



TASK FORCE ON RISK STATUS AND INDICATORS

Albania	Lumturi Papa
Croatia	Ante Ivanković
France	Eléonore Charvolin (Head)
Greece	Christina Ligda
Ireland	Lawrence Alderson
Netherlands	Jack Windig
Turkey	Inci Togan
Ukraine	Oleg A. Katerinich

AUGUST 27-28TH 2011 – ANNUAL ASSEMBLY MEETING



CONTEXT AND PURPOSE

- OBSERVATION :
 - The risk status of AnGR, especially with regard to local breeds, is an essential basis on which to take informed decisions and initiate activities to support breeds at risk.
 - There are several concepts and methodologies used to assess the risk status.
 - Different indicators are in use by individual European countries, the FAO and the European Commission.
- NEED :
 - A harmonisation of such concepts is needed if the risk status is to be comparable at country, regional and global level. The European SEBI indicators have been a starting point in this direction and will provide the basis for a continuation of European harmonisation activities.
- TARGET :
 - A draft concept should be developed and presented to the Assembly for its consideration, discussion and decision, with regard to further progress in this area.



DIFFERENT WORKS TO HARMONIZE *NATIVE BREED*

- Since SEBI work, we have in mind to develop sthg around « Native Breed »
- Experience has shown it will be difficult to develop at global level
- But, in Europe, different countries use this notion, with their own criteria, sometime just based on group of experts
- Behind a native breed <-> my country is responsible for?



DIFFERENT WAY TO DEFINE NATIVE BREEDS

-> for those who have develop criteria to define native breed > please send to us

Nature of the criteria and thresholds if exist
We could develop guidance after that.

-> with or without common criteria, we could check native/non native in EFABIS.

Each country can precise (if wanted) on his website on AnGR the criteria used

-> At least Indicators that have been/will be developped on native breed notion could be produced directly at ERFP level : EASY



ASSESS THE RISK STATUS

- Different works / papers / synthesis to explore
- Different angles :
 - Numerical/genetic : lot of formula and sometime still under scientific discussion (ex : N_e)
 - Geographic : under development (UK + ERFP Project)
 - A lack on socioeconomic aspects (characterisation of breeders, valorisation...) ERFP Project/Heritage sheep
 - Other?



PROPOSALS FOR THE NEXT YEAR FOR THE TF

1-Testing existing indicators

1a : Making a list of the indicators used by different countries and test on others

1b : testing indicators found in litterature, comparing different breeds

2-Link with GIS ERFP project and UK work


2a : Testing on different countries and work together,

2b : Making some proposal for socioeconomic aspect based on existing data (if possible)

3- Establishment of a list of indicators that could be useful for NCs and developed through EFABIS



TIMETABLE



LINK WITH ERFP GROUP ON INDICATORS

- No work this year for ERFP Group
- A lot of similarities with TF
- Perhaps need for further concrete development of synthetic indicator(s) when proposals will be done by TF
- Money still there > useful for any TF or WG



TO CONCLUDE

- TF should be the opportunity to develop a clear document that will
 - Push the collection of data where needed
 - Push the harmonisation through europe
 - Suggest concrete development of figure in EFABIS, and through that, being a tool for promoting EFABIS in countries
 - Help the development of this indicators in each country
 - Clarifying the fact that endangerment of local breed is not only a problem of genetic (even if it s very important)
- If you are agree, lets meet in Bratislava for the results!



Thank you very much!!!

Albania	Lumturi Papa
Croatia	Ante Ivanković
France	Eléonore Charvolin (Head)
Greece	Christina Ligda
Ireland	Lawrence Alderson
Netherlands	Jack Windig
Turkey	Inci Togan
Ukraine	Oleg A. Katerinich

