not always is it a good idea to have joint meetings. I see the point of saving travelling costs, but....		
Motivating countries to participate - not failure, but not complete still		
The communication between NCs between Assemblies: is not a real failure nor unnecessary, but could be really improved in a more participative way?		
ERFP Newsletter		
Achieving legal personality		
WG ABS		
Activities/ initiatives should be always considered within the period that these have been implemented and the level of development at that period		

15. Please identify activities/initiatives of the ERF P that you consider a failure or unnecessary

Unnecessary activities	Number of responses	%
Task force EU - needs professional assistance by a permanent secretariat, exceeds the work load volunteers are willing to invest, following up EU processes should not be in the responsibility of a small group of people		
Become legal entity		
Newsletter		
EFABIS additional fields proposals		
We don't believe any areas are a failure		
An area that we would like to see more of is information sharing so that we can learn from what other countries are doing well		
Not sure if changes in DAD-IS and then EFABIS are helpful		
Eugena might be helpful for some countries but not always		

16. Do you consider a system of rotation the ERFP Secretariat as a successful approach?

Options	Number of replies	%
Yes	11	44
No	8	32
I am not sure	6	24

- Puts a lot of burden on a country and may not be the most efficient approach. On the other hand it is probably cheaper than having a permanent secretariat in an office.
- The rotation of the ERFP-secretariat is a vulnerable system as long as the host country has to cover the expenses of running the Secretariat. The national contributions are too low to finance a secretariat in addition to running the WGs and Task forces

17. Do you think that the funding mechanism of the ERF, based on national contributions, is satisfactory?

Options	Number of replies	%
Yes	13	52
No	3	12
I am not sure	9	36

- For several contributing countries there seems lack of continuity in annual payments; free riders - any country can participate in meetings and get reimbursement, paying annual country contribution or not
- Would be more so if more countries would participate
- No better alternatives for funding
- It needs a real discussion

17. Do you think that the funding mechanism of the ERF, based on national contributions, is satisfactory?

- Problem lies in stability of funding. If (more) activities are planned in the future, ERF has to have more stable income.
- I think it's the only possible at the moment. I can understand that in some cases there is no mechanism to pay contributions, and I appreciate that everything works so far on the principle of solidarity.
- To avoid the problems to justify this contribution on a voluntary basis, would it be possible to explore the possibility of paying the fee altogether with the FAO contribution and so, receive the fee from FAO?
- The level of the country contribution and the range of contributions needs revision. The lower limit should be discussed and also the in kind contribution and the funding through research projects

17. Do you think that the funding mechanism of the ERFP, based on national contributions, is satisfactory?

- Struggling to get contributions even by financially sound countries
- ERFP should seek to legalize and collaborate in projects
- Additional sources of funding should be found
- Funding can be supplemented through various grant applications of ERFP member institutions
- More emphasis needs to be put on requiring countries who don't pay to do so. Maybe they should not be allowed to participate if they miss 2 or 3 years payments in a row? Think other organisations take a stricter approach on payment

18. Do you have specific suggestions how the ERFP structure/ organisation or the role of ERFP should further develop in the next 10 years?

Options	Number of replies	%
Yes	11	44
No	8	32
I am not sure	6	24

- ERFP could further develop as a coordinating platform/network organisation. Not just a network or communication platform for NCs only, but more visible and communicating to 'sister organisations' and to the outside world in general.
- Permanent secretariat
- A permanent Secretariat could handle more workload which would i.e. result in a better transparency. However, a permanent Secretariat has high costs in comparison to a rotating Secretariat.

18. Do you have specific suggestions how the ERFPP structure/ organisation or the role of ERFPP should further develop in the next 10 years?

- ERFPP should become more visible and act in more official way (**maybe as reference/consulting body**)
- To cover the costs of running the ERFPP-secretariat one should maybe consider increasing the country contributions. The country contributions to the ECPGR and EUFORGEN are so much higher than the ERFPP-contributions.
- It needs a real discussion
- I am not able to predict the future but developing into a multi-speed platform that will require a different management structure cannot be excluded
- Some changes to establishment of **ERFPP as legal body**? External, professional and permanent support for the administrative and economical aspects to the Secretariat. Distinction between scientific, administration and sector approach.
- Strengthen the role of the ERFPP within the Global FAO strategy. Stimulate the work of NCs at national level, improving capacities etc. **Maintain the light structure** and facilitate the coordination among NCs, enhance links with other regions

18. Do you have specific suggestions how the ERFP structure/ organisation or the role of ERFP should further develop in the next 10 years?

- Set up of a professional, **permanent secretariat**
- Add the function of **European Reference center** for endangered breeds
- Work towards solving problems with **legal entity**
- More guidance and assistance to deal with key issues such as Agri Environmental schemes, genebanks etc.
- It should use more networking activities in order to reach decision bodies, for example in the EC
- There should be greater collaboration with other genetic resource groups e.g. ECPGR with generic issues being dealt with across groups.
- Would be better for ERFP to focus on key work and progress that quickly rather than deal with a lot of things that lose momentum and take a long time to deliver



Zagreb, June 15-16, 2018

Part III. ERFP evaluation: support for the NCs

Questions 19 - 24

19. What areas of current work on conservation and sustainable use of AnGR should be strengthened in your country?

Areas of activities	Number of responses: MC	
	YES	NO
Inventory and monitoring of between breed diversity	6	19
Inventory and monitoring of within breed diversity	9	16
In situ conservation	12	13
Ex situ conservation	16	9
Valorisation of breed products and services	11	4
Knowledge transfer and capacity building	6	19
Development of policies and legislation	8	17
Cooperation with and between stakeholders	???????	
Raise awareness in society and among consumers	13	12
Sustainable breeding programs for the endangered native breeds	13	12
Others	-	25



Zagreb, June 15-16, 2018

19. What areas of current work on conservation and sustainable use of AnGR should be strengthened in your country?

Additional comments

- More scientific research on 'phenotyping' and research on technical/economic performance of non-mainstream breeds in a variety of well described production systems
- Strengthen co-operation with other sectors, especially with the biodiversity conservation sectors
- Tools to know the effectiveness of the breeding programs
- Establishment of National Gene Bank, setting the legislative framework and operational plan, as it has been delayed significantly.
- Less relevant as small country
- Cooperation with and between stakeholders

20. For which area of current priorities at national level you expect benefits from collaboration through the ERFP?

Areas of activities	Number of responses: MC	
	YES	NO
Inventory and monitoring of between breed diversity	7 (6)	18
Inventory and monitoring of within breed diversity	6 (9)	19
In situ conservation	12(12)	13
Ex situ conservation	17 (16)	8
Valorisation of breed products and services	13 (11)	12
Development of policies and legislation	10 (8)	15
Cooperation with and between stakeholders	8 ()	17
Raise awareness in society and among consumers	9 (13)	16
Others	-	25

20. For which area of current priorities at national level you expect benefits from collaboration through the ERFP?

Additional proposals

- Tools to know the effectiveness of the breeding programs

21. Do you consider that activities/initiatives of the ERFP related to international (FAO, EU) are supporting your work as NC? Are they:

Evaluation	Number of responses:	%
Extremely important	5	20
Very important	10	40
Important	7	28
Quite useful	2	8
Not so important	-	
Not relevant	-	
No answer	1	4

- The ad hoc actions where we prepare for the ITWG AnGR are very helpful in the preparatory work for my country.

21. Do you consider that activities/initiatives of the ERFP related to international (FAO, EU) are supporting your work as NC? Are they:

- FAO works on global level, Europe has some special needs and ERFP helps to fulfil these. ERFP does not equal EU, but on EU level ERFP helps to inform about and to coordinate national and transboundary initiatives.
- Preparation for FAO-ITWG meetings
- Provide arguments to support/fund the necessary measures and activities
- The activities that we do in ERFP are connected to the activities we must do in FAO/EU, so there are important synergies that support the NC work
- Contributions of ERFP in the international bodies, outcomes of projects and activities are further diffused in the country and contribute to maintain the discussion on the major issues of AnGR in the country
- ERFP is some type of bridge between NCs or countries and FAO



22. Does the ERFp have an impact on your standing as the National Coordinator at the national level?

Evaluation	Number of responses:	%
Yes, very much	7	28
Limited	13	52
No	4	16
No answer	1	4

- Position of NC is not so well recognized at national level. It is not a formal role/position. At the same time ERFp is not well known at government levels.

22. Does the ERFP have an impact on your standing as the National Coordinator at the national level?

- It gives me support and a common understanding. As a group you can feel the support in difficult matters. Without ERFP not so much would be looked upon. Sometimes you can use ERFP to strengthen your arguments against the ministry.
- Perception of ERFP on national level is not so high as in international issues as Austria has a fairly well developed national structure for AnGR.
- With the absence of legal status of ERFP and its very tiny visibility, it is quite difficult to explain what it produces and what it is useful for.
- It was very important years ago for the development of the appropriate position and for the establishment of the National Center, is now seen as respected but standard institute
- It make easier the coordination at national level and implementation of the activities for AnGR. It's very important to keep a coordination to conserve the AnGR and to exchange experiences



22. Does the ERFp have an impact on your standing as the National Coordinator at the national level?

- The NC is the Focal Point for FAO to develop the national Program of conservation of AnGR
- The diffusion of the work that ERFp is doing, specifically in the frame of the Global Plan for Action, contributes in showing in the country the importance of the management of AnGR, informing on the developments that are going on at European level and in stimulating the relevant authorities to develop further policies
- the choice of priorities by the "superior body" over the NC, affects the reduction of importance of genetic resources protection, particularly in relation to native, local breeds.
- Preparation for the ITWG-AnGR and CGRFA

23. Which organizational/communicational elements of current work of the ERFPP might be strengthened?

	Examples of work to be strengthened			
	1	2	3	4
Number of NCs providing examples	24	12	8	2
No examples	1	13	17	23

- Please, specify why and how

23. Which organizational/communicational elements of current work of the ERF P might be strengthened?

Elements	Number of responses	%
Attractive website		
Regular newsletter		
Use social media		
communication to policymakers, more than the task force on EU-communication.		
Could a seminar on the importance and success of the conservation work on AnGR be an idea? an annual seminar or every other year? It could be streamed to increase the possibility of participation from many countries.		
Work with the general assembly		
ERFP Website		
EUGENA		
Work of the steering committee (see answers of previous questions)		



ERFP

23. Which organizational/communicational elements of current work of the ERFP might be strengthened?

Elements	Number of responses	%
Maybe to help with policy making, a platform with national policies in the field of animal genetic resources could help/ in general, allow benchmarking with ERFP internal discussion platforms		
More information should be posted on the WEB		
Improved presentation of the work of ERFP		
Use of web-discussions (video, chat)		
Individual approach/assistance to currently inactive NCs		
More exchange of information		
Use of video conferences or telematic ways for communications		
Monitoring and follow up work for activities		
ERFP web platform as forum of exchange among NCs		
Definitely the networking and communication between NCs		

23. Which organizational/communicational elements of current work of the ERFP might be strengthened?

Elements	Number of responses	%
ERFP Newsletter		
Information		
Workshop		
Data information		
Policy implementation		
Use of the ERFP webpage		
Higher responsiveness of NCs		
Develop best practice examples, country reports on the ERFP webpage		
I don't know		
Attractive website		
Newsletter related to latest development in AnGR		
More active involvement of all NC		

23. Which organizational/communicational elements of current work of the ERFP might be strengthened?

Elements	Number of responses	%
Communiaction and involvment in EU - policies		
Project activities related of AnGR - maybe on regional base		
Including research on AnGR		
Creation of smaller regional groups with similar problems		
Strengthening the importance of local breeds		
Work on new projects		
In vivo AnGR conservation		
Regular emails with common queries of NCs (more information sharing)		
Website update, newsletter to interested stakeholders, general visibility of ERFP		
More work on new projects		
Task Forces		

24. Please name at least three key expectations related to the ERFPP which could support your work as the NC

Key expectations	Number of responses	%
Identify and anticipate and discuss major policy issues		
Organise ERFPP as communication platform at EU level		
Could a seminar on the importance and success of the conservation work on AnGR be an idea? an annual seminar or every other year? It could be streamed to increase the possibility of participation from many countries.		
Good support in difficult questions		
EFABIS in national language		
New CRYOweb		
Continuing active engagement in the development of the next CAP		
Evaluation of FAO,EU and member state activities		
Strengthen EUGENA network		
ITWG preparation		

24. Please name at least three key expectations related to the ERFP which could support your work as the NC

Key expectations	Number of responses	%
ERFP could help me to know how to deal in my country, with issues that have been addressed in other countries		
ERFP could help me to get an expert opinion on topics that are important today or that will be important for the future		
ERFP could help me to explain in my country, what agrobiodiversity is and why it is important to protect it.		
Sharing experiences with other countries		
Working together with representatives of other states through the WG`s		
The ability to get timely information		
Publishing summarized information about the implementation of the GPA in Europe		
Inputs - recommendations, statements, reports, guidelines		

24. Please name at least three key expectations related to the ERFPP which could support your work as the NC

Key expectations	Number of responses	%
Active participation in a future project consortium (like e.g. Horizon 2020)		
Collaborative research/ management of shared transboundary breeds		
Tools to know the effectiveness and necessities of each breeding program according to its situation and type of production		
Improvement in data bases (EFABIS...)for completing and loading information (web services, CSV...)		
Tools to improve awareness for services from AnGR to society		
Regular and on time communication and update on relevant issues		
Organization of Technical Workshops on specific items of national level importance as a collaboration between national institutes and ERFPP		
Develop ERFPP Newsletter (i.e. through the diffusion of news from the different countries, specific cases/ projects etc)		

24. Please name at least three key expectations related to the ERFPP which could support your work as the NC

Key expectations	Number of responses	%
Inventory and monitoring of AnGR		
In Vitro conservation		
Policy elaboration		
Less relevant as small country		
Include the existence of a NFP as an inseparable part of the country's implementation of GPA for AnGR in Europe		
Cases studies and recommendations on In situ conservation and valorisation of local breeds		
Involvement and setting up projects related to valorisation of products		
Work on exchange experiences between countries in implementation of in situ and ex situ conservation		
Support of less developed countries in creation breeding programs or program of conservation for AnGR		

24. Please name at least three key expectations related to the ERFIP which could support your work as the NC

Key expectations	Number of responses	%
Sometimes to invite representatives of Ministry agriculture		
exchange of experiences		
support the work of the national coordinator		
development of new ideas (AnGR conservation)		
Efabis		
Annual Meeting		
Summary information on various FAO or EC initiatives related to AnGR to be regularly provided to NCs		
Recommendations for in-situ conservation (numbers of animals in nucleus, families, lines and etc.)		
Task Forces		



Zagreb, June 15-16, 2018

Part IV. SWOT analysis

Questions 25 - 28

25. Please list the key elements that you consider as benefits and strong points (Strenghts) of the ERF

	Examples of strong points			
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th
No of NCs providing examples	22	19	14	5
No examples	2	6	11	20

25. Please list the key elements that you consider as benefits and strong points (Strenghts) of the ERFP

- Continuing (financial) support of majority of countries
- The establishment of WGs and Task Forces for the major areas of work
- Having both establisehd WG and TF in addition to Ad hoc actions make the work both predictable and long time investing and give room for spontanious tasks.
- Well connected to FAO
- Network for NC AnGR, this is very important and valuable
- Good discussion partner
- Giving answers quickly
- The networking
- Exchange of information
- High quality scientific base
- Broad approach of topics by various WGs and TFs
- Integrates all of Europe (EU and Non-EU)

25. Please list the key elements that you consider as benefits and strong points (Strenghts) of the ERFP

- Network of national coordinators
- Cost effective
- Many NCs are attending the General Assembly
- The secretariat is very organised
- ERFP is known at EU level, taken into account in the Animal breeding regulation
- Open for participation and discussion for all countries
- Can help NC in their job
- Can have an impact on EU policy regarding the conservation of AnGR
- Good framework for networking and collaboration of all NCs in Europe
- Leading initiatives, which are useful for all countries
- Network of people providing knowledge exchange
- NCs from diverse fields can give opinions from different angles (legislative, research)
- TFs and AdHoc actions provide good basis for flexible and quick responses to urgent matters

25. Please list the key elements that you consider as benefits and strong points (Strenghts) of the ERF P

- Equal chances and equal access to all activities and outputs / products
- Solidarity
- Sharing best practices and experience
- Established position at important international institutions
- Tools provision (EFABIS, EUGENA...) to evaluate the state of AnGR and which supports or reinforces decisions in each MS policies regarding AnGR
- Forum of exchange of opinions between representatives of different countries or regions (with different situation/characteristics of breeds, census, policies...)
- Compared to other regions, High reliability of the data related to AnGR in EFABIS (census, description of breeds, inventory and monitoring of breeds...). Official Breeding programs developed and monitored.
- New initiatives on a regular basis and professionalism of members which are experts in this field (high knowledge and experience).
- Network of NCs in Europe with light structure that doesn't require higher management approval



25. Please list the key elements that you consider as benefits and strong points (Strenghts) of the ERFP

- Development of the European Biodiversity Information System
- Collaboration and links with FAO, EAAP, EU
- Connecting experts, NCs
- Promoting exchange of experience, skills
- Working groups, task force, ad hoc actions
- Implementation of interesting projects within Ad Hoc Action, Task force and WG
- Regional platform to support the in situ and ex situ conservation
- Regional platform of fast communication
- Sharing knowledge
- Joining forces in projects
- Collaboration in different WG, TF etc.
- Cooperation with all EU countries

25. Please list the key elements that you consider as benefits and strong points (Strengths) of the ERF

- Involvement or invitation of all NC from all Europe and countries
- Transparency of all ERF activities
- Network
- International character
- Experience
- Team work
- Networking / Collaboration
- Annual meeting allows for updates on key issues among experts
- Voluntary participation of countries
- Open discussions at general assembly
- Collaboration between NC



Working Groups

Zagreb, June 15-16, 2018

26. Please name and explain the key elements that you consider as weak points (Weaknesses) of the ERF P

	Examples of weak points			
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th
No of NCs providing examples	23	17	11	6
No examples	2	8	14	19

26. Please name and explain the key elements that you consider as weak points (Weaknesses) of the ERF

- Too much focus on endangered breeds only
- Substantial part of WG participants are not active
- Objectives and expected outputs of WGs and TFs are not always clear
- Invisible for the institutions that finance the country contributions.
- This invisibility might be the reason for why there is no "fight" for financing the ERF-secretariat.
- few persons in the Secretariat - heavy workload
- Dealing with many problems
- Problems to get dedicated people to work in WG
- Funding
- Not all countries are active



26. Please name and explain the key elements that you consider as weak points (Weaknesses) of the ERF

- Lack of awareness for AnGR generally and ERF as institution
- Informal structure
- Transparency of S.C.
- Financial support (but no better alternative)
- The NCs not directly involved in specific working groups etc. have limited visibility of ERF work during the year, between Assemblies
- NCs do not have a platform to exchange views, questions, ideas; they cannot co-create easily or punctually (online?) collaborate to existing taskforces etc.
- The rules of ERF are too strict and formal, too much "top-down" for its structure

26. Please name and explain the key elements that you consider as weak points (Weaknesses) of the ERF

- ERF has no legal existence, NCs do not have so much time to give to ERF
- Is not a legal entity and therefore documents arising from the work of WG's are not legally binding
- The presentation of the ERF work to the general public
- NCs are not fully active in experience exchange
- Funding can limit the range of activities
- The lack of legal personality in some situations
- The main activities usually involve the same "strong group"
- Instability and discontinuity of the NC position in some member states

26. Please name and explain the key elements that you consider as weak points (Weaknesses) of the ERFP

- Sometimes the discussions are only approached from the scientific point of view, and the opinion and experience of public administration and the sector itself (a representative of the breeding associations in each country) are not taken into account. This reduces the effectiveness of the proposals (sometimes are not applicable).
- Little ACTIVE participation and/or attendance at meetings
- Differences between countries and interests/priorities and difficulties for commitment in the proposals for joint actions. The ERFP works in recommendations and then each country decides what to do.
- The structure of the ERFP itself. It has no legal figure or structure that enables it to become, for example a Reference Centre of EU

26. Please name and explain the key elements that you consider as weak points (Weaknesses) of the ERFP

- Declining level of communication among the members of ERFP
- Not active involvement of all NCs in shaping the ERFP strategy, which could easily lead that the decisions are taken by very few people Lack of communication between the SC and the NCs (even though members of the SC are expected to represent specific regions)
- Rotational system of secretariat - request for permanent secretariat
- Secretariat work should extend beyond administrative work
- Weak access to EU institutions, lobbying, Further strengthen collaboration with other GRes networks
- Get better involvement of experts, NCs, active role to play, ERFP is not a travel agency

26. Please name and explain the key elements that you consider as weak points (Weaknesses) of the ERF

- A small number of actively cooperating countries, eg lack of cooperation with Russia
- Difficulty with gathering all NC or members of WG, TF, AHA in same place in same time
- Difficulty of understanding because of the multilingualism
- Rotational secretariat
- Legal entity
- Inactive members
- Voluntary work
- Limited budget and limited number of participants for some events (only one per country)

26. Please name and explain the key elements that you consider as weak points (Weaknesses) of the ERF

- Small secretariat team for wither activities
- Work of the most or all participants on voluntary base
- no comment
- Lack of resources
- Voluntary nature of the organisation is a weakness (ie not statutory)
- Delay of information sharing prior to major decision making by e.g. the Steering Committee
- no, any
- Access to ERF information

27. What are the future opportunities for the ERF P?

	Examples of opportunities			
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th
No of NCs providing examples	23	12	8	6
No examples	2	13	17	19

27. What are the future opportunities for the ERF?

- Develop ERF as a recognized communication platform on animal diversity
- Establishment of EU reference centre that is closely linked to ERF Secretariat
- More interest in society for biodiversity in general
- Use of modern technologies for conservation and promoting use
- Being a recognized technical network for all NC on AnGR in Europe.
- Keeping the good work with the new Secretariat
- Highly professional organisation needed by policy makers to give information
- Market trends - individualisation and regionalisation of products help to promote (rare) breeds

27. What are the future opportunities for the ERFP?

- Project partnerships
- Changes in AnGR-production
- Communicate directly to the breeders
- ERFP's projects could get technical and financial support from the (hypothetic) future EU reference center for endangered breeds and ERFP could pilot/provide the governance of the EURC
- ERFP could get a legal basis and facilitate the financial participation of countries
- ERFP could merge with other genetic resources/agrobiodiversity networks?
- To become a legal entity
- Collaboration and exchange of experience with other regions
- Expertize capacity of people can be base for making ERFP more official and recognized on international level



27. What are the future opportunities for the ERFPP?

- Direct connection (and knowledge) to national situations via NCs allows finding better regional solutions
- To encourage the involvement of all inactive NCs
- To strengthen networking in different areas (breeders - research teams - etc)
- Future new regulations that affect AnGR: Animal breeding regulation (2016/1012), ABS, Animal health requirements of germinal products (article devoted to genebanks to ease the exchange of material between them)
- The design of a new MYPOW and new structure/composition of the Steering committee and Secretariat of ERFPP (which is likely to involve new ideas, proposals...)
- New version of EFABIS and DADIS which provide countries with new tools, reports, graphics...to study and to assess the situation of AnGR in each MS and in Europe.

27. What are the future opportunities for the ERFP?

- Growing importance of AnGR and increasing concern in society about environmental issues, climate change, sustainability where local breeds have an essential role (adaptability, robustness, linked to extensive production systems...).
- Period of recovery from an international economic crisis which may allow the competent authorities of each MS to reorient and support this sector and the policies related to it.
- Increased impact on shaping relevant policies (at EU level)
- Increased possibility for funding from EU (i.e. through Horizon)
- Interaction with other regions to share the experience of the regional network
- Development of DAD-IS and its flexibility can be used to promote this interaction (i.e. through across regions data analysis, or workshops as it is the case of Mediterranean region in connection with EAAP MWG)



Promote ERFP through its new webpage

27. What are the future opportunities for the ERFP?

- Strengthen collaboration with other GRes networks
- Establish ERFP as a permanent body
- Give ERFP a voice at the level of institutional bodies
- The possibility of good, strong, frequent contact with FAO
- Legalize organization
- Collaborating in projects
- Serve as advisor to EU
- Strengthen active collaboration within ERFP and outside
- To establish stronger and more active network of all NC from Europe
- To play recognizable and key role in Europe in regarding of conservation and sustainable use of AnGR



27. What are the future opportunities for the ERFP?

- More active participation in creation of policies related AnGR
- New projects
- Team work
- More resources to support better outcomes
- Better collaboration with EU Commission and other EU experts in Universities
- Funding calls for research related to animal genetic resources
- More countries involved in ERFP
- Access to ERFP information
- To contribute effectively to the valorisation of AnGR and theirs products
- Contribute to the public recognition of the importance of AnGR



28. What are the potential threats to the ERFPP?

	Examples of threats			
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th
No of NCs providing examples	22	14	7	4
No examples	3	11	18	21

28. What are the potential threats to the ERF?

- Lack of visibility outside the NC network and limited impact and outputs
- Threat if not well connected to NGO, research and industry and government networks at national and European level
- Invisibility for the institutions/policymakers who finance the country contributions
- Too little focus on reaching out with our work and messages to more than our selves and the scientific community
- Can establishing a reference center for AnGR in Europe be a threat?
- Different ideas for how the work will be done with the new Secretariat
- If not enough country contributions are obtained
- Lack of manpower
- Lack of funding



28. What are the potential threats to the ERFP?

- Lack of awareness on national/European level
- General threats to animal production
- No volunteer for a Secretariat
- Go even more formal: ERFP could become a hollow shell with much formal procedures but few real benefits for the NCs
- Ignore the needs of the NCs not participating in working groups
- At this moment there are no serious threats
- What are the potential threats to the ERFP?
- Status of ERFP as non-legal body complicates efforts for project funding
- Loss of interest of policy-makers to support/fund ERFP activities

28. What are the potential threats to the ERFPP?

- A limited number of states capable of providing the rotating secretariat function
- Changes in priorities or public policies on AnGR and administrative burden (for contracts, subsidies..) with impacts on current activities. Abandonment of projects
- Lack or deficiencies in future budget on AnGR or funding
- Dependency in FAO to modify EFABIS database (less freedom or independence)
- Limitations in means and economical and personal resources in countries for activities as NC/ERFP activities
- Few countries getting the benefit from participating in projects, increasing the absence of involvement of the rest countries
- Increasing degree of not circulating widely all information and decisions are taken by few people

28. What are the potential threats to the ERFP?

- Confusion (lack of clear boundaries) between different roles of NCs (in EU bodies, EAAP, FAO)
- GRes is not very high on the agenda of governments, policy making, affected by budget cuts
- ERFP not considered as legal body
- NCs, experts losing interest in the activities of ERFP
- Problems with country payments of annual contributions
- Disparity between the scientific capabilities of eastern and western countries
- Inactive members
- Voluntary work
- Lack of formal/legal organization
- Lack of funding



28. What are the potential threats to the ERFP?

- Decreasing budget and limitation of activities
- Lower motivation of NCs for everyday contribution in different aspects
- Closeness
- Insufficient budget
- Absence of new ideas
- The voluntary nature of the organisation
- Declining resources
- Other bodies such as the Animal Task Force overshadowing the influence ERFP decisions and recommendations have on major decision bodies such as the EC
- No ideas
- Different level of interest of each country
- Budget

