

**European Crop Wild Relative Diversity
Assessment and Conservation Forum**



www.pgrforum.org

Summary Report of Workshop 2: Threat and Conservation Assessment

27-30 April 2005, Kørsor (Western Sealand), Denmark

C. Hilton-Taylor, S. Kell, N. Maxted and K. Kristiansen



PGR Forum - EVK2-2001-00192

Fifth Framework Programme for Energy, Environment and Sustainable Development
Coordinated by The University of Birmingham, UK



PGR Forum European Crop Wild Relative Diversity Assessment and Conservation Forum

Summary Report of Workshop 2: Threat and Conservation Assessment

27-30 April 2005, Kørsor (Western Sealand), Denmark

C. Hilton-Taylor, S. Kell, N. Maxted and K. Kristiansen

Hosted by the Danish Institute of Agricultural Sciences
Location: Hotel Jens Baggesen, Kørsor, Denmark

Organisers:

Craig Hilton-Taylor
Caroline Pollock
Kell Kristiansen
Shelagh Kell
Nigel Maxted

Front cover: Wood Garlic (*Allium ursinum*)
Photographer: Craig Hilton-Taylor

Contents

	Page
1. BACKGROUND	4
2. INTRODUCTION	5
2.1 Rationale for Red Listing CWR	5
2.2 Workshop 2 Participants	6
3. WORKSHOP SESSIONS	6
3.1 Session 1: Red List assessments	6
3.2 Session 2: Methods and approaches for establishing conservation priorities	7
3.3 Session 3: Systematic conservation planning	7
3.4 Session 4: <i>In situ</i> and <i>ex situ</i> gap analysis for CWR and data limitations	7
4. RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	8
4.1 Assessing the conservation status of European CWR taxa	8
4.2 Identification of data gaps while undertaking assessment work	8
4.3 Additional data sets required to help conservation planning	8
4.4 How to set conservation priorities for CWR taxa across Europe and in individual countries	9
4.5 <i>In situ</i> conservation planning	9
4.6 <i>Ex situ</i> conservation planning	9
4.7 Broader conservation planning	9
5. ONGOING AND PLANNED INITIATIVES TO IMPLEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS	10
APPENDIX 1: FINAL AGENDA	12

1. Background

PGR Forum (European Crop Wild Relative Diversity Assessment and Conservation Forum) is a Thematic Network funded under the EC Framework 5 Programme for Research, Key action 2 'Global change, climate and biodiversity', 2.2.3 'Assessing and conserving biodiversity'. PGR Forum provides a European forum for the assessment of taxonomic and genetic diversity of European crop wild relatives and the development of appropriate conservation methodologies. The project brings together 23 partners from 21 countries: Belgium, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Slovak Republic, Spain, Sweden, Romania, Russia, the United Kingdom, with the addition of partners representing IUCN -The World Conservation Union and the International Plant Genetic Resources Institute (IPGRI). Advisory and Stakeholder Panels provide additional input and feedback on project activities and deliverables. A broad cross-section of the professional European PGR community is represented, including conservationists, taxonomists, plant breeders, information managers, policy-makers and end-users. The project duration is 36 months, with a start date of November 1, 2002.

PGR Forum has built an information system providing access to European crop wild relative data (www.pgrforum.org/cwris.htm). The database includes all socio-economically important species that occur in Europe and the Mediterranean and their wild relatives; including food, fodder and forage, medicinal plants, condiments, ornamentals, forestry species, as well as plants used for industrial purposes, such as oils and fibres. PGR Forum has also developed methodologies for:

- The creation of national and regional inventories of CWR
- Establishing conservation priorities for CWR
- Management of CWR data, with a particular emphasis on site and population data
- *In situ* genetic population management and monitoring of CWR
- Genetic erosion and genetic pollution assessment

PGR Forum's work programme is implemented through a series of five interrelated workpackages and associated workshops: 1) European crop wild relative assessment, 2) threat and conservation assessment, 3) data management methodologies, 4) population management methodologies, and 5) genetic erosion and genetic pollution methodologies. An additional workpackage coordinates thematic network product dissemination and exploitation, and the final dissemination conference.

The primary aims of Workshop 2 were to establish methodologies for:

- Assessing threat and conservation status of CWR
- Undertaking CWR conservation gap analysis

2. Introduction

Crop wild relative threat and conservation assessment was the theme of PGR Forum Workshop 2.

The Workshop organised by Craig Hilton-Taylor and Caroline Pollock of the IUCN Red List Programme, Kell Kristiansen of the Danish Institute of Agricultural Sciences, and Shelagh Kell of the University of Birmingham, brought together 32 participants from 18 countries in Europe to discuss and debate the specific needs and problems of threat and conservation assessment for CWR. This Workshop, postponed from an earlier date to allow for the compilation of data, was the fifth and final workshop in the PGR Forum project. A Red List training course (originally part of Workshop 2) was run by Craig Hilton-Taylor and Caroline Pollock (members of Partner 4) at the end of Workshop 4 (in April 2004). The aim of the training course was to teach all the project participants how to assess the conservation status of CWR taxa using the IUCN Red List Categories and Criteria and the associated Regional Application Guidelines, so that the participants could in the period leading up to Workshop 2 do some assessments that would be used as the basis for the discussions at Workshop 2.

The overall aim of Workshop 2 was to establish methodologies for assessing the threat of CWR diversity loss and the conservation status of crop wild relatives.

The primary objectives of Workshop 2 were to:

- Assess the risk of extinction for selected European crop wild relatives
- Review the *in situ* and *ex situ* conservation status of the selected taxa
- Agree methodology to conduct a gap analysis of conservation needs
- Review methods for producing a preliminary list of priority taxa for conservation action

Objectives relating to other Workpackages were to:

- Review progress in Workpackages 1, 3, 4 and 5.
- Review plans for the PGR Forum Final Dissemination Conference.

Three intensive days were spent discussing the application of the IUCN Red List Categories and Criteria to CWR, how to establish conservation priorities for CWR, systematic conservation planning, *in situ* and *ex situ* gap analysis for CWR, and data limitations (see Appendix 1 for the full agenda).

This report summarizes the key issues discussed at the Workshop and outlines the recommendations that were agreed. The report does not include summaries of progress made on other Workpackages or the plans for the Final Dissemination Conference. The report also does not include summaries of the presentations given by the invited speakers or the results of working group discussions on issues related to Red List assessments, setting conservation priorities, systematic conservation planning, and conducting gap analyses. PGR Forum participants can however access the Workshop 2 presentations and summaries of the working group discussions via the project intranet: www.pgrforum.org/Partner_intranet/WS_Presentations.htm. Although the Workshop was held during the final year of the project, a number of the recommendations agreed will be taken forward through other initiatives; some of these are briefly outlined at the end of this report.

2.1 Rationale for Red Listing CWR

Assessing the conservation status of CWR taxa (and subsequent regular reassessments) provides a significant baseline for helping to monitor changes in and the loss of biodiversity. Without establishing this baseline it would be impossible to monitor progress towards achieving the 2010 target of significantly reducing the current rate of biodiversity loss at global, regional and national levels. The 2010 target was endorsed by 190 countries present at the Johannesburg World Summit on Sustainable Development in 2002 and was subsequently reaffirmed at the Convention on Biological Diversity Conference of the Parties. Similarly, progress towards achieving the 2015 Millennium Development Goals is also dependent on having such baseline surveys in place, particularly for groups like CWR, on

which human livelihoods are so dependent. Having these baseline assessments and their supporting data in place helps to inform management decisions and helps to enhance and fulfil the EU commitments to the CBD. Thus assessment of the status of European CWR and identification of appropriate methodologies for establishing conservation priorities (species and places), will enable Europe to maintain its biodiversity heritage, ensure social well-being and facilitate access to crop wild relatives for future exploitation.

The ability to assess the conservation status of crop wild relative taxa and to use this information in establishing priorities for conservation action and for conducting gap analyses resulting in systematic conservation plans for CWR species contributes directly to the needs of a number of European and international policies, for example:

- The European Community Biodiversity Strategy
- The European Plant Conservation Strategy
- The Berne Convention
- The EU Habitats Directive
- The Convention on Biological Diversity (in particular the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation)
- The International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture
- The FAO Global Plan of Action for the Conservation and Sustainable Utilisation of Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture

2.2 Workshop 2 Participants

Dr. Åasmund Asdal	Dr. Stephen Jury	Prof. Isaak Rashal
Mr. Damiano Avanzato	Ms. Shelagh Kell	Ms. Sabine Roscher
Dr. Daniela Benedikova	Dr. Kell Kristiansen	Mr. Stelios Samaras
Ms Joana Magos Brehm	Dr. Juozas Labokas	Ms. María Scholten
Ms. Lene Krøll Christensen	Dr. Nigel Maxted	Dr. Tamara Smekalova
Ms. Lori De Hond	Ms. Marianne Mitchell	Dr. Robert Smith
Ms. Sónia Dias	Prof. Valeria Negri	Dr. Zdenek Stehno
Dr. Ehsan Dulloo	Dr. Wieslaw Podyma	Dr. Silvia Strajeru
Dr. Brian Ford-Lloyd	Ms. Maria Pohjamo	Dr. André Toussaint
Mr. Craig Hilton-Taylor	Ms. Caroline Pollock	Mr. Gabor Vörösváry
Dr. José Iriondo	Ms. Elizabeth Radford	

Apologies:

Mr. Eliseu Bettencourt, Mr. Dag Terje Endresen, Mr. Jay Moore, Dr. Marco van Veller

3. Workshop Sessions

The Workshop was structured into four separate sessions: session 1 focused on CWR Red List assessments; session 2 provided background information from Workshop 5 on methods and approaches for establishing conservation priorities and allowed for further discussion to help consolidate an agreed approach; session 3 focused on approaches for systematic conservation planning for CWR taxa; and session 4 looked at *in situ* and *ex situ* gap analyses for CWR taxa and the associated data limitations.

3.1 Session 1: Red List Assessments

Marianne Mitchell, a PhD student from the University of Birmingham, UK gave a presentation on the work she had been doing to conduct national assessments of selected CWR in Europe (using data on taxa in the UK, The Netherlands, Portugal, Germany, Poland and data on other taxa provided by project participants). José Iriondo from the Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, Spain gave a presentation on the implications of Red List assessments on genetic reserve conservation of CWR in Spain, showing that whilst the priority taxa for conservation action were being identified reasonably well, there was a group of important taxa (declining but widespread) that were in danger of not receiving sufficient attention. Craig Hilton-Taylor gave a presentation on behalf of Paul Smith of the Millennium Seed Bank Project, Royal

Botanic Gardens Kew, UK on an approach for obtaining preliminary Red List assessments for establishing priorities for seed conservation, and then refining the assessments following feedback from field trips to collect the seeds. Finally, Gabor Vörösváry from the Institute for Agrobotany, Tápiószéle, Hungary gave a brief outline of the CWR taxa selected for Red List assessment in Hungary.

Following the presentations, three parallel working groups held discussions around the following topics associated with establishing the Red List status for CWR:

- Group 1 - Availability of direct or indirect population information
- Group 2 - Availability of direct or indirect distribution information
- Group 3 - How to detect declines and the use of proxy data

The working groups' results and recommendations were presented and discussed in plenary.

3.2 Session 2: Methods and Approaches for Establishing Conservation Priorities

Presentations were given by participants from the University of Birmingham, UK: Brian Ford-Lloyd provided an overview of options for priority-setting, Maria Scholten presented an investigation into options for establishing the economic value of CWR taxa, and Joana Magos Brehm presented a methodology for setting priorities at the national level for CWR, illustrated with a case study for Portugal. These presentations were essentially a follow-up and consolidation of the discussions that took place during Workshop 5 (September 2004) and served as the background for sessions 3 and 4.

3.3 Session 3: Systematic Conservation Planning.

This session investigated methods of systematic conservation planning for CWR. Bob Smith from the Durrell Institute of Conservation and Ecology, University of Kent, UK, introduced the concept of systematic conservation planning. Liz Radford from Plantlife International, UK, presented the criteria for identifying Important Plant Areas, and reported on progress for identifying IPAs in Europe.

The presentations were followed by three parallel working group discussions:

- Group 1 - Should efforts to conserve CWR be incorporated into broader planning initiatives?"
- Group 2 - Would methods based on scoring systems be too inefficient?
- Group 3 - What other data should be included to make the plans more relevant for CWR conservation?

The working groups' results and recommendations were presented and discussed in plenary.

3.4 Session 4: *In Situ* and *Ex Situ* Gap Analysis for CWR and Data Limitations

Nigel Maxted from the University of Birmingham, UK, opened session 4 with an overview of current experience in genetic resource gap analysis and how such methodologies can be used to target CWR populations for *in situ* and *ex situ* conservation. This was followed by presentations from staff of the International Plant Genetic Resources Institute, with Ehsan Dulloo presenting his experience of undertaking *in situ* gap analysis of *Coffea* spp. in Mauritius, and Sónia Dias describing the potential and limitations of EURISCO as a tool to assist in *ex situ* gap analysis of CWR. Bob Smith followed up with a presentation on the effect of data limitations and how to set targets for conservation. A case study was presented by Tamara Smekalova of the N.I. Vavilov Research Institute of Plant Industry, St. Petersburg, Russia, on the development of a CWR *in situ* conservation strategy for Russia.

Following the presentations and a general discussion, three parallel working groups debated:

- Group 1 - What data are available on the *in situ* distribution of CWR and can these data be converted into a suitable format for use in planning exercises?
- Group 2 - How one would set targets for conserving CWR *in situ*?
- Group 3 - How would one set targets for conserving CWR *ex situ*?

The working groups' results and recommendations were presented and discussed in plenary.

4. Results and Recommendations

A number of specific issues related to CWR threat and conservation assessments were discussed at the Workshop. These issues and the resulting recommendations can be grouped under seven main themes. The issues and recommendations for each theme are presented below:

4.1 Assessing the conservation status of of European CWR taxa

Issues:

- Only 163 CWR are listed on the *2004 IUCN Red List of Threatened Species*.
- A large, but unknown, number of CWR taxa are listed on the *1997 IUCN Red List of Threatened Plants*. Many CWR taxa are listed in national Red Lists.
- Use of the *Guidelines for Application of IUCN Red List Criteria at Regional Levels*.
- Use of fixed 10x10 km grids to determine distribution area is not an accurate measure of extent of occurrence or area of occupancy.

Recommendations:

- Use all the available sources to produce a single list of preliminary conservation ratings for all European CWR taxa.
- Exclude any CWR taxa introduced to Europe since 1500 AD from the assessment process. Vagrants or 'casuals' excluded on a case-by-case basis.
- Encourage collection of distribution data at a finer scale than 10x10 km² to enable more accurate conservation assessment.

4.2 Identification of data gaps while undertaking assessment work

Issues:

- Availability of and access to recent, reliable and appropriate data. Use of proxy data.

Recommendations:

- Encourage collection of information on breeding and dispersal systems, including host-parasite relationships.
- Encourage collection of distribution information at the appropriate scales, especially for infra-specific taxa.

4.3 Additional datasets required to help conservation planning

Issues:

- Poor knowledge about and access to other useful additional data sets for assessments and planning.
- Use of genetic data.

Recommendations:

- Establish what spatial data is available on key threats (e.g. land use maps, deforestation maps, etc.).
- Establish who has protected area coverage data - a single source or multiple national sources.
- Establish who has legislative information.
- Any consideration of using genetic data should first include a cost analysis.
- Adopt a range of proxy indicators of genetic erosion.

4.4 How to set conservation priorities for CWR taxa across Europe and in individual countries

Issues:

- Dealing with a large number of taxa (+20,000), so do we:
 - Select sites to include all taxa?
 - Accept that some species will be lost and focus efforts instead on the maintenance of representative ecosystems and habitats?
 - Concentrate on those taxa under immediate threat?
 - Focus on genotypes most useful to human needs?

Recommendations:

- The discussions at Workshops 1, 2 and 5 resulted in a proposed methodology for how CWR priorities might be set at a variety of scales (see talk by Brian Ford-Lloyd *et al.* at the Final Dissemination Conference (www.pgrforum.org/conference.htm)).
- The methodology should be tested and if successful, used to prioritise the CWR list.
- Utilise the prioritised list to establish CWR reserves in European countries, with an emphasis on multiple-species reserves.

4.5. *In situ* conservation planning

Issues:

- How best to identify areas of highest priority?
 - A range of approaches already exists, some of which use site scoring mechanisms and others that use site selection algorithms.

Recommendations:

- There is probably adequate data to conduct a gap analysis of European CWR (using species distribution, landcover, and protected area data).
- MARXAN – a software package for selecting sites based on an agreed list of targets and using the principles of complementarity and irreplaceability could be used for the gap analysis (this software enables adaptive management to be incorporated).
- If MARXAN is used, the area of habitat should be used as a surrogate for Minimum Viable Population size.
- The proposed number of target sites would be 5 for outbreeders and more than 5 for inbreeders.

4.6 *Ex situ* conservation planning

Issues:

- Which CWR taxa are held in European genebanks?
- How adequate is the sampling in terms of taxonomic, genetic and geographic representation?

Recommendations:

- Use the EURISCO data to conduct a gap analysis of European CWR in *ex situ* collections.
- Compare the CWR Catalogue to the list of known recalcitrant taxa compiled by RBG Kew.
- Encourage the continued use of the excellent standards and procedures for collecting and storing germplasm that have been published.

4.7 Broader conservation planning

Issue:

- There are many existing and planned conservation initiatives across Europe that take little or no account of CWR taxa and vice versa.

Recommendations:

- Utilise the PGR Forum CWR Catalogue for Europe and the Mediterranean to identify which CWR taxa are covered by existing conservation initiatives (populations, species', habitats and sites)
- Raise awareness about CWR and encourage their incorporation into broader planning initiatives where possible (especially priority taxa not included in current initiatives).
- Promote monitoring of CWR populations in protected areas and in national schemes (e.g. Plantlife's UK Common Plants Survey).

5. Ongoing and Planned Initiatives to Implement Recommendations

Although the recommendations outlined above and some of the deliverables from the project were not fully achieved during the lifespan of the project, they will all be attained through several ongoing initiatives.

A number of the recommendations made at the Workshop will be followed up as part of existing programmes or projects. All those involved in Workshop 2 and all those interested in CWR taxa will be able to contribute to many of these initiatives:

- To achieve target 2 of the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation (namely, a preliminary assessment of the world's plant species by 2010) a new approach has been formulated (building on some of the ideas put forward at Workshop 2) and presented to the CBD Contact Group for the GSPC. IUCN will play a lead role in overseeing this process, and the work will involve a large number of botanical institutions and organizations.
- A review of plant Red List activities in European countries is being coordinated by staff of Plant Talk for Planta Europa (see <http://www.plantaeuropa.org/FeatureRedL.htm>).
- A project to obtain a preliminary assessment for all the Mediterranean species (both European and North African) has been initiated by Plantlife International and the IUCN Mediterranean Centre for Regional Cooperation.
- A paper assessing the status of a number of European CWR taxa has been drafted and this will be submitted for publication in a peer-reviewed journal. The paper presented at Workshop 2 on the methodology for conducting a gap analysis is likely to be submitted for publication in a peer-reviewed journal.
- Aspects from the papers given at the Workshop on the methodology for gap analysis, systematic conservation planning and the identification of Important Plant Areas have already been published in the peer-reviewed literature or are available as methodological manuals and as specific software packages.
- There is a major initiative underway involving several international organisations to reach agreement on criteria that could be used to identify what are termed Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs).
- The methodology for prioritising CWR species developed during Workshops 2 and 5 was further refined and presented at the First International Conference on Crop Wild Relative Conservation and Use. A paper outlining the methodology will appear in the Conference proceedings.
- A Crop Wild Relative Specialist Group has been established under the auspices of the IUCN Species Survival Commission. This new Specialist Group will be directly involved in many of the deliverables, recommendations and activities described above. The group has responsibility for overseeing any Red List activities related to CWR species worldwide and based on the data collected, they will be able to test the prioritization methodology, and coordinate and promote appropriate conservation actions for CWR around the world.

- Target 9 of the draft Global Strategy for CWR Conservation and Use (see *Crop wild relative* Issue 5 - ([http://www.pgrforum.org/Documents/Newsletters/CWR_5_\(online\).pdf](http://www.pgrforum.org/Documents/Newsletters/CWR_5_(online).pdf)) provides a framework for taking forward assessment of CWR conservation and threat status at global level.

Appendix 1: Final Agenda

DAY 1: Wednesday 27 April

09.00 – 09.15	Welcome, introductions and logistics	
09.15 – 11.40	PGR Forum progress reports	Chair: Kell Kristiansen
09.15 – 10.30	WP6 Update – Shelagh Kell (15 min) WP1 Progress Report – Shelagh Kell (40 min) WP3 Progress Report – Sabine Roscher (10 min)	
10.30 – 11.00	COFFEE BREAK	
11.00 – 11.20	WP4 Progress Report – José Iriondo, Lori De Hond (20 min)	
11.20 – 11.40	WP5 Progress Report – Brian Ford-Lloyd and Eliseu Bettencourt (20 min)	
11.40 – 12.30	Session 1: Red List assessments	Chair: Caroline Pollock
11.40 – 12.00	Overview of objectives of the workshop – Craig Hilton-Taylor	
12.00 – 12.30	Regional Red List assessment of CWRs in Europe – Marianne Mitchell	
12.30 – 14.00	LUNCH	
14.00 – 15.30	Session 1: Red List assessments continued	
14.00 – 14.30	Red List assessments of CWRs in Spain. Implications for genetic reserve conservation – José Iriondo	
14.30 – 15.00	Prioritising species for seed collection – Paul Smith (presented by Craig Hilton-Taylor)	
15.00 – 15.15	Red Listing and conservation in Hungary – Gabor Vörösváry	
15.15 – 15.30	Discussion and background to working groups – Craig Hilton-Taylor	
15.30 – 16.00	COFFEE BREAK	
16.00 – 17.30	Session 1: working groups	Chair: Craig Hilton-Taylor
	Working group discussions on issues related to assessing the Red List status of CWR: The CWR list – is the relevant data available, how easy is it to assess taxa, and can indirect or proxy data be used? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group 1 – Availability of direct or indirect population information (<i>Facilitator: José Iriondo</i>) • Group 2 – Availability of direct or indirect distribution information (<i>Facilitator: Caroline Pollock</i>) • Group 3 – How to detect declines and the use of proxy data (<i>Facilitator: Ehsan Dullo</i>) 	
17.00 – 17.30	Presentation of Session 1 working group results and recommendations	
17.30 –	Meeting of PGR Forum Partners to discuss budget expenditure; followed by meeting of chapter leaders for the Genetic Reserve Management Guidelines (WP4 Publication)	

DAY 2: Thursday 28 April

09.00 – 10.30	Session 2: Setting the scene – how to establish priorities for CWRs	Chair: Isaak Rascal
09.00 – 09.20	Overview of options for setting priorities (follow-up from Workshop 5) – Brian Ford-Lloyd	
09.20 – 09.40	How to establish economic values for CWRs – Maria Scholten	
09.40 – 10.00	Setting conservation priorities for CWRs in Portugal – Joana Brehm	
10.00 – 10.30	Discussion	
10.30 – 11.00	COFFEE BREAK	
11.00 – 12.30	Session 3: Systematic conservation Planning	Chair: Stephen Jury
11.00 – 11.45	Introduction to systematic conservation planning – Bob Smith	
11.45 – 12.15	Approaches to identifying Important Plant Areas in Europe – Liz Radford	
12.15 – 12.30	Open discussion and background to working groups	
12.30 – 14.00	LUNCH	
14.00 – 15.30	Session 3: Working groups	Chair: Daniela Benedikova
	<p><i>Working group discussions on methodology and approaches</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Group 1 – Should efforts to conserve CWRs be incorporated into broader planning initiatives? (Facilitator: Liz Radford)</i> • <i>Group 2 – Would methods based on scoring systems be too inefficient? (Facilitator: Bob Smith)</i> • <i>Group 3 – What other data should be included to make the plans more relevant for CWR conservation? (Facilitator: Brian Ford-Lloyd)</i> 	
15.30 – 16.00	COFFEE BREAK	
16.00 – 17.00	Presentation of Session 3 working group results and recommendations	
17.00 – 17.30	Development of Workpackage 2 products – Craig Hilton-Taylor	
17.30 –	Steering Committee, Advisory Board Meeting and Conference Scientific Programme Committee	

DAY 3: Friday 29 April

09.00 – 10.30	Session 4: <i>In situ</i> and <i>ex situ</i> gap analysis of CWRs and data limitations	Chair: Tamara Smekalova
09.00 – 09.30	Genetic resource gap analysis: targeting for CWR <i>in situ</i> and <i>ex situ</i> conservation – Nigel Maxted	
09.30 – 10.00	<i>In situ</i> gap analysis of <i>Coffea</i> in Mauritius – Ehsan Dullo	
10.00 - 10.30	EURISCO as a tool to assist in <i>ex situ</i> gap analysis of European CWR – Sónia Dias	
10.30 – 11.00	COFFEE BREAK	
11.00 – 12.30	Session 4: <i>In situ</i> and <i>ex situ</i> gap analysis of CWRs and data limitations continued	Chair: Lori de Hond
11.00 – 11.45	Effects of data limitations and how to set targets – Bob Smith	
11.45 – 12.05	Main aspects of the development of CWR <i>in situ</i> conservation strategy for Russia – Tamara Smekalova	
11.05 – 12.30	Discussion	
12.30 – 14.00	LUNCH	
14.00 – 16.00	Session 4: Working groups	Chair: Åsmund Asdal
	Working group discussions on data availability for <i>in situ</i> and <i>ex situ</i> conservation planning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group 1 – What data are available on the <i>in situ</i> distribution of CWRs and can these data be converted into a suitable format for use in planning exercises? (<i>Facilitator: Sabine Roscher</i>) • Group 2 – How would one set targets for conserving CWRs <i>in situ</i>? (<i>Facilitator: Nigel Maxted</i>) • Group 3 – How would one set targets for conserving CWRs <i>ex situ</i>? (<i>Facilitator: Sónia Dias</i>) 	
15.30 – 16.00	Presentation of Session 4 working group results and recommendations	
16.00 – 16.30	COFFEE BREAK	
16.30 - 17.00	Final reporting and recommendations	
17.00 – 18.00	Session 5: The way forward for PGR Forum: future funding opportunities	Chair: Nigel Maxted