



## Results of questionnaires to survey progress on ECPGR objectives

(Prepared by the ECPGR Secretariat, April 2018)

---

---

### Introduction

As part of the preparation of the background documents for the 15th (End-of-Phase) Steering Committee meeting (May 2018), the Secretariat was requested by the ExCo to collect information on progress towards the objectives of ECPGR through appropriate online questionnaires. Reports of progress should consist of a schematic ranking of the level of progress for each scrutinized item with provision of indicators of progress.

This document displays the results of the questionnaires in a raw data format, as a supporting document to the annotated analysis made by the Secretariat (Technical report on ECPGR Phase IX). The level of progress for each scrutinized item was evaluated on a scale 0-3 where 0 = no progress, 1 = low, 2 = medium and 3 = high progress. Indicators of progress were also requested. As the different Outputs of the ECPGR objectives fall under the responsibility of different stakeholders, the evaluation was carried out in the following way:

- National Coordinators were requested to evaluate Outputs 1.2, 1.5, part of 2.1 and part of 2.3, 3.1, 4.2, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3 and 5.4. Replies were received from 29 National Coordinators.
- The Chair of the Documentation and Information WG evaluated part of Output 2.3.
- The Chair of the Wild Species Conservation in Genetic Reserves WG was asked to evaluate Outputs 3.1 to 3.5.
- The EURISCO Coordinator evaluated parts of Outcome 2.
- The remaining Outputs were evaluated by the Secretariat.

## CONTENTS

OUTCOME 1. AEGIS is operational. Accessions in AEGIS are characterized and evaluated .....	1
OUTCOME 2. Quantity and quality data in EURISCO, including <i>in situ</i> and on-farm data, have been increased. Functionality of EURISCO meets users' expectations.....	10
OUTCOME 3. <i>In situ</i> conservation of priority crop wild relative (CWR) and landrace (LR) populations are implemented throughout Europe. Mechanisms are in place for more effective utilization of the conserved germplasm.....	16
OUTCOME 4. Commitment and regular resources of national governments are sustained or increased, and commitments and resources of the European Commission (EC) as well as of other potential donors towards ECPGR are increased.....	27
OUTCOME 5. Relations with users of germplasm are strengthened .....	32
OUTCOME 6. Organizational structure and secretarial support are adequate to effectively sustain the operations of ECPGR.....	36
GENERAL COMMENTS .....	40

## OUTCOME 1

### OUTCOME 1. AEGIS is operational. Accessions in AEGIS are characterized and evaluated

		Average	Albania	Austria	Belgium	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Bulgaria	Croatia	Czech Republic	Denmark	Estonia	Finland	France	Germany	Greece	Hungary	Ireland	Italy	Latvia	Lithuania	Montenegro	Netherlands	Norway	Romania	Serbia	Slovakia	Spain	Sweden	Switzerland	Turkey	United Kingdom	ECPGR Secretariat
<b>Output 1.1.</b>	<b>Membership agreements signed</b>	<b>2</b>																													<b>2</b>	
Activity 1.1.1.	Discussion with ECPGR members on AEGIS membership and associate membership continued	2.0																													2	
Activity 1.1.2.	Establishment of proper documentation of AEGIS accessions	(1.0)																													(1)	
Activity 1.1.3.	Establishment of a monitoring and reporting plan	(1.0)																													(1)	
<b>Output 1.2.</b>	<b>AEGIS collections established</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>1.3</b>	
Activity 1.2.1.	Identification of eligible accessions to be proposed for registration as AEGIS accessions	1.5	1	1	1	2	2	1	3	2	2	1	1	3	0	1	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	1	3	0	1	2	0	1	
Activity 1.2.2.	Verification of the proposed AEGIS accessions	1.6	1	1	2	2	3	3	2	1	1	0	3	0	1	0	3	3	1	3	3	0	3	1	3	0	2	2	0	1		
Activity 1.2.3.	Monitoring of the management of AEGIS accessions by the AMs in accordance with the principles of AEGIS	1.4	0	1	0	2	1	2	2	2	3	-	0	3	0	2	2	2	2	0	2	3	0	1	1	2	0	2	2	0	2	

## OUTCOME 1

### OUTCOME 1. AEGIS is operational. Accessions in AEGIS are characterized and evaluated

		Average	Albania	Austria	Belgium	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Bulgaria	Croatia	Czech Republic	Denmark	Estonia	Finland	France	Germany	Greece	Hungary	Ireland	Italy	Latvia	Lithuania	Montenegro	Netherlands	Norway	Romania	Serbia	Slovakia	Spain	Sweden	Switzerland	Turkey	United Kingdom	ECPGR Secretariat
<b>Output 1.3.</b>	<b>AQUAS quality system developed and operationalized</b>	<b>1.3</b>																														
Activity 1.3.1.	Development of crop-specific management system, including procedures and protocols for all crops	2																														
Activity 1.3.2.	Trainings for AMs in the development and implementation of a quality system undertaken	0																														
Activity 1.3.3.	AEGIS record-keeping, reporting and monitoring system developed and adopted	2																														
<b>Output 1.4.</b>	<b>Funds mobilized to help Associate Members to implement AQUAS</b>	<b>0.5</b>																														
Activity 1.4.1.	Fundraising among potential national and regional donors for establishing and implementing AM quality systems undertaken	0.5																														

## OUTCOME 1

### OUTCOME 1. AEGIS is operational. Accessions in AEGIS are characterized and evaluated

		Average	Albania	Austria	Belgium	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Bulgaria	Croatia	Czech Republic	Denmark	Estonia	Finland	France	Germany	Greece	Hungary	Ireland	Italy	Latvia	Lithuania	Montenegro	Netherlands	Norway	Romania	Serbia	Slovakia	Spain	Sweden	Switzerland	Turkey	United Kingdom	ECPGR Secretariat
<b>Output 1.5.</b>	<b>Other capacity building schemes for Associate Members operational</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>0.25</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>0.2</b>	
Activity 1.5.1.	Capacity building needs of AMs identified	1.1	0	1	0	0	3	1	2	2	1	0	0	1	0	1	3	3	1	0	3	0	1	2	1	1	0	0	2	1	1	
Activity 1.5.2.	Training opportunities identified	1.0	0	2	0	0	2	-	3	2	1	-	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	0	3	1	0	2	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	
Activity 1.5.3.	Services for C&E and/or phenotyping of AEGIS accessions provided to AMs	0.9	2	1	0	2	1	1	2	0	0	-	0	1	0	0	2	2	2	1	1	0	-	1	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	
Activity 1.5.4.	Regeneration capacity for AEGIS accessions offered to AMs	0.8	2	1	0	0	1	2	2	1	0	-	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	2	2	0	0	1	1	2	0	1	1	0	0	
Activity 1.5.5.	Safety duplication facilities for AEGIS accessions offered to AMs	1.0	0	1	0	-	1	0	3	2	2	-	0	-	0	0	3	0	3	1	0	3	0	1	-	2	0	2	0	0	0	

## OUTCOME 1

<b>OUTCOME 1. AEGIS is operational. Accessions in AEGIS are characterized and evaluated</b>		
Rating		
<b>Output 1.1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>Membership agreements signed</b>
<b>Activity 1.1.1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>Discussion with ECPGR members on AEGIS membership and associate membership continued</b>
<b>Indicator 1.1.1.1</b>		<b>Number of Membership Agreements</b>
ECPGR Secretariat	2	34 AEGIS membership agreements were signed (April 2017)
<b>Indicator 1.1.1.2</b>		<b>Number of Associate Membership Agreements</b>
ECPGR Secretariat	2	65 Associate member agreements from 30 countries (April 2017)
<b>Activity 1.1.2</b>	<b>(1)</b>	<b>Establishment of proper documentation of AEGIS accessions</b>
<b>Indicator 1.1.2.1</b>		<b>AEGIS accessions flagged in EURISCO and national documentation systems</b>
ECPGR Secretariat	-1	Accessions flagged in EURISCO as part of AEGIS increased by 17 305 during Phase IX, from 11 381 to 34 333 (April 2017)
<b>Activity 1.1.3</b>	<b>(1)</b>	<b>Establishment of a monitoring and reporting plan</b>
<b>Indicator 1.1.3.1</b>		<b>Plan approved by Steering Committee (SC) and available</b>
ECPGR Secretariat	-1	Record keeping, reporting and monitoring plan was endorsed by SC in January 2016
<b>Output 1.2</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>AEGIS collections established</b>
<b>Activity 1.2.1</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>Identification of eligible accessions to be proposed for registration as AEGIS accessions</b>
<b>Indicator 1.2.1.1.</b>		<b>Number of proposed AEGIS accessions</b>
Albania	1	-
Austria	1	-
Belgium	1	122
Bosnia and Herzegovina	2	-
Bulgaria	1.7	341 accessions are registered with AEGIS status
Croatia	1	90 accessions of <i>V. vinifera</i> have been proposed for registration as AEGIS accessions (all have been flagged already)
Czech Republic	3	1346
Denmark	2	NordGen has started a new round of selection of AEGIS accessions but do not have a final list of suggested accessions
Estonia	2	150
Finland	1	Contribution through NordGen
France	1	Some accessions have been proposed in the wheat and barley working groups but there are no progress due to the absence of signature of MoU by France
Germany	3	~20,000
Greece	0	-
Hungary	1	0
Ireland	1	-
Italy	2	9.3
Latvia	3	128
Lithuania	1	-
Montenegro	2	they have already been flagged as part of AEGIS
Netherlands	3	5853
Norway	1	22
Romania	2	623 accessions
Serbia	1	-
Slovakia	3	299+200
Spain	0	-
Sweden	1	Not known - meeting being planned with NordGen
Switzerland	2	4300
Turkey	0	-
United Kingdom	1	1659
<b>Activity 1.2.2</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>Verification of the proposed AEGIS accessions</b>
<b>Indicator 1.2.2.1.</b>		<b>Number of designated and registered AEGIS accessions</b>
Albania	1	-
Austria	1	-
Belgium	2	0
Bosnia and Herzegovina	2	-
Bulgaria	2	341 accessions are registered with AEGIS status
Croatia	3	90 accessions of <i>V. vinifera</i> have been proposed for registration as AEGIS accessions (all have been flagged already)
Czech Republic	3	1346

## OUTCOME 1

<b>OUTCOME 1. AEGIS is operational. Accessions in AEGIS are characterized and evaluated</b>		
	<b>Rating</b>	
Denmark	2	From NordGen we have 3708 accessions flagged in total
Estonia	1	72
Finland	1	3708 accessions flagged in NordGen (457 of Finnish origin)
France	0	-
Germany	3	14,183
Greece	0	-
Hungary	1	0
Ireland	0	0
Italy	3	9.131 Our National Inventory is currently being updated. Flagged accessions will be visible upon successful upload of the Inventory in EURISCO as part of AEGIS
Latvia	3	27
Lithuania	1	-
Montenegro	3	31
Netherlands	3	5853
Norway	0	0
Romania	3	623 accessions
Serbia	1	-
Slovakia	3	299
Spain	0	-
Sweden	2	3708
Switzerland	2	4839
Turkey	0	-
United Kingdom	1	1659
<b>Activity 1.2.3</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>Monitoring of the management of AEGIS accessions by the AMs*</b>
<b>Indicator 1.2.3.1</b>		<b>AMs having adopted AEGIS principles</b>
Albania	0	1
Austria	1	AGES - Austrian Agency for Heal and Food Safety
Belgium	0	-
Bosnia and Herzegovina	2	Institute of genetic resources, University of Banja Luka
Bulgaria	1	BGR001
Croatia	2	All accessions included into AEGIS are maintained by only one Associate Member - Faculty of Agriculture Zagreb (HRV0410. Most of the European Accessions are safety duplicated and maintained according to agreed genebank standards. According to the recently adopted Croatian national PGRFA Programme, use of SMTA is obligatory for all accessions held in the National Collection, including European Accessions.
Czech Republic	2	8 AMs adopted standards medium to fully (some acc. Need safety dupl. 1 AM has own MTA)
Denmark	2	NordGen
Estonia	3	Estonian Crop Research Institute, Polli Horticultural Research Centre (Estonian University of Life Sciences)
Finland	-	-
France	0	-
Germany	3	IPK - Leibniz Institute of Plan Genetics and Crop Plant Research (fully implemented), JKI - federal Research Centre for Cultivated Plants (fully implemented), BSA - Federal Plant Variety Office (fully implemented)
Greece	0	-
Hungary	2	Center for Plant Diversity, Tapioszele (Hungary); partially
Ireland	2	National genebank in Backweston is in the process of adopting AEGIS principles following capacity building training course on genebank curation which was organised in May 2017. SMT is routinely used and genebank standards being adhered to in development of SOP's
Italy	2	all involved AMs operate according to AEGIS principles, especially concerning crop- and genebank specific standards as well as use of the SMTA for germplasm exchange
Latvia	2	3
Lithuania	0	-
Montenegro	2	University of Montenegro-Biotechnical faculty Podgorica; partially; SMTA is in use; genebank and crop-specific standards have been implemented
Netherlands	3	Centre for Genetic Resources, The Netherlands
Norway	0	0
Romania	1	Suceava genebank
Serbia	1	-
Slovakia	2	10: National Agricultural and Food Centre - RIPP, RIPP Piestany, PBS Maty saris, BS Viglas Selekt a.s. Isropol a.s. RIFDT, RIVE, RIGMA, RUIA
Spain	0	-

## OUTCOME 1

<b>OUTCOME 1. AEGIS is operational. Accessions in AEGIS are characterized and evaluated</b>		
	<b>Rating</b>	
Sweden	2	NordGen, National genebank for vegetatively propagated plants in progress
Switzerland	2	National Genebank Agroscope
Turkey	0	-
United Kingdom	2	the John Innes Centre, Genetic Resource Unit at the University of Warwick, and the National Fruit collection all use the SMTA and adhere to the agreed genebank standards
<b>Output 1.3</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>Output AQUAS quality system developed and operationalized</b>
<b>Activity 1.3.1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>Development of crop-specific management system, including procedures and protocols for all crops</b>
<b>Indicator 1.3.1.1</b>		<b>AQUAS quality system adopted and implemented</b>
ECPGR Secretariat	2	The AEGIS Quality System was adopted in all its components
<b>Indicator 1.3.1.2</b>		<b>Number of crops or crop groups for which procedures and protocols have been established</b>
ECPGR Secretariat	2	Crop-specific standards have been endorsed by 9 Working Groups
<b>Indicator 1.3.1.3</b>		<b>Number of AQUAS-certified collections</b>
ECPGR Secretariat	2	There is no definition of an AQUAS-certified collection
<b>Activity 1.3.2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>Trainings for AMs in the development and implementation of a quality system undertaken</b>
<b>Indicator 1.3.2.1</b>		<b>Number of trainings realized</b>
	0	No trainings were realized
<b>Indicator 1.3.2.2</b>		<b>Number of trainees trained</b>
	0	No trainees were trained
<b>Activity 1.3.3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>AEGIS record-keeping, reporting and monitoring system developed and adopted</b>
<b>Indicator 1.3.3.1</b>		<b>Number of AMs having participated in the record-keeping, reporting and monitoring system</b>
ECPGR Secretariat	2	no AMs have participated yet
<b>Output 1.4</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>Funds mobilized to help Associate Members to implement AQUAS</b>
<b>Activity 1.4.1.</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>Fundraising among potential national and regional donors for establishing and implementing AM quality systems undertaken</b>
<b>Indicator 1.4.1.1</b>		<b>Volume of dedicated grants available for capacity development of AMs</b>
ECPGR Secretariat	0.5	No grants have been made available
<b>Output 1.5</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>Other capacity building schemes for Associate Members operational</b>
<b>Activity 1.5.1</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>Capacity building needs of AMs identified</b>
<b>Indicator 1.5.1.1</b>		<b>Number of AMs supported by capacity development</b>
Albania	0	-
Austria	1	-
Belgium	0	-
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0	1
Bulgaria	3	BGR001
Croatia	1	-
Czech Republic	2	all 8 AMs are supported by NP info and educ. Activities
Denmark	2	NordGen
Estonia	1	2
Finland	0	not relevant
France	0	-
Germany	1	1
Greece	0	-
Hungary	1	0
Ireland	3	5 of 6 attended a genebank curation training course which was organised in May 2017
Italy	3	28 AMs receive regular funding for germplasm management related activities within a national project targeted at the implementation of the FAO International Treaty (RGV/FAO project). AEGIS related were supported, on average, with about 2.000 Euro for each AM
Latvia	1	0
Lithuania	0	-
Montenegro	3	2
Netherlands	0	0
Norway	1	2
Romania	2	Suceava Genebank has received financial support for regeneration, characterisation and evaluation of AEGIS collection
Serbia	1	-
Slovakia	1	3: NPPC: RIPP Piestany, PBS Maly Saris, BRS Viglas (international organisations NPPC)
Spain	0	-
Sweden	0	none



## OUTCOME 1

<b>OUTCOME 1. AEGIS is operational. Accessions in AEGIS are characterized and evaluated</b>		
	<b>Rating</b>	
Switzerland	2	0
Turkey	1	One institute (AARI)
United Kingdom	1	DEFRA funding to the National Fruit Collection, Pea Collection and Vegetable collection contributes to adherence to AEGIS principles
<b>Activity 1.5.2</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>Training opportunities identified</b>
<b>Indicator 1.5.2.1</b>		<b>Proposed indicator: number of training opportunities identified</b>
Albania	0	-
Austria	2	2
Belgium	0	-
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0	-
Bulgaria	2	4
Croatia	-	-
Czech Republic	3	4 workshops/year on GRIN Czech documentation, 2 general meetings of curators incl. AMs
Denmark	2	NordGen is in charge of the five Nordic countries
Estonia	1	-
Finland	-	not relevant
France	0	-
Germany	0	0
Greece	0	-
Hungary	0	0
Ireland	3	Genebank curation training course organised in May 2017 also national genebank staff attended training courses on breeding techniques.
Italy	2	1. Specific seminar on accession characterization and description during the annual meeting of the RGV FAO project. 2. University of Viterbo. Integrated course on C&D of fruit trees
Latvia	1	0
Lithuania	0	-
Montenegro	3	training in the field of primary characterization and evaluation
Netherlands	1	EURISCO training
Norway	0	0
Romania	2	Within a national project funded by the Ministry of Agriculture, a network dedicated to the regeneration and characterisation of vegetable germplasm has been created, involving 5 partners, besides the Genebank, and during the working meetings, either at the Genebank or at the partners' institutions it was provided information about AEGIS and the conditions to become an Associate Member
Serbia	1	-
Slovakia	1	3
Spain	0	-
Sweden	0	none
Switzerland	1	number not known; but there will be an interesting training course activity on botanical classification in wheat
Turkey	1	During the Phase IX, 10 trainings were organized covering all plant genetic resources activities
United Kingdom	0	No training opportunities identified
<b>Activity 1.5.3</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>Services for C&amp;E and/or phenotyping of AEGIS accessions provided to AMs</b>
<b>Indicator 1.5.3.1</b>		<b>Proposed indicator: number of services provided</b>
Albania	2	-
Austria	1	genebank standards, crop specific standards (ECPGR)
Belgium	0	-
Bosnia and Herzegovina	2	safety-duplication space, genotyping or phenotyping facilities, Central databases
Bulgaria	1	registration, taxonomy characterization, field evaluation, database, long term storage safety duplication, regeneration, EURISCO
Croatia	1	-
Czech republic	2	safety-duplication , phenotyping, crop portals, cryopreservation
Denmark	0	safety duplication space ; space service (SESTO)
Estonia	0	-
Finland	-	-
France	0	-
Germany	1	AMs were partner in several ECPGR projects: PRUNDOC, EUCHERRY; Pomefruit
Greece	0	-
Hungary	0	ECPGR Minor Forage Legumes DB

## OUTCOME 1

<b>OUTCOME 1. AEGIS is operational. Accessions in AEGIS are characterized and evaluated</b>		
	<b>Rating</b>	
Ireland	2	Service being provided by means of rolling out a full safety duplication programme for all accessions in the national genebank. Taxonomic expertise is being used to characterise and validate heritage/landrace varieties. Genotyping expertise being exploited by funding individual projects through a nationally funded programme. Multiplication programmes being carried out in National genebank including with a view to exploiting sustainable uses e.g. heritage malting barleys and food grade oats
Italy	2	Assistance to AMs in the development of harmonized characterization protocols, to be used by all partners in the National Inventory PlanA-Res. Finalized so far: apple, olive, grape. Activity is currently in course for several cereals, and other fruit species.
Latvia	2	genotyping facilities, C&E database
Lithuania	1	-
Montenegro	1	Central databases; Phenotyping facilities; multiplication facilities
Netherlands	0	-
Norway	-	-
Romania	1	Genebank offers safety duplication space and central databases
Serbia	1	safety duplication space
Slovakia	2	4: safe duplication, central database portal, multiplication facilities, genotyping facilities
Spain	0	-
Sweden	0	Space for safety duplication; database services (SESTO)
Switzerland	1	Safety duplication space, central database
Turkey	0	-
United Kingdom	0	Unknown - No data available at the time of completing the survey
<b>Activity 1.5.4</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>Regeneration capacity for AEGIS accessions offered to AMs</b>
<b>Indicator 1.5.4.1</b>		<b>Number of accessions regenerated by other AMs</b>
Albania	2	-
Austria	1	0
Belgium	0	-
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0	-
Bulgaria	1	-
Croatia	2	-
Czech Republic	2	8 AM / different institutions, each regenerates own material for delivering to GB and safety dupl.
Denmark	1	0
Estonia	0	-
Finland	-	-
France	0	-
Germany	0	0
Greece	0	-
Hungary	0	0
Ireland	2	Irish Seed Savers Association (ISSA), an NGO conduct an ongoing regeneration programme
Italy	0	None yet. AEGIS accessions are being flagged now for the first time. No regeneration agreements have therefore been put in place. Regeneration is done within the routine genebank work of the single AMs
Latvia	1	0
Lithuania	2	-
Montenegro	2	31
Netherlands	0	-
Norway	0	43
Romania	1	<i>Phaseolus</i> sp. - 67 accessions; Cucurbits sp. - 13 accessions
Serbia	1	-
Slovakia	2	5 : RIPP Prague, Agritec Sumperk, RIPP Piestany, PBS Maty Saris, BRS Viglias, RIA
Spain	0	-
Sweden	1	0
Switzerland	1	0
Turkey	0	-
United Kingdom	0	Unknown - No data available at the time of completing the survey
<b>Activity 1.5.5</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>Safety duplication facilities for AEGIS accessions offered to AMs</b>
<b>Indicator 1.5.5.1</b>		<b>Number of accessions safety duplicated by other AMs</b>
Albania	0	-
Austria	1	1500
Belgium	0	-

## OUTCOME 1

<b>OUTCOME 1. AEGIS is operational. Accessions in AEGIS are characterized and evaluated</b>		
	<b>Rating</b>	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	-	-
Bulgaria	1	930 local Bulgarian accessions are safety duplicated in Global Seed Vault in Svalbard, Norway
Croatia	0	-
Czech Republic	3	safety duplication: 95% of seed propagated crops, 70% of vegetatively propagated crops
Denmark	2	NordGen has the following accessions stored as black box for other genebanks. NordGen does not know how many of these that are designated AEGIS accessions
Estonia	2	All AEGIS accessions in NordGen and selection deposited in Svalbard
Finland	-	NordGen holds safety accessions for other genebanks
France	0	-
Germany	-	7964
Greece	0	-
Hungary	0	0
Ireland	3	All except Crop Wild Relative accessions which are solely stored in the national genebank presently
Italy	0	See answer above. Nonetheless, several accessions are present in more than one collection. This is mainly due to exchange of material with national and international institutions for research purposes. Therefore, these accessions are duplicated even if not explicitly under the AEGIS framework.
Latvia	3	27
Lithuania	1	-
Montenegro	0	0
Netherlands	3	24,662 (sent elsewhere plus all material received in NL)
Norway	0	0
Romania	1	80 AEGIS accessions are safety duplicated at the Genebank in Suceava
Serbia	-	-
Slovakia	2	1: RIPP Prague
Spain	0	-
Sweden	2	NordGen has accessions stored as black box arrangement for other genebanks. It is not clear how many of these that are AEGIS accessions. Total number: 2272 accessions (Spain 950, Israel 581, Estonia 200, Lithuania 123, Finland 7, The Netherlands 24, Norway 207).
Switzerland	0	0
Turkey	0	-
United Kingdom	0	Unknown - No data available at the time of completing the survey

OUTCOME 2

**OUTCOME 2. Quantity and quality data in EURISCO, including *in situ* and on-farm data, have been increased. Functionality of EURISCO meets users' expectations.**

	Average	Albania	Austria	Belgium	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Bulgaria	Croatia	Czech Republic	Denmark	Estonia	Finland	France	Germany	Greece	Hungary	Ireland	Italy	Latvia	Lithuania	Montenegro	Netherlands	Norway	Romania	Serbia	Slovakia	Spain	Sweden	Switzerland	Turkey	United Kingdom	Doc & Info Chair	EURISCO Coordinator
<b>Output 2.1</b> <b>All national Focal Points (NFPs) update national inventories effectively and timely</b>	2.3	3.0	2.0	1.0	1.5	2.5	3.0	3.0	1.5	2.0	0.0	1.5	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.5	2.0	2.5	1.5	1.0	3.0	1.5	2.0	1.0	1.5	3.0	1.0	3.0	1.5	2.0		
Activity 2.1.1 Identification of NI (all public <i>ex situ</i> plant genetic resources for food and agriculture (PGRFA) collections to be included in EURISCO)	1.9	3	2	1	2	2	3	3	2	2	0	1	3	2	2	2	2	3	1	1	3	1	2	1	2	3	1	3	0	2		
Activity 2.1.2 Collaboration between NFPs and collection-holding institutes strengthened	2.0	3	2	1	1	3	3	3	1	2	-	2	3	2	2	3	2	2	2	1	3	2	2	1	1	3	1	3	3	2		
Activity 2.1.3 Training of NFPs (how to compile, maintain, update and upload NI) realized	3.0																											3				
<b>Output 2.2</b> <b>C&amp;E data in EURISCO included, with high quality and wide coverage</b>	2.5																											2.5				
Activity 2.2.1 Development of a mechanism to upload C&E data	3.0																											3				
Activity 2.2.2 Training of NFPs in gathering and uploading C&E data	2.0																											2				

## OUTCOME 2

**OUTCOME 2. Quantity and quality data in EURISCO, including *in situ* and on-farm data, have been increased. Functionality of EURISCO meets users' expectations.**

	Average	Albania	Austria	Belgium	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Bulgaria	Croatia	Czech Republic	Denmark	Estonia	Finland	France	Germany	Greece	Hungary	Ireland	Italy	Latvia	Lithuania	Montenegro	Netherlands	Norway	Romania	Serbia	Slovakia	Spain	Sweden	Switzerland	Turkey	United Kingdom	Doc & Info Chair	EURISCO Coordinator
<b>Output 2.3</b>	<b>0.7</b>																														1.2	0.2
Activity 2.3.1	0.6	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0		
Activity 2.3.2	1.0																										1	1				
Activity 2.3.3	1.0																										2	0				
Activity 2.3.4	0.5																										1	0				
Activity 2.3.5	0.5																										1	0				
Activity 2.3.6	0.5																										1	0				

## OUTCOME 2

**OUTCOME 2. Quantity and quality data in EURISCO, including *in situ* and on-farm data, have been increased. Functionality of EURISCO meets users' expectations.**

		Average	Albania	Austria	Belgium	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Bulgaria	Croatia	Czech Republic	Denmark	Estonia	Finland	France	Germany	Greece	Hungary	Ireland	Italy	Latvia	Lithuania	Montenegro	Netherlands	Norway	Romania	Serbia	Slovakia	Spain	Sweden	Switzerland	Turkey	United Kingdom	Doc & Info Chair	EURISCO Coordinator
<b>Output 2.4</b>	<b>Users' expectations explored and functionalities of EURISCO increased</b>	<b>3.0</b>																										<b>3</b>					
Activity 2.4.1	Users survey performed	3.0																										<b>3</b>					
Activity 2.4.2	Database functions adapted or added	3.0																										<b>3</b>					

## OUTCOME 2

<b>OUTCOME 2. Quantity and quality data in EURISCO, including in situ and on-farm data, have been increased. Functionality of EURISCO meets users' expectations.</b>		
	Rating	
<b>Output 2.1</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>All national Focal Points (NFPs) update national inventories effectively and timely</b>
<b>Activity 2.1.1</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>Identification of NI (all public <i>ex situ</i> plant genetic resources for food and agriculture (PGRFA) collections to be included in EURISCO)</b>
<b>Indicator 2.1.1.1</b>		<b>Number of yearly updates on national inventories in EURISCO</b>
Albania	3	-
Austria	2	1
Belgium	1	0.25
Bosnia and Herzegovina	2	1
Bulgaria	2	5
Croatia	3	Since the beginning of Phase IX, a total of 7 updates of Croatian National inventory in EURISCO has been done (2014 - 3; 2015 - 1; 2016 - 1; 2017 - 2)
Czech Republic	3	once per year
Denmark	2	2
Estonia	2	1-2
Finland	0	Nationally-held vegetative inventory not submitted yet. Data updating to SESTO is going on
France	1	5 collections were included in 2017: tomato, eggplants, oat, triticale and melon. 5950 accessions were integrated in EURISCO
Germany	3	2
Greece	2	One per year or less. It depends from the needs of the curator to add new accessions
Hungary	2	once a year
Ireland	2	Less than one per annum due to low overall number of new accessions
Italy	2	The National Inventory is continuously being updated by the single AMs and other partners. Updating of EURISCO takes place once a year.
Latvia	3	1
Lithuania	1	-
Montenegro	1	-
Netherlands	3	6
Norway	1	0
Romania	2	Twice a year
Serbia	1	0-1
Slovakia	2	2
Spain	3	1
Sweden	1	2
Switzerland	3	1
Turkey	0	-
United Kingdom	2	The National Inventory is updated annually
<b>Activity 2.1.2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>Collaboration between NFPs and collection-holding institutes strengthened</b>
<b>Proposed indicator</b>		<b>Number of interactions between NFP and collection-holding Institutes</b>
Albania	3	-
Austria	2	one time per year
Belgium	1	0.25
Bosnia and Herzegovina	1	once per year
Bulgaria	3	permanently
Croatia	3	Until now, communication with curators was continuous. As a general rule, NIFP provided help and/or checks of passport data for all proposed new accessions before the data were included into the national database. All <i>ex situ</i> collections in Croatia use common national online database for passport data and the data for EURISCO are retrieved from this database
Czech Republic	3	on-line access of curators to central documentation, any time
Denmark	1	A few times a year. The SESTO database is set up so that collection holding institutes can download simple data requests without contacting the National Inventory Focal Point
Estonia	2	Random (if needed), 10-12 times a year
Finland	-	A few times a year in contact with NordGen SESTO database experts
France	2	INRA as NFP provides help to INRA data curators for each new submission
Germany	3	Monthly
Greece	2	regularly and whenever help is needed
Hungary	2	Permanent
Ireland	3	On a continuous basis, minimum of twice annually with most genebanks. New accessions are limited but ongoing cooperation regarding safety duplication and improving standards.

## OUTCOME 2

<b>OUTCOME 2. Quantity and quality data in EURISCO, including in situ and on-farm data, have been increased. Functionality of EURISCO meets users' expectations.</b>		
	<b>Rating</b>	
Italy	2	On average twice a year with each partner to the PlantA-Res National Inventory. Depending on the situation, also more frequently.
Latvia	2	National Inventory Focal Point curates all data on Latvian PGRFA collections
Lithuania	2	-
Montenegro	1	a dozen samples
Netherlands	3	-
Norway	2	Continuous dialogue - 3-400 times per year?
Romania	2	Twice a year
Serbia	1	1
Slovakia	1	4
Spain	3	Very often. The contact between the National Inventory Focal Point and the collecting-holding institutes are taking place continuously
Sweden	1	A few times a year, the SESTO database is set up so that collection holding institutes can download simple data requests without contacting the National Inventory Focal Point
Switzerland	3	once a year
Turkey	3	In Turkey, there are two collection-holding institutes, Izmir (AARI) and Ankara (FCRCI). National Inventory Focal Point of Turkey, Ms Aykas works with curators and researchers all the year. She is also responsible of Documentation Unit of National Seed Gene Bank of Turkey
United Kingdom	2	the NFP is part of a UKPGR group that meets bi-annually
<b>Activity 2.1.3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>Training of NFPs (how to compile, maintain, update and upload NI) realized</b>
<b>Indicator 2.1.3.1</b>		<b>Number of NFPs trained</b>
EURISCO	3	17 (2015); 7 (2016); 10 (2017); 2018 pending; 34 in total
<b>Output 2.2</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>C&amp;E data in EURISCO included, with high quality and wide coverage</b>
<b>Activity 2.2.1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>Development of a mechanism to upload C&amp;E data</b>
<b>Indicator 2.2.1.1</b>		<b>Number of European accessions with C&amp;E data in EURISCO</b>
EURISCO	3	32,267 accs; 630,813 records in total (6 countries)
<b>Indicator 2.2.1.2</b>		<b>Number of updates of C&amp;E data sets in EURISCO per year</b>
EURISCO		15 productive datasets
<b>Activity 2.2.2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>Training of NFPs in gathering and uploading C&amp;E data</b>
<b>Indicator 2.2.2.1</b>		<b>Number of NFPs trained on uploading C&amp;E data</b>
EURISCO	2	7 (2016); 10 (2017); 2018 pending; 17 in total
<b>Output 2.3</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>Inclusion of relevant <i>in situ</i>/on-farm data in EURISCO realized</b>
<b>Activity 2.3.1</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>Identification of PGRFA <i>in situ</i>/on-farm qualifying for inclusion in EURISCO in each country</b>
<b>Proposed indicator</b>		<b>Number of in situ populations qualifying for inclusion in EURISCO</b>
Albania	2	-
Austria	0	-
Belgium	0	-
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0	-
Bulgaria	1	450 accessions
Croatia	0	-
Czech Republic	1	priority of NP for the phase 2018-2022
Denmark	0	0
Estonia	0	-
Finland	0	not known
France	0	-
Germany	2	2 populations of wild grapevine, populations (number to be identified) of <i>Apium/Helosciadium</i> in 45 genetic reserves in establishment, and of grassland species in ca. 20 genetic reserves of historical grassland in establishment
Greece	1	<i>In situ</i> /on farm data can't be registered in EURISCO yet. Although through national and EU projects and actions that are running the last years data of PGRFA <i>in situ</i> /on farm are gathered.
Hungary	0	0
Ireland	3	181
Italy	1	All curators try to implement their collections, also by introducing <i>in situ</i> material in the collections. However, no specific population analysis has been carried out with the aim to designate them for inclusion in EURISCO. They are usually included in the National Inventory (and in EURISCO) once they are characterized in the collection.
Latvia	1	0
Lithuania	1	-
Montenegro	2	11



## OUTCOME 2

<b>OUTCOME 2. Quantity and quality data in EURISCO, including in situ and on-farm data, have been increased. Functionality of EURISCO meets users' expectations.</b>		
	Rating	
Netherlands	0	-
Norway	0	52
Romania	0	-
Serbia	1	-
Slovakia	0	1
Spain	0	-
Sweden	0	no such data
Switzerland	0	1 <i>Vitis</i> , 2 <i>Pyrus pyraeaster</i> , 1 <i>Mespilus germanica</i>
Turkey	0	no research
United Kingdom	0	No currently designated sites, although work has been done on the Lizard peninsular in SW England
<b>Activity 2.3.2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>Development of a standard for exchange of <i>in situ</i> and on-farm data</b>
<b>Indicator 2.3.2.1</b>		<b>Formats to document <i>in situ</i>/on-farm data in EURISCO available</b>
Doc&Info Chair	1	-
EURISCO	1	not scheduled for the EURISCO workplan yet; concept for extension of <i>in situ</i> data will be developed in the frame of the Farmer's Pride project (started November 2017)
<b>Activity 2.3.3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>Agreement on standards between ECPGR, Bioversity International and FAO</b>
<b>Indicator 2.3.3.1</b>		<b>Number of NIs for <i>in situ</i>/on-farm PGRFA</b>
Doc&Info Chair	2	the agreement focussed on the essential PUI (implemented as DOI) as the basis for information exchange
EURISCO	0	see above
<b>Indicator 2.3.3.2</b>		<b>Number and categories of <i>in situ</i> data sets (crop x trait) in EURISCO</b>
Doc&Info Chair	2	the availability of in situ data remained low
EURISCO	0	see above
<b>Activity 2.3.4</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>Extension and adaptation of the EURISCO database structure to allow inclusion of <i>in situ</i> / on-farm data</b>
<b>Activity 2.3.5</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>Development of a transfer mechanism for <i>in situ</i>/on-farm data from NIs to EURISCO</b>
<b>Activity 2.3.6</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>Provision of capacity building and training where necessary</b>
<b>Indicator 2.3.6.1</b>		<b>Number of trainings offered</b>
Doc&Info Chair	1	-
EURISCO	0	see above
<b>Output 2.4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>Users' expectations explored and functionalities of EURISCO increased</b>
<b>Activity 2.4.1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>Users survey performed</b>
<b>Indicator 2.4.1.1</b>		<b>Number of respondents to survey</b>
EURISCO	3	17
<b>Activity 2.4.2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>Database functions adapted or added</b>
<b>Indicator 2.4.2.1</b>		<b>Number of adaptations realized</b>
EURISCO	3	For the EURISCO back-end we have 10 database packages with 128 functions (import, integrity checks, AEGIS auditing etc.) in total + 103 database triggers. For EURISCO web, we have 6 packages with 26 functions (newsletter subscription system, download, C&E, statistics etc.) in total. In addition 31 Java classes for data import, MS Access dump etc.

\*AMs = Associated Members

OUTCOME 3

**OUTCOME 3. *In situ* conservation of priority crop wild relative (CWR) and landrace (LR) populations are implemented throughout Europe. Mechanisms are in place for more effective utilization of the conserved germplasm**

	Average	Albania	Austria	Belgium	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Bulgaria	Croatia	Czech Republic	Denmark	Estonia	Finland	France	Germany	Greece	Hungary	Ireland	Italy	Latvia	Lithuania	Montenegro	Netherlands	Norway	Romania	Serbia	Slovakia	Spain	Sweden	Switzerland	Turkey	United Kingdom	Wild Species Conservation Chair
<b>Output 3.1 National CWR conservation strategies produced</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>2.2</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>2.2</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>2.2</b>	<b>2.2</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>2.0</b>
Activity 3.1.1 Generation of national CWR checklists	1.9	0	0	2	1	2	1	2	2	2	2	1	3	1	2	3	3	2	1	0	3	3	3	2	1	3	3	1	3	2	2
Activity 3.1.2 Prioritization of CWR checklists	1.5	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	2	1	3	0	1	1	0	2	1	0	3	0	3	3	2	1	1	3	3	3	3	2	2
Activity 3.1.3 Production of national CWR inventories	1.3	1	0	0	-	1	1	3	2	0	2	0	2	1	0	3	0	0	1	1	3	2	1	1	1	3	3	1	1	1	-
Activity 3.1.4 Diversity and gap analysis of national priority CWR taxa	0.8	1	0	0	2	2	0	3	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	-	1	2	0	1	1	2	0	0	2	0	2
Activity 3.1.5 Definition of national CWR conservation actions	0.9	1	0	0	1	1	1	2	1	0	1	0	2	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	2	-	0	1	1	1	2	-	1	0	2
Activity 3.1.6 Production of national CWR conservation action plans	0.8	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	2	1	1	2	0	1	1	-	1	-	0	1	1	1	2	-	1	1	2

OUTCOME 3

**OUTCOME 3. *In situ* conservation of priority crop wild relative (CWR) and landrace (LR) populations are implemented throughout Europe. Mechanisms are in place for more effective utilization of the conserved germplasm**

	Average	Albania	Austria	Belgium	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Bulgaria	Croatia	Czech Republic	Denmark	Estonia	Finland	France	Germany	Greece	Hungary	Ireland	Italy	Latvia	Lithuania	Montenegro	Netherlands	Norway	Romania	Serbia	Slovakia	Spain	Sweden	Switzerland	Turkey	United Kingdom	Wild Species Conservation Chair
<b>Output 3.2 Regional (European) CWR conservation strategies produced</b>	<b>3.0</b>																														<b>3.0</b>
Activity 3.2.1 Generation of regional (European) CWR checklists	3.0																														3
Activity 3.2.2 Prioritization of regional (European) CWR checklists	3.0																														3
Activity 3.2.3 Production of regional (European) CWR inventories	3.0																														3
Activity 3.2.4 Diversity and gap analysis of regional (European) priority CWR taxa	3.0																														3
Activity 3.2.5 Definition of regional (European) CWR conservation actions	3.0																														3

OUTCOME 3

**OUTCOME 3. *In situ* conservation of priority crop wild relative (CWR) and landrace (LR) populations are implemented throughout Europe. Mechanisms are in place for more effective utilization of the conserved germplasm**

	Average	Albania	Austria	Belgium	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Bulgaria	Croatia	Czech Republic	Denmark	Estonia	Finland	France	Germany	Greece	Hungary	Ireland	Italy	Latvia	Lithuania	Montenegro	Netherlands	Norway	Romania	Serbia	Slovakia	Spain	Sweden	Switzerland	Turkey	United Kingdom	Wild Species Conservation Chair
Activity 3.2.6 Production of regional (European) CWR conservation action plans	3.0																														3
<b>Output 3.3 Integrated European strategy for CWR conservation produced</b>	<b>1.5</b>																														<b>1.5</b>
Activity 3.3.1 Drafting of integrated European strategy for CWR conservation	1.0																														1
Activity 3.3.2 Agreement on regional (European) and national MAWPs (Most Appropriate crop Wild Relative Population) to form European <i>in situ</i> network	2.0																														2

OUTCOME 3

**OUTCOME 3. *In situ* conservation of priority crop wild relative (CWR) and landrace (LR) populations are implemented throughout Europe. Mechanisms are in place for more effective utilization of the conserved germplasm**

	Average	Albania	Austria	Belgium	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Bulgaria	Croatia	Czech Republic	Denmark	Estonia	Finland	France	Germany	Greece	Hungary	Ireland	Italy	Latvia	Lithuania	Montenegro	Netherlands	Norway	Romania	Serbia	Slovakia	Spain	Sweden	Switzerland	Turkey	United Kingdom	Wild Species Conservation Chair
<b>Output 3.4</b> <b>European MAWP network established</b>	1.0																														1.0
Activity 3.4.1 Official designation of national and regional (European) MAWPs at national level	1.0																														1
<b>Output 3.5</b> <b>Integrated regional (European) CWR conservation strategies operational</b>	1.0																														1.0
Activity 3.5.1 Active conservation management of national and regional (European) MAWPs	1.0																														1

### OUTCOME 3

**OUTCOME 3. *In situ* conservation of priority crop wild relative (CWR) and landrace (LR) populations are implemented throughout Europe. Mechanisms are in place for more effective utilization of the conserved germplasm**

	Average	Albania	Austria	Belgium	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Bulgaria	Croatia	Czech Republic	Denmark	Estonia	Finland	France	Germany	Greece	Hungary	Ireland	Italy	Latvia	Lithuania	Montenegro	Netherlands	Norway	Romania	Serbia	Slovakia	Spain	Sweden	Switzerland	Turkey	United Kingdom	Wild Species Conservation Chair	
<b>Output 3.6</b> MAWP network germplasm effectively utilized																																
Activity 3.6.1 Germplasm samples collected and actively managed <i>ex situ</i>																																
Activity 3.6.2 MAWP germplasm characterized																																
Activity 3.6.3 Access to MAWP germplasm facilitated																																
Activity 3.6.4 MAWP germplasm evaluated																																
Activity 3.6.5 MAWP germplasm utilized in crop improvement programme																																

OUTCOME 3

<b>OUTCOME 3. <i>In situ</i> conservation of priority crop wild relative (CWR) and landrace (LR) populations are implemented throughout Europe. Mechanisms are in place for more effective utilization of the conserved germplasm</b>		
<b>Rating</b>		
<b>Output 3.1</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>National CWR conservation strategies produced</b>
<b>Activity 3.1.1</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>Generation of national CWR checklists</b>
<b>Indicator 3.1.1.1</b>		<b>Number of national CWR checklists produced</b>
Albania	0	-
Austria	0	-
Belgium	2	2
Bosnia and Herzegovina	1	in preparation
Bulgaria	2	-
Croatia	1	-
Czech Republic	2	CWR in collections are in documentation system GRIN Czech, others were collated from National flora
Denmark	2	<a href="http://lbst.dk/landbrug/genetiske-ressourcer/plantegenetiske-ressourcer/#c8647">http://lbst.dk/landbrug/genetiske-ressourcer/plantegenetiske-ressourcer/#c8647</a>
Estonia	2	Preliminary checklist has been produced, but still under review for some minor changes
Finland	2	1 complete checklist
France	1	Checklists are made by genebanks curators and are available in the genebanks websites but these data are not gathered at national level.
Germany	3	Complete national CWR checklist
Greece	1	One checklist by the Greek Gene Bank
Hungary	2	under review
Ireland	3	Periodic surveys are funded by Government and use of validated data from volunteer organisations is used in carrying out mapping activities
Italy	3	a LR checklist has been produced covering the whole Italian territory and including all types of crops (cereals, vegetables, fruit, forage etc.)
Latvia	2	Partial CWR checklist produced. Further consultation with relevant stakeholders required to finalise and implement checklist
Lithuania	1	A complete National Crop Wild Relatives checklist has been produced
Montenegro	0	no results
Netherlands	3	complete checklist produced and available on line
Norway	3	1
Romania	3	A complete national CWRs checklist has been produced, but not published
Serbia	2	1
Slovakia	1	1
Spain	3	One national checklist. Please see: <a href="http://www.inia.es/PGR_Secure/Indexing.htm">http://www.inia.es/PGR_Secure/Indexing.htm</a> and the following recent publication: <a href="https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10722-018-0610-0">https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10722-018-0610-0</a>
Sweden	3	Yes, two different lists (different points of departure)
Switzerland	1	CWR checklist is established, but no progress and the list is in revision
Turkey	3	There is a complete CWR checklist of Turkey and it includes 9046 taxa
United Kingdom	2	A checklist of 2109 taxa has been created
Chair of Wild species Conservation in GR WG	2	-
<b>Activity 3.1.2</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>Prioritization of CWR checklists</b>
<b>Proposed indicator</b>		<b>(1) number of CWR taxa prioritized (2) Percentage of CWR taxa prioritized compared to the total included in the national checklist</b>
Albania	0	-
Austria	0	-
Belgium	0	-
Bosnia and Herzegovina	1	in preparation
Bulgaria	1	-
Croatia	1	-
Czech Republic	2	(1) 212; (2) approx. 1%
Denmark	2	(1) 101 has been identified as mandate species but no further action for conservation actions in situ has been taken so far
Estonia	1	-
Finland	3	(1) 92 taxa; (2) 4.8%
France	0	-
Germany	1	(1) 545 (draft list); (2) 19%
Greece	1	Process is going on. Priority is given to native species, threatened species and crop wild relatives of important crops for agriculture
Hungary	0	(1) 6; (2) 2%
Ireland	2	17% (31 of total 181)

### OUTCOME 3

<b>OUTCOME 3. <i>In situ</i> conservation of priority crop wild relative (CWR) and landrace (LR) populations are implemented throughout Europe. Mechanisms are in place for more effective utilization of the conserved germplasm</b>		
	<b>Rating</b>	
Italy	1	work is currently under way
Latvia	0	0
Lithuania	3	(1) prioritized 160 taxa, which is 14% of the national checklist
Montenegro	0	2
Netherlands	3	54 (about 25% of the CWR on the list)
Norway	3	204
Romania	2	34 species representing 12% of the list
Serbia	1	-
Slovakia	1	1
Spain	3	In total, the checklist contains 929 taxa, of which 578 are prioritized CWR taxa, i.e. 62%
Sweden	3	(1) 84 and 138, depending on criteria; (2) 6.0 and 5.3%, respectively
Switzerland	3	(1) 143; (2) 5% (the list is in revision)
Turkey	3	(1) Number of CWR taxa, prioritized is 870; (2) percentage (%) of CWR prioritized is 9.6
United Kingdom	2	CWR taxa prioritised
Chair of Wild species Conservation in GR WG	2	-
<b>Activity 3.1.3</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>Production of national CWR inventories</b>
<b>Indicator 3.1.3.1</b>		<b>Number of national CWR inventories produced</b>
Albania	1	-
Austria	0	-
Belgium	0	-
Bosnia and Herzegovina	-	-
Bulgaria	1	-
Croatia	1	-
Czech Republic	3	One
Denmark	2	<a href="http://lbst.dk/landbrug/genetiske-ressourcer/plantegenetiske-ressourcer/#c8647">http://lbst.dk/landbrug/genetiske-ressourcer/plantegenetiske-ressourcer/#c8647</a>
Estonia	0	-
Finland	2	1 partial inventory
France	0	-
Germany	2	Partial CWR inventory
Greece	1	An inventory of CWR has been produced for the first time by the Greek Gene Bank
Hungary	0	Partial CWR inventory
Ireland	3	Complete CWR inventory is in the process of being produced and will be finalised mid-2018. A high quality publication has been funded by the government to promote the inventory and its importance
Italy	0	No inventory in the sense of this question has been produced, neither for LR nor for CWR
Latvia	0	no inventory produced
Lithuania	1	Partial CWR inventory has been produced
Montenegro	1	partial CWR inventory for <i>Salvia</i> and <i>Dactylis</i>
Netherlands	3	complete inventory made
Norway	2	23
Romania	1	Partial CWR inventory has been produced
Serbia	1	-
Slovakia	1	1 (CWR of wheat)
Spain	3	One: The recently developed national checklist has been the base to publish the National Inventory of CWRs
Sweden	3	complete
Switzerland	1	0, no specific inventory, but data are also entered in "The National Data and Information Center on the Swiss Flora"
Turkey	1	not yet
United Kingdom	1	Partial inventory completed for 3 sites in England
Chair of Wild species Conservation in GR WG	-	-
<b>Activity 3.1.4</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>Diversity and gap analysis of national priority CWR taxa</b>
<b>Proposed indicator</b>		<b>Number of priority CWR taxa for which a diversity and gap analysis has been concluded</b>
Albania	1	-
Austria	0	-
Belgium	0	-
Bosnia and Herzegovina	2	Inventory of genetic resources in Banja Luka region - project: Two doctoral Thesis on wild fruits
Bulgaria	2	-



### OUTCOME 3

<b>OUTCOME 3. <i>In situ</i> conservation of priority crop wild relative (CWR) and landrace (LR) populations are implemented throughout Europe. Mechanisms are in place for more effective utilization of the conserved germplasm</b>		
	<b>Rating</b>	
Croatia	0	-
Czech Republic	3	212
Denmark	0	-
Estonia	0	-
Finland	2	<i>In situ</i> diversity analysis will be completed in 2018 for 92 priority taxa. <i>Ex situ</i> gap analysis for 209 priority taxa completed in 2013.
France	0	-
Germany	2	Diversity analysis for 2 <i>Apium</i> species, 2 <i>Helosciadium</i> species, 1 wild grapevine, several species of historical grassland, several species of wild fruit crops, 300 species of the Genebank for Crop Wild Relatives in Germany
Greece	0	-
Hungary	0	0
Ireland	0	No progress in this area
Italy	0	see answer above
Latvia	0	0
Lithuania	1	About 14% of priority species are conserved <i>ex situ</i> with more than 5 accessions each
Montenegro	-	-
Netherlands	1	no systematic <i>ex situ</i> duplication is intended, only for threatened species back-up duplication
Norway	2	201
Romania	0	-
Serbia	1	-
Slovakia	1	1
Spain	2	25 taxa included in a three year international project funded by the Crop Trust to collect national CWRs (2016-2018)
Sweden	0	none
Switzerland	0	0
Turkey	2	GAP analysis of CWR of Turkey is still under progress
United Kingdom	0	No data available at the time of completing the survey
Chair of Wild species Conservation in GR WG	2	Not a sensible question as taxa will overlap across countries, so I would guess about 1,000 taxa in total
<b>Activity 3.1.5</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>Definition of national CWR conservation actions</b>
<b>Proposed indicator</b>		<b>Number of national CWR conservation actions defined</b>
Albania	1	-
Austria	0	-
Belgium	0	-
Bosnia and Herzegovina	1	-
Bulgaria	1	3-5 expeditions per year supported by international projects
Croatia	1	-
Czech Republic	2	partly in protected regions and partly in our collections
Denmark	1	-
Estonia	0	-
Finland	1	Some priority CWR species accessions ( <i>Crambe maritima</i> , <i>Malus sylvestris</i> , <i>Ribes nigrum</i> , <i>Ribes spicatum</i> , <i>Vaccinium myrtillus</i> , <i>Vaccinium oxycoccos</i> , <i>Vaccinium uliginosum</i> , <i>Vaccinium vitis-idaea</i> ) are conserved <i>ex situ</i> in national threatened species seedbank. Some Finnish CWR accessions are also in NordGen genebank (mainly forage species)
France	0	-
Germany	2	2 projects for the establishment of genetic reserves for <i>Apium</i> / <i>Helosciadium</i> and sites of historical grassland
Greece	1	No nationally coordinated actions. Pilot studies for specific taxa or locations have been made
Hungary	1	National Strategy for the Conservation of Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (2014-2020)
Ireland	1	National Plant Strategy report (Curtis 2014) has identified specific taxa on which additional work is required
Italy	1	concerning fruit LR, the purpose is to include them all in the National Collection of Fruit Germplasm located at CREA-OFA Rome. This is a continuous process.
Latvia	0	0
Lithuania	1	Defined the number of genetic reserves (four) to be established in the first stage
Montenegro	1	-
Netherlands	2	contract with managers of the reserves was made

### OUTCOME 3

<b>OUTCOME 3. <i>In situ</i> conservation of priority crop wild relative (CWR) and landrace (LR) populations are implemented throughout Europe. Mechanisms are in place for more effective utilization of the conserved germplasm</b>		
	<b>Rating</b>	
Norway	-	1 (location)
Romania	0	-
Serbia	1	-
Slovakia	1	1 ( <i>Aegilops</i> : Sered, Dunajska Streda, Burda, Kovacovske kopce, Cierna n/Tisou)
Spain	1	One specific action to collect CWR of 25 taxa across most part of the peninsular national territory
Sweden	2	Red-listed taxa are continuously being monitored (84 spp. or subspp.)
Switzerland	-	1 <i>Vitis</i> (environmental organisation), a concept for conservation actions for wild pears was proposed
Turkey	1	Not at national level, a few actions mostly carried out by NGO's individually
United Kingdom	0	Although significant work has been done on the Lizard peninsula, no formal recognition of the site has taken place yet.
Chair of Wild species Conservation in GR WG	2	Not a sensible question as taxa will overlap across countries, so I would guess about 1,000 taxa in total
<b>Activity 3.1.6</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>Production of national CWR conservation action plans</b>
<b>Indicator 3.1.6.1</b>		<b>Number of national CWR conservation action plans produced</b>
Albania	1	-
Austria	0	-
Belgium	0	-
Bosnia and Herzegovina	1	Action plan for CWR in preparation
Bulgaria	1	BGR001 - 5531 accessions, 26 plant families, 88 genera, 176 species
Croatia	1	-
Czech Republic	1	3
Denmark	1	-
Estonia	0	-
Finland	0	-
France	0	-
Germany	2	3 conservation action plans for <i>Apium/Helosciadium</i> , wild grapevine, sites of historic grassland
Greece	1	CWR are conserved in NATURA sites <i>in situ</i> and <i>ex situ</i> in Gene banks
Hungary	1	Target 10 of the Strategy for the Conservation of Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture: Identification, collection and documentation of genetic resources within Hungary; Life+ Pannon Seed Bank Project: Pannonian biogeographical region
Ireland	2	National Plant Strategy Report (Curtis 2014) has 40 Recommendations in relation to <i>in situ</i> and <i>ex situ</i> conservation of plant genetic resources. <i>Ex situ</i> conservation has progressed well. Mapping of <i>In situ</i> CWRs is well developed. <i>In situ</i> measures for conservation of CWRs urgently required, early work is progressing on addressing this deficiency.
Italy	0	No action plan produced within the framework of ECPGR. However, regional laws specify that priority has to be set on the conservation of LR which are at risk of extinction.
Latvia	1	0
Lithuania	1	None
Montenegro	-	-
Netherlands	1	initial phases
Norway	-	1 (52 CWR species included in management plan)
Romania	0	-
Serbia	1	-
Slovakia	1	1
Spain	1	The National inventory will serve as a base for the development of National conservation strategies
Sweden	2	Red-listed taxa
Switzerland	-	0
Turkey	1	National CWR conservation plan is being prepared by General Directorate of Agricultural Research and Policies
United Kingdom	1	A generic statement is provided in the Natural England document "Crop Wild Relatives: Plant conservation for food security"
Chair of Wild species Conservation in GR WG	2	-
<b>Output 3.2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>Regional (European) CWR conservation strategies produced</b>
<b>Activity 3.2.1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>Generation of regional (European) CWR checklists</b>
Chair of Wild species Conservation in GR WG	3	

OUTCOME 3

<b>OUTCOME 3. <i>In situ</i> conservation of priority crop wild relative (CWR) and landrace (LR) populations are implemented throughout Europe. Mechanisms are in place for more effective utilization of the conserved germplasm</b>		
	Rating	
<b>Activity 3.2.2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>Prioritization of regional (European) CWR checklists</b>
Chair of Wild species Conservation in GR WG	3	
<b>Activity 3.2.3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>Production of regional (European) CWR inventories</b>
Chair of Wild species Conservation in GR WG	3	
<b>Indicator 3.2.3.1</b>		<b>Regional (European) CWR inventories produced and endorsed by <i>In Situ</i> Conservation WG members</b>
Chair of Wild species Conservation in GR WG	3	S.P.Kell has done this work and is preparing it for WG distribution as part of Farmer's pride
<b>Activity 3.2.4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>Diversity and gap analysis of regional (European) priority CWR taxa</b>
Chair of Wild species Conservation in GR WG	3	
<b>Activity 3.2.5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>Definition of regional (European) CWR conservation actions</b>
Chair of Wild species Conservation in GR WG	3	
<b>Activity 3.2.6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>Production of regional (European) CWR conservation action plans</b>
Chair of Wild species Conservation in GR WG	3	
<b>Indicator 3.2.6.1</b>		<b>Regional (European) CWR conservation action plans produced and endorsed by <i>In Situ</i> Conservation WG members</b>
Chair of Wild species Conservation in GR WG		S.P.Kell has done this work and is preparing it for WG distribution as part of Farmer's pride
<b>Output 3.3</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>Integrated European strategy for CWR conservation produced</b>
<b>Activity 3.3.1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>Drafting of integrated European strategy for CWR conservation</b>
Chair of Wild species Conservation in GR WG	1	
<b>Indicator 3.3.1.1</b>		<b>Integrated European strategy for CWR conservation published</b>
Chair of Wild species Conservation in GR WG		In draft form but incomplete
<b>Activity 3.3.2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>Agreement on regional (European) and national MAWPs (Most Appropriate crop Wild relative Population) to form European <i>in situ</i> network</b>
<b>Indicator 3.3.2.1</b>		<b>List of agreed regional (European) and national MAWPs for inclusion in the <i>in situ</i> network published</b>
Chair of Wild species Conservation in GR WG	2	To be done as part of Farmer's pride
<b>Output 3.4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>European MAWP network established</b>
<b>Activity 3.4.1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>Official designation of national and regional (European) MAWPs at national level</b>
Chair of Wild species Conservation in GR WG	1	
<b>Indicator 3.4.1.1</b>		<b>List of officially designated national and regional (European) MAWPs published</b>
Chair of Wild species Conservation in GR WG	1	To be done as part of Farmer's pride but not due till 2019
<b>Output 3.5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>Integrated regional (European) CWR conservation strategies operational</b>
<b>Activity 3.5.1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>Active conservation management of national and regional (European) MAWPs</b>
Chair of Wild species Conservation in GR WG	1	
<b>Indicator 3.5.1.1</b>		<b>Periodic reports submitted to European Topic Centre for Biodiversity indicating national and regional (European) MAWP conservation status and conservation management actions</b>
Chair of Wild species Conservation in GR WG	1	To be done as part of Farmer's pride but not due till 2019
<b>Indicator 3.5.1.2</b>		<b>Adherence to minimum quality standards for genetic reserve conservation of CWR</b>
Chair of Wild species Conservation in GR WG	-	Yes that will be a condition to entry into the European CWR Network

### OUTCOME 3

<b>OUTCOME 3. <i>In situ</i> conservation of priority crop wild relative (CWR) and landrace (LR) populations are implemented throughout Europe. Mechanisms are in place for more effective utilization of the conserved germplasm</b>		
Rating		
<b>Output 3.6</b>	-	<b>MAWP network germplasm effectively utilized</b>
<b>Activity 3.6.1</b>	-	<b>Germplasm samples collected and actively managed <i>ex situ</i></b>
<b>Indicator 3.6.1.1</b>		<b>Number of germplasm samples of MAWPs collected and actively managed <i>ex situ</i></b>
<b>Activity 3.6.2</b>	-	<b>MAWP germplasm characterized</b>
<b>Indicator 3.6.2.1</b>		<b>Number of MAWP germplasm samples characterized</b>
<b>Activity 3.6.3</b>	-	<b>Access to MAWP germplasm facilitated</b>
<b>Indicator 3.6.3.1</b>		<b>Number of MAWP germplasm samples provided to users</b>
<b>Activity 3.6.4</b>	-	<b>MAWP germplasm evaluated</b>
<b>Indicator 3.6.4.1</b>		<b>Number of MAWP germplasm samples evaluated</b>
<b>Activity 3.6.5</b>	-	<b>MAWP germplasm utilized in crop improvement programme</b>
<b>Indicator 3.6.5.1</b>		<b>Number of MAWP utilized in crop improvement programmes</b>
<b>Indicator 3.6.5.2</b>		<b>Number of MAWP utilized successfully for crop improvement</b>

## OUTCOME 4

### OUTCOME 4. Commitment and regular resources of national governments are sustained or increased, and commitments and resources of the European Commission (EC) as well as of other potential donors towards ECPGR are increased

	Average	Albania	Austria	Belgium	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Bulgaria	Croatia	Czech Republic	Denmark	Estonia	Finland	France	Germany	Greece	Hungary	Ireland	Italy	Latvia	Lithuania	Montenegro	Netherlands	Norway	Romania	Serbia	Slovakia	Spain	Sweden	Switzerland	Turkey	United Kingdom	ECPGR Secretariat
<b>Output 4.1</b> Relationship between ECPGR and EC/EU and responsible national ministries strengthened and sustainable funding of ECPGR secured	2.0																														2
Activity 4.1.1 Development and implementation of a strategy to improve relationships with the EC/EU and secure sustainable funding levels	2																														2
<b>Output 4.2</b> Increased awareness of the value of PGRFA amongst-policy makers at national and regional level	1.2	1.5	1.5	1.5	2.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	0.5	2.0	1.5	0.5	2.0	1.0	1.5	2.0	1.5	0.5	0.5	1.0	1.0	0.5	1.0	1.5	1.5	0.5	1.5	1.0	1.5	1.5	
Activity 4.2.1.a Regular communication with policy-makers within relevant national ministries	1.9	2	2	2	3	2	1	2	1	2	2	1	2	1	3	2	3	1	1	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	2	2	3	3	
Activity 4.2.1.b Regular communication with policy-makers within European Commission	0.6	1	1	1	1	-	1	0	0	2	1	0	2	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	

OUTCOME 4

**OUTCOME 4. Commitment and regular resources of national governments are sustained or increased, and commitments and resources of the European Commission (EC) as well as of other potential donors towards ECPGR are increased**

	Average	Albania	Austria	Belgium	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Bulgaria	Croatia	Czech Republic	Denmark	Estonia	Finland	France	Germany	Greece	Hungary	Ireland	Italy	Latvia	Lithuania	Montenegro	Netherlands	Norway	Romania	Serbia	Slovakia	Spain	Sweden	Switzerland	Turkey	United Kingdom	ECPGR Secretariat
<b>Output 4.3</b> <b>Increased collaboration between ECPGR and the International Treaty for Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA) and FAO Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (CGRFA)</b>	2.0																														2
Activity 4.3.1 Reporting of ECPGR activities to the Governing Body of the ITPGRFA and the CGRFA, including requests for feedback	2																														2
<b>Output 4.4</b> <b>Increased awareness of the value of PGRFA amongst users and the wider public</b>	2																														2
Activity 4.4.1 Development and implementation of a communication and public relations strategy	2																														2

## OUTCOME 4

<b>OUTCOME 4. Commitment and regular resources of national governments are sustained or increased, and commitments and resources of the European Commission (EC) as well as of other potential donors towards ECPGR are increased</b>		
	Rating	
<b>Output 4.1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>Relationship between ECPGR and EC/EU and responsible national ministries strengthened and sustainable funding of ECPGR secured</b>
<b>Activity 4.1.1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>Development and implementation of a strategy to improve relationships with the EC/EU and secure sustainable funding levels</b>
<b>Indicator 4.1.1.1</b>		<b>Number of countries renewing ECPGR membership each Phase</b>
ECPGR Secretariat	2	33 countries have signed the Letter of Agreement for ECPGR Phase IX and additional 3 countries are paying their fees
<b>Indicator 4.1.1.2</b>		<b>Regular payment of ECPGR membership contributions</b>
ECPGR Secretariat	2	Contributions in the first four years of Phase IX have been paid regularly by 30 countries. By April 2018, contributions for the years 2014, 2015, 2016 and 2017 have been € 507 000, € 474 449, € 471 250 and € 404 500 respectively
<b>Indicator 4.1.1.3</b>		<b>Level or regular EU contribution to ECPGR</b>
ECPGR Secretariat	2	It has not been possible to obtain any regular contribution from the EU
<b>Output 4.2</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>Increased awareness of the value of PGRFA amongst-policy makers at national and regional level</b>
<b>Activity 4.2.1.a</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>Regular communication with policy-makers within relevant national ministries</b>
<b>Indicator 4.2.1.1.a</b>		<b>Number of contacts (meetings, workshops realized)</b>
Albania	2	-
Austria	2	two times per year
Belgium	2	4
Bosnia and Herzegovina	3	12
Bulgaria	2	135 year Agricultural Science in Sadovo and International Conference in 2017, AGRA Exhibitions Workshops
Croatia	1	-
Czech Republic	2	regular contacts with Ministry of Agriculture
Denmark	1	One meeting: a thematic day for PGRFA which afterwards resulted in questions from a policy maker to the minister about this area
Estonia	2	Regular contacts with the Ministry of Rural Affairs (national programme, Estonian PGR commission, CGRFA, ITPGRFA webinars), low with Ministry of Environment (Nagoya, CWR).
Finland	2	Regularly (4 meetings annually by National Body on Genetic Resources with relevant ministries and other stakeholders), also other communication on project-based
France	1	7 meetings with various stakeholders and ministries representative between 30/09/2016 and 30/01/2018
Germany	2	3 projects: Organization of an ECPGR workshop in Private Public Partnerships for the Use of Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (GenR 2016-2); Project to improve the search functionality of EURISCO with regard to the taxonomic names of the documented germplasm accession; ECPGR European Genetic Resources - Improving access to European Genetic Resources and their related data (GenR 2017-3). General remark: as governmental institution we have regularly contacts with our national ministry.
Greece	1	one workshop
Hungary	3	regular at a week basis
Ireland	2	(This question PGRFA not ECPGR?) NFP also involved in national PGR policy and hence good awareness. Success in achieving an action to aid with conservation and sustainable use of PGR within (agri-environmental schemes), the Rural Development Programme (RDP) 2014-2020 a success with plans to extend to other crops in the next RDP. Recognition of importance of plant genetic resources in national climate change adaption plans.
Italy	3	about 2 per year, plus several informal meetings
Latvia	1	1
Lithuania	1	-
Montenegro	2	Activities related to the implementation budget lines for PGRFA; Activities related to the creation of a new action
Netherlands	2	frequent contact with relevant ministry
Norway	1	Continuous dialogue - estimated 25-35 meetings
Romania	2	4 meetings, including ministerial visits at the Genebank in Suceava

## OUTCOME 4

<b>OUTCOME 4. Commitment and regular resources of national governments are sustained or increased, and commitments and resources of the European Commission (EC) as well as of other potential donors towards ECPGR are increased</b>		
	<b>Rating</b>	
Serbia	2	1
Slovakia	2	5 (AMRD + conference)
Spain	1	Communications have taken place several times
Sweden	2	Inter-ministerial meetings, seminars held at SLU as well as within the national programme (Pom)
Switzerland	2	regularly
Turkey	3	During the phase IX, app. 80 meetings, workshops and etc. mainly focused on plant genetic resources
United Kingdom	3	There are 2 annual PGR meetings with Defra, in addition Defra also attend gene bank advisory committee meetings and Defra representatives are easily contacted by email or phone
<b>Activity 4.2.1.b</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>Regular communication with policy-makers within European Commission</b>
<b>Indicator 4.2.1.1.b</b>	<b>Number of contacts, meetings, workshops realized</b>	
Albania	1	-
Austria	1	two times per year
Belgium	1	3
Bosnia and Herzegovina	1	2; Brussels, June 2016; Bonn, 2017 PPP
Bulgaria	-	FAO workshops on technical working group on PGR, Final conference - Preparatory action plan on EU plant and animal genetic resources, ECPGR workshop meetings
Croatia	1	-
Czech Republic	0	no
Denmark	0	0
Estonia	2	Meetings in Brussels before CGRA and IPGRFA (2017, more involved due to the Presidency)
Finland	1	Ministry level policy meetings
France	0	-
Germany	2	7 Workshops for the Preparatory actions on EU plant and animal genetic resources in agriculture
Greece	1	EU preparatory actions for plant and animal genetic resources meeting that took place in Brussels in 2016
Hungary	0	0
Ireland	2	Contributed and worked with consultants on the 1st and 2nd preparatory actions on Genetic Resources
Italy	0	-
Latvia	0	0
Lithuania	0	-
Montenegro	0	-
Netherlands	0	-
Norway	0	0
Romania	0	-
Serbia	1	1
Slovakia	1	1 (1=every year)
Spain	0	None
Sweden	1	Swedish EPs contacted concerning outcome of PrepActGR (April 2017, but no feed-back)
Switzerland	0	Non EU-member state
Turkey	0	-
United Kingdom	0	no data available at the time of completing the survey
<b>Output 4.3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>Increased collaboration between ECPGR and the International Treaty for Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA) and FAO Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (CGRFA)</b>
Activity 4.3.1	2	Reporting of ECPGR activities to the Governing Body of the ITPGRFA and the CGRFA, including requests for feedback
<b>Indicator 4.3.1.1</b>	<b>Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with Secretariats of ITPGRFA and CGRFA about regional role of ECPGR and direct collaboration</b>	
ECPGR Secretariat	2	An MoU with the Secretariat of the Treaty has been signed in December 2016



## OUTCOME 4

<b>OUTCOME 4. Commitment and regular resources of national governments are sustained or increased, and commitments and resources of the European Commission (EC) as well as of other potential donors towards ECPGR are increased</b>		
	<b>Rating</b>	
<b>Output 4.4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>Increased awareness of the value of PGRFA amongst users and the wider public</b>
Activity 4.4.1	2	Development and implementation of a communication and public relations strategy
<b>Indicator 4.4.1.1</b>		<b>Number of publication and other communications, events (radio, TV, etc.) realized</b>
ECPGR Secretariat	1	Public Awareness article was published in "Pan European Networks Science and Technology", Issue 10, March 2014. ECPGR and AEGIS brochures are available from the web site and regularly distributed at meetings. Presentations on AEGIS/ECPGR were delivered at the occasion of Milan Expo 2015 and during EC Preparatory Action workshops in 2016. A communication strategy was drafted by a Task Force

OUTCOME 5

**OUTCOME 5. Relations with users of germplasm are strengthened**

		Average	Albania	Austria	Belgium	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Bulgaria	Croatia	Czech Republic	Denmark	Estonia	Finland	France	Germany	Greece	Hungary	Ireland	Italy	Latvia	Lithuania	Montenegro	Netherlands	Norway	Romania	Serbia	Slovakia	Spain	Sweden	Switzerland	Turkey	United Kingdom
<b>Output 5.1</b>	<b>Good knowledge of which C&amp;E data are of high relevance to potential users</b>	<b>1.0</b>																													
Activity 5.1.1	Survey of user needs performed and results analysed	1.0	1	2	1	2	0	1	2	0	1	1	0	0	1	2	0	2	1	1	0	3	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	1	1
<b>Output 5.2</b>	<b>Expectations of users regarding genebank services known and answered</b>	<b>1.9</b>																													
Activity 5.2.1	Effective services to users are established	1.9	2	2	2	3	2	1	3	1	2	2	-	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	3	2	2	2	1	3	1	2	3	0
<b>Output 5.3</b>	<b>Enhanced use of CWRs realized</b>	<b>1.0</b>																													
Activity 5.3.1	Closer links with conservationists and breeders realized	1.0	0	1	2	0	2	0	2	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	2	2	0	2	0	1	1	1	1	2	0	3	0
<b>Output 5.4</b>	<b>Improved collaboration with users in public and private sector</b>	<b>1.7</b>																													
Activity 5.4.1	Research partnerships established between genebanks and researchers, including through EU projects	1.7	2	1	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	1	2	3	2	1	2	1	1	3	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	3	1

## OUTCOME 5

<b>OUTCOME 5. Relations with users of germplasm are strengthened</b>		
Rating		
<b>Output 5.1</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>Good knowledge of which C&amp;E data are of high relevance to potential users</b>
<b>Activity 5.1.1</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>Survey of user needs performed and results analysed</b>
<b>Indicator 5.1.1.1</b>		<b>Needs analysis available</b>
Albania	1	-
Austria	2	Evaluation data of old varieties
Belgium	1	-
Bosnia and Herzegovina	2	two master thesis (white corn, kale)
Bulgaria	0	the active users of PGR and C&E data are breeders, ecological and organic producers, small farmers
Croatia	1	-
Czech Republic	2	responsibility of each crop curator
Denmark	0	no analysis available
Estonia	1	Regular contacts with users (breeders, researchers, farmers), no specific analysis carried out
Finland	1	No analysis available, but user's need have been heard in evaluation projects, e.g. in hop
France	0	-
Germany	0	0
Greece	1	-
Hungary	2	Not published, only for interior usage
Ireland	0	Provision of germplasm for research to identify traits to combat predicted climate change effects in Ireland. Seminars organised on heritage malting barleys to piggy-back on explosion in establishment of craft breweries/distilleries in operation and who are searching for a niche
Italy	2	oral exchange of views
Latvia	1	0
Lithuania	1	-
Montenegro	0	-
Netherlands	3	permanent process as part of ISO9001 quality management
Norway	1	0
Romania	1	Scientific analysis do not exist, but conclusions can be drawn based on the samples (species, biological status, certain traits, etc.) that are required either by researchers, breeders, or by individuals practicing traditional farming
Serbia	1	-
Slovakia	2	unknown, lack of information
Spain	0	None. However, the Spanish Center of Plant Genetic Resources is in constant contact with PGRFA users (e.g. farmers, seed companies).
Sweden	0	no analysis available
Switzerland	0	-
Turkey	1	-
United Kingdom	1	Analysis of all user requests for UK gene bank material has been completed. Characterization descriptors have been prioritized by the work
<b>Output 5.2</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>Expectations of users regarding genebank services known and answered</b>
<b>Activity 5.2.1</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>Effective services to users are established</b>
<b>Indicator 5.2.1.1</b>		<b>Overview of types and numbers of services across ECPGR available</b>
Albania	2	-
Austria	2	Homepage for users of old varieties ( <a href="http://www.ages.at">www.ages.at</a> )
Belgium	2	Releasing seeds and budwood of selected accessions; creating a commercial trade mark for fruit genetic resources cvs
Bosnia and Herzegovina	3	Training (master study in organization of Faculty of Sciences, Faculty of Agriculture and IGR); Storage of material at the IGR
Bulgaria	2	germplasm accessions in small quantity, passport data, technologies, training service, storage of breeding materials - lines, cultivars
Croatia	1	-
Czech republic	3	Crop database including C&E data, training service, storage of breeding material
Denmark	1	Public database (SESTO) with online ordering an MTA; PGRFA advice via email
Estonia	2	Information available on webpage, public database in NordGen (SESTO), presentations/workshops to different user groups, storage of breeding material
Finland	2	Service provided by NordGen: SESTO with online ordering; Nationally data management tool developed for taking announcements of potential genetic resources
France	-	-
Germany	2	European <i>Vitis</i> Database, Database of the German Genebank for grapevine; ECPGR Grant Scheme Activity "GrapeOnFarm"; Database of the German Genebank for fruit crops; Database of the German Genebank for ornamental plants.

## OUTCOME 5

<b>OUTCOME 5. Relations with users of germplasm are strengthened</b>		
	<b>Rating</b>	
Greece	2	Greek accessions in EURISCO, seeds and information available, medium and long term storage conditions
Hungary	2	Cop database, storage, training, web shop for seed request, permanent exhibition on general gene bank activities
Ireland	2	Sufficient quantities of germplasm are regenerated to meet commercial and research needs and thus improve likelihood of conservation through use
Italy	2	National Inventory is available online and steadily increasing; C&E data will be uploaded as well once the function has been added to the database. However, C&E data are available in all partner institutions and shared with users upon request
Latvia	2	C&E database, storage of breeding material, genotyping and genetic analysis of PGRFA and other breeding material
Lithuania	1	Crop Database, storage of breeding material
Montenegro	1	Crop database; Storage of breeding material; Education
Netherlands	3	web user interface to CGN collections; advice on Nagoya Protocol (National ABS Focal Point)
Norway	2	0 (services available, but no formal reporting is carried out)
Romania	2	Each year, after the traditional varieties distribution campaign to individuals who practice small-scale agriculture, an analysis of the most demanding species and varieties is done. Starting from the results obtained, in the multiplication plan for the next season, the preferred varieties, with the attributes sought by the users are included.
Serbia	2	Database, storage
Slovakia	1	crop of database, training, storage of DUS biological material for UKSUP
Spain	3	Provision of plant germplasm (mainly winter cereals, grain legumes and some industrial crops), maintenance of the National Inventory of PGRFA, establishment of a protocol for germplasm exchange, participation in several workshops and courses to increase awareness about PGRFA.
Sweden	1	Public data base (SESTO) with online ordering and MTA; PGRFA advice via email
Switzerland	2	Public database with passport data and evaluation data, on line order
Turkey	3	Crop database, training service, storage of breeding material provided to germplasm users in our country
United Kingdom	0	Germplasm databases are maintained for all 3 UK genebanks. No additional training is available to users.
<b>Output 5.3</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>Enhanced use of CWRs realized</b>
<b>Activity 5.3.1</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>Closer links with conservationists and breeders realized</b>
<b>Indicator 5.3.1.1</b>		<b>Numbers of CWRs distributed by AMs</b>
Albania	0	-
Austria	1	-
Belgium	2	More than 6000 seeds of wild indigenous apple
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0	-
Bulgaria	2	150 accessions
Croatia	0	-
Czech republic	2	CWR are distributed from GB and crop curators (110-300 per year)
Denmark	1	During the period 2014-2017 NordGen distributed 3364 wild and semi-wild accessions: 2014: 724 acc.; 2015: 1022 acc.; 2016: 1035 acc.; 2017: 583 acc.
Estonia	2	Not many distributed but forage grasses and legumes collected from joint (genebank-breeders) seed collecting expeditions have been successfully used in breeding programmes.
Finland	0	-
France	0	-
Germany	0	no data available
Greece	1	-
Hungary	1	852
Ireland	1	Low - average of approximately 3 CWR accessions are provided each year under SMTA. Overall number of accessions in the genebank is low relative to other European Genebanks.
Italy	1	most requests for LR and CWR are coming in from amateur gardeners, not much from the seed sector/breeders' side
Latvia	2	0
Lithuania	2	-
Montenegro	0	-
Netherlands	2	CWRs are distributed like all other material in the collection; some successes were documented
Norway	0	Estimated 1500, mainly to private hobby use, mainly potato. For production use estimated 75, mainly hops
Romania	1	-
Serbia	1	-

## OUTCOME 5

<b>OUTCOME 5. Relations with users of germplasm are strengthened</b>		
<b>Rating</b>		
Slovakia	1	0 (they have no interest)
Spain	1	We have just started to be focussed on CWR and therefore, a lot of work needs to be done (at least in terms of multiplication and regeneration) before being able to have these materials available for users.
Sweden	2	During the period 2014-2017 NordGen distributed 3364 wild and semi-wild accessions, as follows: 2014 - 724 acc.; 2015 - 1022 acc., 2016 - 1035 acc.; 2017 - 583 acc.
Switzerland	0	0
Turkey	3	200 accessions of CWR distributed
United Kingdom	0	No data available at the time of completing the survey
<b>Output 5.4</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>Improved collaboration with users in public and private sector</b>
<b>Activity 5.4.1</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>Research partnerships established between genebanks and researchers, including through EU projects</b>
<b>Indicator 5.4.1.1</b>		<b>Number of partnerships established over given time frame</b>
Albania	2	-
Austria	1	material for research projects
Belgium	2	6
Bosnia and Herzegovina	2	Common project with Agricultural Institute of Slovenia; GIZ regional project on agrobiodiversity
Bulgaria	1	5
Croatia	1	-
Czech Republic	1	within 3 EU projects
Denmark	2	Number of partnerships: 19 (5 pre-breeding partnerships; 8 network partnerships; 6 characterisation and evaluation partnerships (NordGen counts projects with many members as one partnership))
Estonia	2	Several (10-15) small projects (ECPGR, regional, national), couple of EU projects
Finland	2	Realizes through NordGen
France	2	Characterisation projects: French project on barley, vine, peas, lavender collections, and at European level: Whealbi project, Grasslandscape project,...
Germany	1	INNOVINE (evaluation of genetic resources - Black rot, Phylloxera, Plasmopara - 4 years)
Greece	2	The Greek genebank and the field collections are maintained in research institutes of the Hellenic Agricultural Organization - DEMETER, that are involved with breeding too. As a result many projects are established between genebank and researches, breeders and other scientists, from the same or other institutes of the Organization and/or from other organizations and universities national or international. This partnership aims to enhance use of PGR in agriculture as well as in support of EU CAP measures and biodiversity strategy targets
Hungary	3	10 projects as germplasm provider
Ireland	2	1. Identify traits that will adapt to projected climate change problems in Ireland and provide this data to plant breeders. 2. Funded projects on genetic characterisation of malting barley varieties with a view to identification of suitable varieties
Italy	1	One project aiming at the systematic re-introduction of old Italian maize landraces from ex situ conservation to farmers who are located in the regions of origin; participation in the ECPGR funded Project BetaNet
Latvia	2	2014-2016 genotyping of bi-parental spring barley populations, 2015-2017 genotyping and analysis of <i>Festulolium</i> breeding material
Lithuania	1	-
Montenegro	1	Distribution of seed to small organic producers; education concerning production technology
Netherlands	3	various; joint phenotyping, joint research and other joint activities
Norway	2	Estimated 10, 4 partnerships in prebreeding of seed crops, plus few research collaboration (not actual partnership)
Romania	2	A national network for regeneration/multiplication and characterisation/evaluation of vegetables has been established, including 5 public breeding entities.
Serbia	2	regional
Slovakia	1	2: project H2020/accepted, new repository
Spain	1	We are currently working with 6 research groups both national and international (e.g. Kew, Politecnica University of Madrid, CBGP-Centro de Biotecnología y Genómica de Plantas)
Sweden	2	19 (including 5 pre-breeding, 8 network, 6 characterisation and evaluation; NordGen counts projects with many members as one single partnership)
Switzerland	2	Some nice projects within the Swiss National plan of action for the conservation and utilisation of plant genetic resources
Turkey	3	more than 300
United Kingdom	1	Material has been provided to numerous research users across the EU, more through service provision than official partnerships

## OUTCOME 6

### OUTCOME 6. Organizational structure and secretarial support are adequate to effectively sustain the operations of ECPGR

		Average:	ECPGR Secretariat score
<b>Output 6.1</b>	<b>New structure for the operations of WGs implemented and operational</b>	Average:	<b>3.0</b>
Activity 6.1.1	Definition of Terms of Reference (TORs) of WG Chairs		3
Activity 6.1.2	Definition of rules for Phase IX, including country quota system and criteria for fields of expertise		3
Activity 6.1.3	Formation of Working Groups as pools of experts and nomination of a Chair		3
Activity 6.1.4	Development of procedures for WGs to submit expressions of interest and proposals for activities		3
Activity 6.1.5	Establishment of procedure to select proposals and grant projects		3
<b>Output 6.2</b>	<b>Effective operation of ExCo and SC</b>	Average:	<b>3.0</b>
Activity 6.2.1	ExCo selects a new member each year		3
Activity 6.2.2	ExCo interacts via email and meets when necessary		3
Activity 6.2.3	ExCo reports its activities to the SC meetings		3
Activity 6.2.4	SC approves the budget for Phase IX		3
Activity 6.2.5	SC meets at least every two years and a half		3
<b>Output 6.3</b>	<b>Synergies with external partners are realized</b>	Average:	<b>2.0</b>
Activity 6.3.1	Opportunities for synergies are sought for		2
<b>Output 6.4</b>	<b>Fundraising is undertaken</b>	Average:	<b>2.8</b>
Activity 6.4.1	Monitoring of the disbursement of agreed contributions by ECPGR members		3
Activity 6.4.2	Scouting opportunities for additional funding		3
Activity 6.4.3	Submit fund applications		2.5
<b>Output 6.5</b>	<b>Effective operation of the Secretariat</b>	Average:	<b>3.0</b>
Activity 6.5.1	All activities in the framework of the Programme coordinated		3
Activity 6.5.2	Phase and annual budgets prepared and financial management ensured		3
Activity 6.5.3	Technical and financial reports provided annually		3
Activity 6.5.4	Support provided to the WGs including planning activities, implementing workplans and projects, organization of meetings and reporting		3
Activity 6.5.5	Information gathered and distributed to ECPGR community		3
<b>Output 6.6</b>	<b>ECPGR Secretariat adequately staffed</b>	Average:	<b>3.0</b>
Activity 6.6.1	ECPGR Secretary identified by Steering Committee and appointed by Hosting Institution		3
Activity 6.6.2	Secretariat staff appointed by Hosting Institution upon recommendation of ECPGR Secretary		3
<b>Output 6.7</b>	<b>ECPGR Secretariat effectively hosted by Hosting Institution</b>	Average:	<b>3.0</b>
Activity 6.7.1	Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with Hosting Institution signed by minimum number of member countries (i.e. representing at least 75% of the budgetary contributions for Phase IX)		3

## OUTCOME 6

<b>OUTCOME 6. Organizational structure and secretarial support are adequate to effectively sustain the operations of ECPGR</b>		
Rating		
<b>Output 6.1</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>New structure for the operations of WGs implemented and operational</b>
Activity 6.1.1	3.0	Definition of Terms of Reference (TORs) of WG Chairs
<b>Indicator 6.1.1.1</b>		<b>ToRs of WG Chairs published online</b>
ECPGR Secretariat	3	ToRs of WG were published online as part of the ECPGR ToRs at the beginning of the Phase
Activity 6.1.2	3.0	Definition of rules for Phase IX, including country quota system and criteria for fields of expertise
<b>Indicator 6.1.2.1</b>		<b>Country quota system implemented online. Criteria published online</b>
ECPGR Secretariat	3	Country quota system explained in the ECPGR ToRs and implemented, with current situation regularly updated online
Activity 6.1.3	3.0	Formation of Working Groups as pools of experts and nomination of a Chair
<b>Indicator 6.1.3.1</b>		<b>WGs established with pools of experts listed on the ECPGR website</b>
ECPGR Secretariat	3	WGs established and updated lists of experts available from the ECPGR website; All Chairs nominated and replaced when substitutions needed
Activity 6.1.4	3.0	Development of procedures for WGs to submit expressions of interest and proposals for activities
<b>Indicator 6.1.4.1</b>		<b>Number of calls and proposals for activities</b>
ECPGR Secretariat	3	6 Calls of the Grant Scheme launched (for the first five calls, 40 eligible proposals received)
Activity 6.1.5	3.0	Establishment of procedure to select proposals and grant projects
<b>Indicator 6.1.5.1</b>		<b>Number of project approved</b>
ECPGR Secretariat	3	28 proposals approved under the first five calls
<b>Output 6.2</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>Effective operation of ExCo and SC</b>
Activity 6.2.1	3.0	ExCo selects a new member each year
<b>Indicator 6.2.1.1</b>		<b>Updated composition of ExCo on the web each year</b>
ECPGR Secretariat	3	The ExCo composition is updated every year and situation is available online
Activity 6.2.2	3.0	ExCo interacts via email and meets when necessary
<b>Indicator 6.2.2.1</b>		<b>Number of ExCo meetings held and minutes of meetings published on the web</b>
ECPGR Secretariat	3	Five ExCo meetings were held in four years and the minutes are available online
Activity 6.2.3	3.0	ExCo reports its activities to the SC meetings
<b>Indicator 6.2.3.1</b>		<b>ExCo reports provided to the SC</b>
ECPGR Secretariat	3	ExCo formally reports its activity at the SC meetings and regularly through email exchanges with the SC
Activity 6.2.4	3.0	SC approves the budget for Phase IX
<b>Indicator 6.2.4.1</b>		<b>Budget for Phase IX approved</b>
ECPGR Secretariat	3	The budget for Phase IX was approved in early 2014
Activity 6.2.5	3.0	SC meets at least every two years and a half
<b>Indicator 6.2.5.1</b>		<b>Number of SC meetings held and reports published online</b>
ECPGR Secretariat	3	Mid-Term SC meeting took place in May-June 2016 end-of-phase SC meeting is scheduled for May 2018

## OUTCOME 6

<b>OUTCOME 6. Organizational structure and secretarial support are adequate to effectively sustain the operations of ECPGR</b>		
Rating		
<b>Output 6.3</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>Synergies with external partners are realized</b>
Activity 6.3.1	2.0	Opportunities for synergies are sought for
<b>Indicator 6.3.1.1</b>	<b>Number of effective interactions with external partners</b>	
ECPGR Secretariat	2	Various interactions took place between ExCo/Secretariat and BGCI, Crop Trust, EC, ESA, ETP, EUCARPIA, FAO and SEEDNet
<b>Output 6.4</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>Fundraising is undertaken</b>
Activity 6.4.1	3.0	Monitoring of the disbursement of agreed contributions by ECPGR members
<b>Indicator 6.4.1.1</b>	<b>Total annual contributions received</b>	
ECPGR Secretariat	3	Regular annual contributions amounting to a total of €1 871 699 were received for the years 2014-18 (as at 31 December 2017)
Activity 6.4.2	3.0	Scouting opportunities for additional funding
<b>Indicator 6.4.2.1</b>	<b>Number of potential opportunities identified</b>	
ECPGR Secretariat	3	Various Horizon 2020 calls (SFS07 and SFS28) were identified as fund-raising opportunity; German Ministry of Food and Agriculture opened for project proposals on PGRFA; the Crop Trust ventilated the possibility to fund safety-duplication of AEGIS accessions to Svalbard
Activity 6.4.3	2.5	Submit fund applications
<b>Indicator 6.4.3.1</b>	<b>Number of applications</b>	
ECPGR Secretariat	3	Secretariat participated in four project applications under Horizon 2020 and submitted three project proposals to German government; a proposal for funding multiplication and safety-duplication of 2000 accessions from five countries was submitted to the Crop Trust
<b>Indicator 6.4.3.2</b>	<b>Total funds raised</b>	
ECPGR Secretariat	2	No funds were raised as a result of H2020 applications; the German government granted ca. Euro 333 000; no funds were received from the Crop Trust
<b>Output 6.5</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>Effective operation of the Secretariat</b>
Activity 6.5.1	3.0	All activities in the framework of the Programme coordinated
<b>Indicator 6.5.1.1</b>	<b>Number of Programme's activities coordinated</b>	
ECPGR Secretariat	3	Several activities coordinated, as referred in ECPGR Annual Reports
<b>Indicator 6.5.1.2</b>	<b>Number of Programme's activities reported</b>	
ECPGR Secretariat	3	Several activities reported, as referred in the ECPGR e-bulletins and Annual Reports
Activity 6.5.2	3.0	Phase and annual budgets prepared and financial management ensured
<b>Indicator 6.5.2.1</b>	<b>Budget tables approved by SC</b>	
ECPGR Secretariat	3	Budget tables were approved by SC at the onset of Phase IX
<b>Indicator 6.5.2.2</b>	<b>Reports on annual and end-of-Phase balance of ECPGR finances</b>	
ECPGR Secretariat	3	Reports on balance of ECPGR finances were provided as part of Financial reports (2014 - 2017)
Activity 6.5.3	0.0	Technical and financial reports provided annually
<b>Indicator 6.5.3.1</b>	<b>Technical and financial reports</b>	
ECPGR Secretariat	3	Technical and financial reports for 2014-2017 were provided
Activity 6.5.4	3.0	Support provided to the WGs including planning activities, implementing workplans and projects, organization of meetings and reporting
<b>Indicator 6.5.4.1</b>	<b>Number of interactions facilitating the WG activities</b>	
ECPGR Secretariat	3	Regular email and direct interactions between Secretariat and WG members took place, either in the framework of the Grant Scheme proposal preparation, or regarding implementation and reporting of granted proposals



## OUTCOME 6

<b>OUTCOME 6. Organizational structure and secretarial support are adequate to effectively sustain the operations of ECPGR</b>		
<b>Rating</b>		
<b>Indicator 6.5.4.2</b>		
<b>Number of endorsed workplans</b>		
ECPGR Secretariat	3	The Mode of operation of Phase IX is not conducive to the endorsement of formal workplans by WGs. Crop Wild Relatives WG and On-farm conservation and management WG rely on the respective endorsed concepts as workplans. The other WGs mainly operate through the planning made for the specific Grant Scheme proposals (28 approved). A workplan for EURISCO development is approved at the beginning of each year
<b>Indicator 6.5.4.3</b>		
<b>Number of meetings facilitated by the Secretariat</b>		
ECPGR Secretariat	3	Organization of Documentation and Information workshop in 2014, On-farm concept meeting in 2015, EURISCO Advisory Committee meeting in 2016 and 3 PPP project meetings in 2017-18 ; organization of six ExCo meetings (2014-2018) and two SC meetings (2016 and 2018). 23 Grant Scheme activity meetings administered and 8 attended by Secretariat.
<b>Indicator 6.5.4.4</b>		
<b>Number of WG reports processed by the Secretariat</b>		
ECPGR Secretariat	3	Fifteen Grant Scheme Activity Reports were processed by the Secretariat as at March 2018.
Activity 6.5.5	3.0	Information gathered and distributed to ECPGR community
<b>Indicator 6.5.5.1</b>		
<b>Number of messages sent to list server</b>		
ECPGR Secretariat	3	<b>Steering listserver: 383 - Chairs listserver: 56 - ECPGR listserver: 44</b>
<b>Indicator 6.5.5.2</b>		
<b>Number of news and events published on the ECPGR website</b>		
ECPGR Secretariat	3	109 news items have been published on the ECPGR website since January 2014 (as at March 2018)
<b>Output 6.6</b>		
<b>3.0 ECPGR Secretariat adequately staffed</b>		
Activity 6.6.1	3	ECPGR Secretary identified by Steering Committee and appointed by Hosting Institution
<b>Indicator 6.6.1.1</b>		
<b>Number of Secretariat staff members appointed (persons per month)</b>		
ECPGR Secretariat	3	Secretary: full time; Programme assistant: full time; Scientific assistant: half-time; Senior advisor: half time in 2014, 25% in 2015 and 15% in 2016. Research assistant at 40% between January and November 2017
Activity 6.6.2	3	Secretariat staff appointed by Hosting Institution upon recommendation of ECPGR Secretary
<b>Output 6.7</b>		
<b>3.0 ECPGR Secretariat effectively hosted by Hosting Institution</b>		
Activity 6.7.1	3	Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with Hosting Institution signed by minimum number of member countries (i.e. representing at least 75% of the budgetary contributions for Phase IX)
<b>Indicator 6.7.1.1</b>		
<b>Number of signed MoUs archived by Secretariat</b>		
ECPGR Secretariat	3	33 Letters of Agreement for Phase IX have been received, representing 90% of the budgetary contributions of Phase IX

\*AMs = Associated Members

## GENERAL COMMENTS

### GENERAL COMMENTS

<b>Progress towards the ECPGR Objectives during Phase IX (2014-2018)</b>		
<b>Country</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>General rating</b>
Albania	Lack of survey and inventory of CWR in all territory and in protected areas. Lack for local and landraces, lack of sustainable system for on-farm conservation	Medium
Austria	Reduced staff and financial resources	Low
Belgium	-	Medium
Bosnia and Herzegovina	The fund for common projects should be higher; training in taxonomy; more WGs crop oriented	High
Bulgaria	During the period researchers - members in ECPGR working groups, participated in planned meetings with the financial support of the Activity Grant Scheme, which increases their knowledge and collaboration	Medium
Croatia	-	Low
Czech Republic	-	High
Denmark	-	Medium
Estonia	Almost no progress in the area of CWR: difficulties to motivate the stakeholders and to involve relevant ministry (MoE) and agencies	Medium
Finland	-	Medium
France	The new coordination in France has started in spring 2016. First actions are focus on official recognition of stakeholders and elaboration of the French national collection. This collection will be integrated in Eurisco. To revive the coordination of PGR and CWR in France, we have set up a special committee with stakeholder's representatives from ex situ conservation, in situ and on-farm management together with representatives of ministries (agriculture, environment, research, culture and overseas). We can expect that actions launched will help France to better answer ECPGR objectives in the coming years	Low
Germany	-	Medium
Greece	Greece couldn't participate in actions during the whole Phase IX, although the national progress was sufficient	Medium
Hungary	-	Medium
Ireland	-	Medium
Italy	We are currently discussing with our partners. If possible I would like to submit observations at a later stage. I apologize for the inconvenience	Medium
Latvia	-	Medium
Lithuania	-	Low
Montenegro	Adopting the missing legislation, new National Program and the Action Plan is the top priority, as well as creation of a more extensive budget support in the frame of Rural Development measures; create precise plans to support farmers who maintain genetic resources on their property. Providing stable funding for maintaining full working capacity of Gene bank of PGR; Support further inventory, studying and popularizing the sustainable use of the most important PGR	Medium
Netherlands	-	Medium

GENERAL COMMENTS

Progress towards the ECPGR Objectives during Phase IX (2014-2018)		
Country	Comments	General rating
Norway	Bottleneck is funding of activities. All AEGIS progress depends on project funding where main objectives are other than the AEGIS goals. The structure of Norwegian national conservation work outside NordGen is rather informal, hence documentation is limited.	Low
Romania	-	Medium
Serbia	-	Medium
Slovak Republic	the increase of NP-PGR funding, because funding NP-PGR and number of employees (curators) is decreasing	Low
Spain	Problems to be able to disburse the money to pay the ECPGR fee. In this respect, we are currently making efforts to try to make the Ministry of Agriculture to become responsible of the payment instead of the Ministry of Economy, Industry and Competitiveness, to which INIA (the Spanish Institute of Agricultural Research) belongs. Constraints to coordinate the big Spanish network of PGRFA's collections	Low
Sweden	Medium progress with outcome 3 refers to limited funding and difficulties establishing bridge to nature conservation authorities	Medium
Switzerland	ECPGR activities might be too small projects and failing resources means also lack of liabilities and low progress. CWR activities is also depending on collaboration with Environmental Offices and other agencies and sometimes complicated	Medium
Turkey	In term of plant genetic resources. Turkey has just started important activities such as "Inventory of local varieties ", genebank portal (includes both genebanks). On the other hand, public is very enthusiastic about Community Seed Genebank and local varieties issues. We hope to be more active in the 10th Phase.	Low
United Kingdom	Due to the gaps in the information available at the time of completing the survey, there are some questions which I have not been able to provide detailed answers on. Within DEFRA there have been some changes in PGR policy leads which have impacted the amount of resources available to fully review ECPGR progress. However closer monitoring of ECPGR activities is something that we are looking at addressing over the next Phase of activities	Medium
EURISCO Coordinator		High
Chair of Documentation and Information WG		Medium
Chair of Wild Species Conservation in GR WG	EURISCO did a very good job regarding the management of available data; made the first steps toward inclusion of C&E data regarding <i>in situ</i> and on farm data, possibly the objectives were too ambitious or even unrealistic as the data do not seem to be available in most of the participating countries	Medium