



Options and Strategies for the Conservation of Farm Animal Genetic Resources

Report of an International Workshop

AGROPOLIS, Montpellier, France
7–10 November 2005

J. Gibson, S. Gamage, O. Hanotte, L. Iñiguez, J.C. Maillard,
B. Rischkowsky, D. Semambo and J. Toll



Options and Strategies for the Conservation of Farm Animal Genetic Resources

Report of an International Workshop

AGROPOLIS, Montpellier, France
7–10 November 2005

J. Gibson, S. Gamage, O. Hanotte, L. Iñiguez, J.C. Maillard,
B. Rischkowsky, D. Semambo and J. Toll

The **System-wide Genetic Resources Programme (SGRP)** is a partnership programme of the 15 centres of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR). The International Plant Genetic Resources Institute (IPGRI), one of the CGIAR centres, is the Convening Centre for SGRP and hosts its coordinating Secretariat.

The designations employed and the presentation of the material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Workshop organizers concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. Mention of a proprietary name does not constitute endorsement of the product and is given only for information.

Author affiliations:

- J. Gibson, Director, The Institute for Genetics and Bioinformatics, CJ Hawkins Homestead, University of New England, Australia.
- S. Gamage, National Animal Genetic Resources Coordinator, Veterinary Research Institute, Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, Land and Irrigation, Sri Lanka.
- O. Hanotte, Project Leader, Animal Genetic Resources, International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI), Kenya.
- L. Iñiguez, Senior Small Ruminant Scientist, International Center for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas (ICARDA), Syrian Arab Republic.
- J.C. Maillard, Research Officer, Centre de coopération internationale en recherche agronomique pour le développement (CIRAD), Département d'élevage et médecine vétérinaire (EMVT), National Institute for Animal Husbandry, Vietnam.
- B. Rischkowsky, Animal Production Officer, Animal Production Service, Animal Production and Health Division, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), Italy.
- D. Semambo, Executive Director, National Animal Genetic Resources Centre and Data Bank, Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industries and Fisheries, Uganda.
- J. Toll, Coordinator, CGIAR System-wide Genetic Resources Programme (SGRP) and Director, Global Partnerships Programme, Bioversity International, Italy.

Citation: Gibson J, Gamage S, Hanotte O, Iñiguez L, Maillard JC, Rischkowsky B, Semambo D, Toll J. 2006. Options and Strategies for the Conservation of Farm Animal Genetic Resources: Report of an International Workshop (7-10 November 2005, Montpellier, France). CGIAR System-wide Genetic Resources Programme (SGRP)/ Bioversity International, Rome, Italy. 53 pp.

ISBN-13: 978-92-9043-712-3

ISBN-10: 92-9043-712-X

Bioversity International
Via dei Tre Denari, 472/a
00057 Maccarese
Rome, Italy

© Bioversity International, 2006

All rights reserved. Reproduction and dissemination of material in this information product for educational or other non-commercial purposes are authorized without any prior written permission from the copyright holders provided the source is fully acknowledged. Modification, translation or reproduction of material in this information product for resale or other commercial purposes is prohibited without written permission of the copyright holders. Applications for such permission should be addressed to the Information Dissemination and Communications Manager, Bioversity International, Via dei Tre Denari 472/a, 00057 Maccarese, Rome, Italy (e-mail: bioversity-publications@cgiar.org).

Announcement

With effect from 1 December 2006, IPGRI will change its name to “Bioversity International”. The name echoes the institute’s new strategy, which focuses on improving people’s lives through biodiversity research.

Table of contents

Introduction	3
Acknowledgements	5
Executive summary	9
The origins and content of the report	13
Why is conservation of FAnGR needed?	15
What are the nature and status of threats to FAnGR?	17
What forms of conservation will be required?	21
Key knowledge and information gaps	33
Priorities for action	35
General priorities	35
Conservation priorities	36
Research and information priorities	36
Appendix 1: Summary of workshop objectives, procedure and report format	39
Appendix 2: Workshop participants	41
Appendix 3: Members of the workshop steering and report writing groups	51
Appendix 4: Acronyms and abbreviations	53
Annex: Presented papers [on CD-ROM]	

Introduction

Farm animals play a crucial part in the livelihood systems and well-being of the poor in the developing world, and thereby in helping to meet the Millennium Development Goals. In addition to food, clothing and other goods, livestock are important for income generation, wealth accumulation, traction and nutrient cycling. Of particular significance is the contribution they make to the livelihoods and well-being of smallholders in marginal environments, especially women and children.

The diversity of cattle, sheep, goat, pig, poultry and breeds of other farm animal species represents an irreplaceable source of traits for livestock development in response to changing environmental and human needs. However, these genetic resources are being eroded as a result of changing agricultural practices and economic, environmental and other factors. Of particular concern are the high rates of loss of indigenous breeds in developing countries, which, coupled with inadequate programmes for the use and management of the genetic resources, is negatively impacting on livelihood options for the poor.

The need to reduce the degradation of farm animal genetic resources and establish programmes for their conservation and sustainable use is well recognized. It is embodied in the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity and in the development of the Global Strategy for the Management of Farm Animal Genetic Resources, led by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). Noting the need for a greater understanding of the status of farm animal genetic resources and the measures necessary for their conservation and sustainable use worldwide, in 1999 the FAO Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture initiated a country-driven process to develop the first Report on the State of the World's Animal Genetic Resources. The Report will be finalized at the First International Technical Conference on Animal Genetic Resources in September 2007, hosted by the Government of Switzerland.

With the aim of assisting the international community in developing a global framework for the conservation of farm animal genetic resources and identifying priorities for action, the System-wide Genetic Resources Programme (SGRP) of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR), in association with FAO, AGROPOLIS, France, and the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ) GmbH, Germany, convened an international workshop on Options and Strategies for the Conservation of Farm Animal Genetic Resources in November 2005, hosted by AGROPOLIS in Montpellier, France. The workshop brought together 63 experts from 28 countries and from the CGIAR centres, FAO, the French scientific community, including the Institut national de la recherche agronomique (INRA) and the Centre de coopération internationale en recherche agronomique pour le développement (CIRAD), and GTZ.

The workshop findings are presented in this report.

Acknowledgements

This workshop was convened by the System-wide Genetic Resources Programme (SGRP) of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR), in association with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), AGROPOLIS, France, and Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ) GmbH, Germany. SGRP is a partnership programme of the CGIAR centres, coordinated by the International Plant Genetic Resources Institute (IPGRI) and involving the International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI) and the International Center for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas (ICARDA). The workshop was sponsored by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of France, together with FAO, GTZ and IPGRI/SGRP.

SGRP acknowledges with thanks the generous support of the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs, GTZ, FAO and, through FAO, the Australian government. It records its appreciation of the efforts of the workshop steering and writing groups, and especially those of the facilitators in ensuring the high quality of the discussion and output. Special thanks go to the participants for their substantive contributions and in particular to the presenters of the papers.

Partners in this publication

SGRP: The CGIAR System-wide Genetic Resources Programme (SGRP) joins the genetic resources programmes and activities of the centres of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) in a partnership whose goal is to maximize collaboration, particularly in five thematic areas. The thematic areas—policy, public awareness and representation, information, knowledge and technology, and capacity-building—relate to issues or fields of work that are critical to the success of genetic resources efforts. The SGRP contributes to the global effort to conserve agricultural, forestry and aquatic genetic resources and promotes their use in ways that are consistent with the Convention on Biological Diversity. The steering committee includes representatives from the centres and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). The International Plant Genetic Resources Institute (IPGRI) is the Convening Centre for SGRP and hosts its coordinating Secretariat.

FAO: The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) leads international efforts to defeat hunger. Serving both developed and developing countries, FAO acts as a neutral forum where all nations meet as equals to negotiate agreements and debate policy. FAO is also a source of knowledge and information. FAO helps developing countries and countries in transition modernize and improve agriculture, forestry and fisheries practices and ensure good nutrition for all. It is composed of eight departments: Administration and Finance; Agriculture, Biosecurity, Nutrition and Consumer Protection; Economic and Social; Fisheries; Forestry; General Affairs and Information; Sustainable Development; and Technical

Cooperation. FAO employs more than 3700 staff members and maintains five regional offices, five subregional offices, five liaison offices and 78 country offices, in addition to its headquarters in Rome. Since its founding in 1945, FAO has focused special attention on developing rural areas, home to 70 percent of the world's poor and hungry people. FAO's activities comprise four main areas: putting information within reach; sharing policy expertise; providing a meeting place for nations; bringing knowledge to the field.

AGROPOLIS: AGROPOLIS associates research and higher education institutions located in Montpellier and the 'Languedoc-Roussillon' region, in partnership with territorial authorities and private companies, in close cooperation with international institutions. This scientific community has one major objective: the economic and social development of Mediterranean and tropical countries. The role of AGROPOLIS is that of an international agricultural university. It represents a significant potential in terms of scientific and technological expertise: 2000 research scientists and lecturers in more than 200 labs, with the unique peculiarity of having 500 of its scientists outposted in 60 countries. AGROPOLIS research themes relate to: Mediterranean and tropical agriculture; biotechnology and food technology; biodiversity, natural resources and ecosystems; water, environment and sustainable development; rural development and societies; genomics and plant and animal integrative biology; food and health; and food quality and safety.

GTZ: The Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ) GmbH is an international cooperation enterprise for sustainable development with worldwide operations. It provides viable, forward-looking solutions for political, economic, ecological and social development in a globalized world. GTZ promotes complex reforms and change processes, often working under difficult conditions. Its corporate objective is to improve people's living conditions on a sustainable basis. GTZ is a federal enterprise. Its major client is the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ). The company also operates on behalf of other German ministries, partner-country governments and international clients. GTZ works on a public-benefit basis. GTZ employs some 9500 staff in more than 130 countries.

ICARDA: Established in 1977, the International Center for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas (ICARDA) is one of 15 centers supported by the CGIAR. ICARDA's mission is to improve the welfare of poor people through research and training in dry areas of the developing world, by increasing the production, productivity and nutritional quality of food, while preserving and enhancing the natural resource base. ICARDA serves the entire developing world for the improvement of lentil, barley and faba bean; all dry-area developing countries for the improvement of on-farm water-use efficiency, rangeland and small-ruminant production; and the Central and West Asia and North Africa (CWANA) region for the improvement of bread and durum wheats, chickpea, pasture and forage legumes and farming systems. ICARDA's research provides global benefits of poverty alleviation through productivity improvements integrated with sustainable natural-resource management practices. ICARDA meets this challenge through research, training

and dissemination of information in partnership with the national, regional and international agricultural research and development systems.

ILRI: The International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI) works at the crossroads of livestock and poverty, bringing high-quality science and capacity-building to bear on poverty reduction and sustainable development for poor livestock keepers and their communities. ILRI works in partnership with many other organizations in livestock research, training and information in all tropical developing regions of Africa, Asia and Latin America and the Caribbean. ILRI's strategy focuses on three livestock-mediated pathways out of poverty: (1) securing the assets of the poor; (2) improving the productivity of their livestock systems; and (3) improving their market opportunities in the face of rapidly changing market channels and demands. ILRI is one of 15 centres supported by the CGIAR, which conduct food and environmental research to help alleviate poverty, hunger and environmental degradation.

IPGRI: The International Plant Genetic Resources Institute (IPGRI) is an independent international scientific organization that seeks to improve the well-being of present and future generations of people by enhancing conservation and the deployment of agricultural biodiversity on farms and in forests. It is one of 15 centres supported by the CGIAR, an association of public and private members who support efforts to mobilize cutting-edge science to reduce hunger and poverty, improve human nutrition and health and protect the environment. IPGRI has its headquarters at Maccaresse, near Rome, Italy, with offices in more than 20 other countries worldwide. The Institute operates through four programmes: Diversity for Livelihoods, Understanding and Managing Biodiversity, Global Partnerships, and Commodities for Livelihoods.

Executive summary

Sixty-three experts from 28 countries and eight international organizations met for four days in Montpellier, France, in November 2005 to review the options and strategies for the conservation of farm animal genetic resources (FAnGR)¹ and to identify priorities for action. The workshop focused primarily on the technical needs and opportunities and placed less emphasis on policy and institutional issues, although findings on such issues did arise naturally from many of the conclusions drawn. The workshop resulted in 11 major findings and 13 priorities for action. The workshop also identified four broad areas where information and knowledge were lacking. The findings and priorities for action are listed here in the executive summary and each is explained in more detail in the body of this report. They are presented in the order developed by the workshop. Participants did not attempt to rank the findings and actions.

Findings

- Finding 1: Threats to FAnGR in the developing world have increased in recent years, causing an urgent need for action to limit the loss of diversity.
- Finding 2: *In situ* (community-based management and conservation) approaches are to be preferred as a method of conservation where maintenance and management of the FAnGR is the best available livelihood option for the farmers involved. *In situ* conservation should be established as a preventive measure to protect against loss of the FAnGR.
- Finding 3: *Ex situ in vivo* conservation in institutional or communally owned herds or flocks can successfully be used to support conservation of FAnGR that have current value.
- Finding 4: Virtually all examples of *ex situ in vivo* conservation of FAnGR in the developing world are designed to support current use by farmers (or expected use in the near future) or are populations being maintained for research purposes. The establishment of non-use *in vivo* conservation programmes will be difficult and perhaps rare.

¹ Throughout this report FAnGR (farm animal genetic resources) is understood to encompass animal genetic resources that are or have been maintained to contribute to food and agricultural production and productivity. This includes livestock kept by pastoralists. Fish and other aquaculture and fisheries species and wild relatives of livestock are not included.

- Finding 5: The majority of sustainable *in vivo* (*in situ* and *ex situ*) approaches to conservation in the developing world will be intimately linked to promotion of livelihoods.
- Finding 6: *In vitro* conservation is urgently required to provide a secure back-up for the FAnGR of the developing world. This is to protect against a variety of threats that can drive FAnGR to extinction faster than monitoring can identify the threat and faster than alternative conservation approaches can respond to.
- Finding 7: The various methods of conservation are complementary, with dynamic interactions among methods. A detailed analysis is required for each FAnGR, leading to a coherent strategy for conservation that will include an appropriate combination of *in situ* and/or *ex situ in vivo* and/or *in vitro* conservation methods.
- Finding 8: A framework was identified that can guide decision-making at national, regional and international levels on a suitable combination of conservation strategies for a given FAnGR. The framework is based on the severity and speed of the threats the FAnGR is exposed to, the nature of the value of the FAnGR and the capacity for action.
- Finding 9: There is a need to establish early warning and response systems to protect FAnGR against emergency threats such as civil unrest and outbreak of disease; such response systems need to be established and operated by the key agencies that deal with the threats.
- Finding 10: Information on current status, future needs, current and future values and nature and severity of threats will remain imperfect for the foreseeable future. There is clear need to take action now rather than wait for substantially better information to become available.
- Finding 11: There are many issues in common between conservation of FAnGR and conservation of other components of agrobiodiversity. There will be considerable benefits from sharing resources and knowledge with other areas of agrobiodiversity.

Actions

Actions were grouped into three broad areas: general priorities, conservation priorities and research and information priorities.

General priorities

- Action 1: Develop policy that promotes use of appropriate FAnGR and supports conservation of FAnGR.
- Action 2: Show the benefits and costs of conservation and raise awareness of the issues.
- Action 3: Establish international funding mechanisms, legal frameworks and advocacy to support the actions of developing countries in conserving FAnGR.
- Action 4: Develop policy and guidelines for biosecurity, exchange, ownership, access and benefit-sharing of FAnGR.

Conservation priorities

- Action 5: Develop capacity for cryopreservation, including the development of human and technical resources.
- Action 6: Determine the most appropriate system for regional and/or international cryopreservation programmes as a back-up for developing world FAnGR.
- Action 7: Identify hotspots of diversity and identify the most threatened FAnGR within those hotspots and take action to conserve them now.
- Action 8: Establish early warning and response systems for emergency threats to FAnGR.

Research and information priorities

- Action 9: Capture all existing information on FAnGR into an internationally accessible information system and couple this with tools for analysis and interpretation of information and for decision-making.
- Action 10: Improve the level of knowledge about how to prioritize, design and operate conservation and utilization programmes that will be sustainable in the medium to long term.

- Action 11: Complete global surveys of the molecular genetic diversity of the major livestock species.
- Action 12: Undertake a critical analysis of the economies of scale for various conservation actions and interventions.
- Action 13: Improve the technologies and reduce costs of cryopreservation of gametes, embryos and somatic cells of most species of FAnGR.

The origins and content of the report

Noting the rapid changes in agriculture globally and the potential impacts on FAnGR, and noting the advances in technology and knowledge over the past decade, the workshop was convened to review and analyze the options and strategies for conserving farm animal genetic resources (FAnGR). The primary emphasis was on the needs of developing countries. The workshop brought together scientists, managers of conservation programmes, international organizations and other experts involved with FAnGR from around the world. The workshop was facilitated, with a mix of workshop and plenary discussions. A full description of the workshop process is provided in Appendix 1. The participants are listed in Appendix 2. The papers presented at the workshop are included on a CD that accompanies this report.²

The workshop was designed to identify priorities for action and to contribute to the development of a global framework for the conservation of farm animal genetic resources. This report summarizes the key points of discussion and consensus. Eleven major findings are presented as they developed during the workshop, with an explanation of each finding. Four broad areas were noted where information or knowledge is currently inadequate and 13 priorities for action were identified; in each case a brief explanation follows each knowledge gap or action.

² SGRP. 2006. Options and Strategies for the Conservation of Farm Animal Genetic Resources: Report of an International Workshop and Presented Papers (7-10 November 2005, Montpellier, France) [CD-ROM]. CGIAR System-wide Genetic Resources Programme (SGRP)/Bioversity International, Rome, Italy.

Why is conservation of FAnGR needed?

Several of the background papers covered reasons for conserving FAnGR and participants discussed this topic in working groups. There was consensus that in any given situation there are usually multiple types of threat and reasons why FAnGR should be conserved, with the ranking of these threats and reasons varying between situations (countries, agro-ecosystems, farming system, species, breed, etc.). The following were identified by workshop participants as some of the primary justifications for conserving FAnGR.

- To prevent genetic erosion of populations that retain value for current use;
- To maintain sufficient genetic diversity to meet the needs of current and future utilization;
- To provide options for adaptation to changing environmental conditions;
- To support sustainable animal production systems for food security;
- To provide genetic resources for cross-breeding and development of new genotypes;
- To provide options to meet the demands of new markets for livestock products and services;
- To preserve cultural and historical values;
- To sustain the bequest³ value of livestock;
- To fulfil the rights of an existing genetic resource to continue to exist.

In most of the above examples, the underlying justification for conservation is to protect the FAnGR against risk coupled with imperfect knowledge of what attributes FAnGR currently possess and what economic, social and cultural needs local, regional and global society will have in the short-, medium- and long-term future. Maintaining the option value⁴ of FAnGR was identified in several discussions as a major reason for conservation, nationally, regionally and globally.

Based on what has happened and is happening in developed countries, the effects of economic development on diversity of FAnGR were seen as a process of first a narrowing of genetic diversity followed by expansion of diversity. In the early stages of economic development, increased intensification and specialization of animal production systems and products drives a narrowing of FAnGR diversity. As economic development proceeds further, markets expand and ability of consumers and society as a whole to pay for specialized products and services increases. This

³ The bequest value is the value of passing a resource from one generation to the next as part of the cultural heritage of the individuals or group concerned.

⁴ The option value is the value of FAnGR in providing options to meet future needs, recognizing that it is essentially impossible to predict with accuracy what future needs will be. Future needs include, *inter alia*, functional characteristics of livestock to have certain production characteristics, produce particular products, possess abilities to reproduce and thrive in specific conditions, possess resistance to diseases, possess specific behavioural characteristics, and social characteristics, such as to fulfil specific cultural and heritage functions.

drives an expansion of genetic diversity and of livelihoods associated with that diversity to provide a greater diversity of specialized products, to meet landscape and ecological management requirements and to fulfil heritage functions.

It was generally agreed here, and in later discussions in the workshop, that most societies can be expected to reach a certain stage of economic development where the desire of the society to restore its heritage is matched by its economic capacity to do so. This will ensure that a high proportion of FAnGR that are put into cryopreservation will eventually be restored as live populations. Once restored for their heritage value, such populations again become available for further characterization and research for broader use purposes. This overcomes the concerns that populations in cryopreservation might never be restored because of their uncertain use value due to the poor state of characterization of many FAnGR coupled with the relatively high cost of restoring populations from cryopreservation and subsequently evaluating them.

It was also noted at several points in the workshop that rapidly advancing genetic and reproduction technologies have in recent years greatly increased the ability to identify and utilize genes underlying particular characteristics of FAnGR. The power of these technologies is expected to continue to increase rapidly, further increasing the options and ability to utilize conserved FAnGR diversity in the future. In the context of such advances in technology, conservation of FAnGR can be aimed at conserving adaptive traits, the individual genes controlling which can in future be more easily identified and utilized than at present.

The workshop discussed whether there was an appropriate unit of conservation. It was concluded that there was no universal unit of conservation. In many cases, the unit of conservation will be a clearly defined breed. In some cases it might be a meta-population covering a range of phenotypes and regions. In other cases the unit of conservation might be an allele of a single gene that is not currently desired but might have potential future value. The appropriate unit of conservation will need to be defined on a case-by-case basis.

Overall the workshop concluded that the reasons for conserving FAnGR were manifold and compelling. But it was noted that these reasons have not been well articulated to society and to agencies that might fund conservation of FAnGR. There is a need to develop detailed analyses of socio-economic justifications for conserving FAnGR and to present these reasons to a wide audience.

What are the nature and status of threats to FAnGR?

The nature and status of threats to FAnGR were identified in several working groups leading to the following broad consensus.

Finding 1: Threats to FAnGR in the developing world have increased in recent years, causing an urgent need for action to limit the loss of diversity.

The following table summarizes the key factors identified as causing threats to FAnGR in the developing world along with the dynamic of the threat (an assessment of whether the threat is increasing, decreasing or stable). In the case of environmental degradation and natural disasters, the participants felt they were not in a position to assess the dynamic of these threats.

Several of the threats operate through diverse and overlapping mechanisms. For example, economic development generally causes an intensification of livestock production, which creates a demand for widespread cross-breeding and/or breed substitution that can severely threaten the survival of local FAnGR. Such changes

Table 1. Key factors identified as causing threats to FAnGR in the developing world and the dynamic of the threat.

Factor (source of threat)	Dynamic
Changes in production systems/Intensification	Increasing
Changes in market preferences	Increasing
Rural migration/Urbanization	Site and system dependent
Competition for natural resources	Increasing
Environmental degradation/Pollution	Unknown
Political and economic instability	Constant
Lack of appropriate livestock policies	Increasing
Lack of political will	Increasing
Lack of valuation of local breeds	Decreasing
War and civil conflicts	Constant
Natural disasters	Unknown
Epidemic diseases	Increasing
Climate changes	Increasing
Endemic diseases	Constant
HIV/AIDS	Increasing
Trade agreements (e.g. WTO)	Increasing

in agricultural production may be entirely appropriate objectives of economic development. Changes in market demands may drive similar changes. But inappropriate or inadequate policy may also promote widespread cross-breeding or breed substitution where the imported FAnGR are not the most appropriate solutions to the economic needs of farmers or society at large. As another example, threats to FAnGR can arise through failure of production systems, which can be caused by rural migration, environmental degradation, political instability, war and other factors.

In working groups the participants discussed the dynamics of the various factors causing threats to FAnGR in the developing world and concluded that, as a broad generalization, the majority of the most serious threats to FAnGR had increased in recent times and would continue to increase in future. Only one factor, lack of valuation of FAnGR, was seen to be decreasing, and then only slightly, because methods of valuation had been advanced in recent years and awareness and application of these methods was expected to increase in the future.

It was noted that threats to FAnGR can be broadly categorized according to the severity of the likely impact caused by the threat and timescale over which the endangerment caused by the threat was operating. One working group reviewed different types of threats in terms of their impact and timescale. A summary of their qualitative assessments were that, as illustrated in Figure 1, threats tended to group in five blocks with broadly similar locations in terms of impact and timescale of threat.




Figure 1. Grouping of threats to FAnGR according to the timescale and the severity of the threat.

Epidemic disease causing death from disease of animals or slaughter as part of disease control measures was one threat identified as having very high impact (severe risk of extinction of the breed) and very short timescale for that impact. Conversely, climate change was identified as a threat operating very slowly (long timescale) and likely causing fairly low impact.

It is clear that the importance and the dynamics of the threats vary significantly across regions and species. A working group assessed the relative importance and dynamic of the threats by major geographic region. Using the clusters identified and numbered in Figure 1, the group ranked the five clusters of threats according to region, differentiating by wealth within each region (Table 2). The numbers in each column (i.e. region) represent the scale of importance (1 to 5) of threats in the five clusters. For example with regard to Africa/poor, cluster number 4 was ranked as the most relevant (rank 1). Rankings were not made for the Americas and Africa/rich as it was felt there was not enough competence within the group to make an assessment.

Table 2. Ranking of threats by region (1=highest relevance, 5= lowest relevance).

Threat cluster (ref. Figure 1)	Regions						
	Europe		Africa	Asia		North Africa + Middle East	
	rich	poor	poor	rich	poor	rich	poor
1	4	4	4	4	1	4	4
2	5	2	3	3	3	1	3
3	2	1	4	5	2	2	2
4	1	5	1	3	4	3	4
5	3	3	5	2	5	5	5

There was no consensus about whether the clustering of individual threats or the rankings in the above table correctly reflected the variation across regions, but there was consensus that use of such a framework would be a useful approach for detailed assessments at the regional, subregional or national level. Further work will be required to define and cluster the factors driving threats, the mechanisms by which the threats operate and the various dimensions and ranking of the threats.

What forms of conservation will be required?

In much of the literature on conservation of FAnGR, conservation methods are broadly grouped into *in situ*, *ex situ in vivo* and *in vitro*. The participants recognized that there were a range of *in vivo* conservation approaches ranging from *in situ* conservation involving continued use as part of an ongoing livelihood strategy at one end through to conservation in zoos with no connection to ongoing use at the other. Theoretically, after having passed a certain threshold of endangerment, populations that are put under *in situ* conservation programmes will have to be managed with specific conservation breeding programmes. In practice it is difficult to determine where management of FAnGR ends and conservation begins, in particular in developing countries. In practice it is also difficult to determine where *in situ* conservation ends and where *ex situ in vivo* conservation begins. For the purposes of this workshop, the working groups adopted a working definition that *in situ* conservation included continued maintenance of FAnGR by livestock keepers in ongoing livelihood-based production systems, while *ex situ in vivo* conservation includes any off-farm maintenance, whether by farmer groups, institutions, government herds or others.

Finding 2: *In situ* conservation approaches are to be preferred as a method of conservation where maintenance and management of the FAnGR is the best available livelihood option for the farmers involved. *In situ* conservation should be established as a preventive measure to protect against loss of the FAnGR.

There was a clear consensus that *in situ* conservation was the preferred method of conservation where it could be established with a high probability of success. This is because *in situ* conservation ensures that a breed is maintained in a dynamic state and, when coupled with appropriate genetic improvement programmes, can ensure that the breed retains its relevance to changing production, marketing and social environments. Where *in situ* conservation can be established without external subsidies, it is also a low-cost form of conservation.

The workshop analyzed existing experiences with *in situ* conservation of FAnGR in the developed and developing world and identified the following essential conditions for success:

- The breed is sufficiently defined and its value recognized;
- The cause of breed decline can be identified, properly addressed and overcome;
- Conservation intervention takes place before the breed becomes critically endangered;
- Livestock keepers have a socio-cultural environment that makes them desire to maintain their FAnGR;
- The *in situ* conservation provides a sufficiently rewarding livelihood option that the livestock keepers do not adopt alternative livelihoods;

- The livestock keepers can be organized into a community-based management approach or other forms of breeding organization;
- The production and marketing environment is reasonably stable;
- The political and policy environments are favourable.

The need to provide livestock keepers with a sufficiently rewarding livelihood option, both short and long term, was identified as being absolutely critical to success of *in situ* conservation. If this is not assured then it is clear that the livestock keepers will eventually adopt an alternative livelihood, either switching breeds or species or moving out of livestock keeping altogether and the *in situ* conservation will fail. To ensure that *in situ* conservation supplies a sufficiently rewarding livelihood requires that the causes of breed decline can be identified and counteracted and that intervention takes place sufficiently early when the breed is not already critically endangered (from which state *in situ* conservation on its own is unlikely to be able to assure survival of the breed).

Taking these requirements into account, it is clear that *in situ* conservation is in reality a livelihood development strategy which needs to be embedded in the development strategy of countries, donors and supporting agencies. Conservation of the FAnGR is a secondary byproduct of the development strategy rather than the primary goal. It would be preferable to avoid the term '*in situ* conservation' and adopt the term 'community-based management' to emphasize the livelihood focus of the approach.

The workshop was unable to determine in what proportion of cases *in situ* conservation would prove successful in the developing world. The general consensus was that, given the rates of change in economic development and in agriculture production systems that are expected in much of the developing world, *in situ* conservation is unlikely to be sufficient to conserve most FAnGR. Other approaches to conservation will clearly be required.

Finding 3: *Ex situ in vivo* conservation in institutional or communally owned herds or flocks can successfully be used to support conservation of FAnGR that have current value.

Finding 4: Virtually all examples of *ex situ in vivo* conservation of FAnGR in the developing world are designed to support current use by farmers (or expected use in the near future) or are populations being maintained for research purposes. The establishment of non-use *in vivo* conservation programmes will be difficult and perhaps rare.

Preliminary analysis of the country reports submitted through the State of the World (SoW) FAnGR process reveal a large number of *ex situ in vivo* conservation programmes operating in the developing world. In most cases it is not possible from the information provided to determine the link to livelihoods or the likelihood of successfully sustaining the breed. The collective knowledge of the workshop participants was that virtually all *ex situ in vivo* conservation programmes in the developing world were, in some way, supporting continued use of the FAnGR by

farmers (e.g. serving as a nucleus herd or by providing semen). There were a small number of cases of *ex situ in vivo* herds/flocks of developing world FAnGR being maintained purely for research purposes. Some of these herds/flocks are located in the developed world. With the possible exception of some small flocks of poultry, no examples were identified where populations of FAnGR were being maintained purely for conservation purposes with no expected use in the near future.

There are a very wide variety of ways in which the connection between the *ex situ* population and the use by farmers is made. Examples include nucleus herds/flocks, which sample from local populations and in which genetic improvement is made and returned to farmers, multiplier herds/flocks that sample local populations and return multiplied stock to farmers, and nucleus herds that are essentially closed to outside sampling and which sometimes form the main remaining repository of the pure breed which might be used primarily for cross-breeding by farmers.

The following key factors for success of *ex situ in vivo* conservation programmes were identified:

- **Sustained funding:** in most cases, the maintenance of *ex situ* populations is supported by external (usually government) funding. The security of such populations is dependent on the long-term maintenance of that external funding. Examples exist of such populations having been maintained for many years, but equally many such *ex situ* populations have since disappeared. External funding is vulnerable to change in priorities of the external funding agency and to economic and social instability. Existing examples were identified which participants felt could be self-financing. But these examples were maintained by government departments and the accounting rules of most government departments in most countries make it difficult to achieve self-sustained funding. Thus government-supported populations can sometimes remain vulnerable to changes in funding support even when they could in principle achieve self-sufficiency.
- **Appropriate policy:** whether in government-run facilities or other structures, there needs to be a policy environment that supports the establishment and maintenance of the *ex situ* populations.
- **Continued use and benefit to farmers:** as long as the population continues to contribute to the operation of farmers it is possible to justify to funding agencies their continued support of the population. Long-term financial support is likely to be difficult to maintain when there is no immediate use for the FAnGR being conserved.
- **Ability and capacity to manage the *ex situ* population:** whether at the government level or self-organized by farmer cooperatives, maintenance of *ex situ* populations requires a high capacity to organize, maintain and use the population. In particular, in order to self-organize, farmer groups require a very high capacity of members of the group. Successful self-organization without external support is probably feasible only at high levels of economic development.

Finding 5: The majority of sustainable *in vivo* (*in situ* and *ex situ*) approaches to conservation in the developing world will be intimately linked to promotion of livelihoods.

This finding follows from the observations above on *in situ* and *ex situ in vivo* approaches to conservation. *Ex situ in vivo* conservation appears in general to be sustainable where it supports continued use by farmers, and continued use by farmers is itself only sustainable where such use promotes improvement of livelihoods. Improvement of livelihoods by *in situ* and *ex situ in vivo* conservation can, if required, be achieved by provision of external funds to subsidize the conservation, but such subsidization will increase the risk to the FAnGR, which might be rapidly lost if the financial support is withdrawn. The conclusion is that a high proportion of populations maintained in *in situ* or *ex situ in vivo* conservation will remain under substantial risk of loss unless they are clearly, and without external financial support, a livelihood maximizing option for farmers. It is not clear how often this will be true, but the consensus was that maintenance of their existing FAnGR will not be a livelihood maximizing option for farmers in the short term in a substantial proportion of cases.

Finding 6: *In vitro* conservation is urgently required to provide a secure back-up for the FAnGR of the developing world. This is to protect against a variety of threats that can drive FAnGR to extinction faster than monitoring can identify the threat and faster than alternative conservation approaches can respond to.

While conservation of FAnGR as live animals was recognized as having many advantages and wherever sustainable would be the preferred method of conservation, as discussed above, there was consensus that most live-animal conservation in the developing world would remain exposed to very substantial risk of loss of the FAnGR. This is particularly so in the short term and in countries where economic development has not yet reached levels that would support maintenance of FAnGR for cultural or heritage purposes or through development of higher value niche market products. There was consensus that there was urgent need to develop a system of cryopreservation of FAnGR of the developing world.

Cryopreservation can act as a back-up to secure FAnGR from external threats. In emergency situations, populations can be restored from cryobanks after the crisis. Cryobanks can also provide insurance against inappropriate genetic improvement programmes that result in undesirable genetic changes and can provide insurance against excessive inbreeding induced by intensive genetic improvement programmes or the maintenance of small populations. In systems with relatively high levels of infrastructure and capacity, they can also be used to support ongoing genetic improvement programmes, nationally and internationally.

A past criticism of cryopreservation of FAnGR has been that the high cost of restoring extinct populations from cryobanks will mean that cryopreserved FAnGR will rarely, if ever, be restored to living populations. There was consensus that this criticism is incorrect. For example, there was consensus that if European breeds that are now extinct had been preserved in cryobanks, the majority of such breeds would have been restored from cryobanks by a combination of private and public efforts because of the public interest in their heritage value. As economic development

proceeds in the developing world, it can be expected that future generations will also have the desire and economic resources to be able to restore live populations of their cryopreserved indigenous FAnGR. Once restored for their heritage value, such live populations can be studied and evaluated. Routes then exist to utilize such FAnGR either locally or globally. Thus, in the long term, the concern that cryopreserved FAnGR will prove too costly to restore and evaluate is groundless.

Cryopreservation can involve gametes, embryos, somatic cells or primordial germ cells. The technologies for cryopreservation of different cells and tissues are at varying levels of development, cost and ease of application for different species. Allowing for these technical constraints, the participants developed an assessment of the role of *in vitro* conservation in varying situations, as summarized in Table 3. This assessment applies to the major mammalian livestock species. In poultry, cryopreservation of embryos and oocytes is not yet possible and somatic cell cloning has not yet been demonstrated.

Table 3. Assessment of relevance and feasibility of cryopreservation for various purposes.

Purpose	Semen	Embryos	Oocytes	Somatic cells	Primordial germ cells
Support breeding of small population	+++ ***	++ *	+ 0	0 0	0 0
Emergency (disease, war, natural disaster)	+++ ***	+ 0	+ 0	+ *	0 0
Breeding programmes	+++ ***	++ **	+ 0	+ 0	0 0
Backup of population in use	+++ ***	+++ **	0 0	++ *	+ 0
Trait selection	+++ ***	+++ **	+ 0	+ 0	0 0
Germplasm exchange	+++ ***	+++ ***	+ 0	0 0	+ 0
Breed reconstruction	+++ **	+++ ***	+ 0	+++ *	+ 0

+ = potential relevance of technology; * = current feasibility. A larger number of + and * indicates greater relevance or feasibility; 0 = no foreseeable relevance or not currently feasible.

The assessments shown in Table 3 take into account the relative costs and technical feasibility of collection, storage and reconstitution. For example, somatic cells are relatively easy and cheap to collect and store, but producing a cloned

progeny from somatic cells remains extremely costly and requires high levels of infrastructure and technical expertise. It is possible that the ease of producing cloned progeny from somatic cells may increase in future and as such it may be prudent to store somatic cells as an emergency procedure; but at present levels of technical development and cost somatic cells score relatively low or zero for feasibility even where potential relevance is high. In contrast, collection and freezing of semen is more time consuming, requires higher levels of infrastructure and expertise and is more expensive per animal than collection and storage of somatic cells. But semen is easily removed from storage and artificial insemination with frozen semen is relatively straightforward and inexpensive in many species. With modest levels of infrastructure and expertise it is possible to develop and sustain programmes of routine use of frozen semen in ongoing breeding programmes. Thus, despite the fact that reconstitution of the original breed may require several generations of backcrossing, storage of semen ranks highly for relevance and relatively highly for feasibility for breed reconstruction.

Finding 7: The various methods of conservation are complementary, with dynamic interactions among methods. A detailed analysis is required for each FAnGR, leading to a coherent strategy for conservation that will include an appropriate combination of *in situ* and/or *ex situ in vivo* and/or *in vitro* conservation methods.

In previous debates there has often been the fear that promotion of one form of conservation might prevent the use of other forms of conservation. For example, proponents of *in situ* conservation have expressed concerns that development of cryopreservation programmes might divert resources and focus from the more desirable option of maintaining live animal populations in continued use. A clear finding of the workshop participants was that the various forms of conservation are highly complementary. For example, and as noted earlier in this report, *ex situ in vivo* conservation programmes generally are used to support continued use *in situ*. Two working groups considered the roles of different conservation approaches to meet various conservation objectives and came up with very similar assessments. Table 4 synthesizes the results of the two working groups, showing the relative roles of *in situ*, off-farm (*ex situ in vivo*) and *in vitro* conservation approaches to meet a variety of conservation objectives.

The key finding in Table 4 is that a single conservation method is rarely suitable, and in most cases two or more methods are complementary to each other.

In several discussions it was noted that conservation is a dynamic process. It was noted earlier in this report that breeds are dynamic entities that change over time. Similarly the threats to FAnGR, the relative values of FAnGR and the ability to support conservation and utilization programmes are in constant flux. Consequently, conservation programmes will be dynamic processes, with the relative needs for and the emphasis on different methods of conservation changing over time. Also, when complementary methods of conservation are employed, germplasm will often be

Table 4. The relative roles of different conservation methods for a variety of conservation objectives.

Objective	Approach		
	<i>In vivo</i>		<i>In vitro</i>
	<i>In situ</i>	Off-farm	
Current livelihood value	*** Method of choice	** Institute herds may be main support in some cases. Zoos can provide education but are the last option for <i>in vivo</i> .	** Can support and guarantee the safety of the resource. Possible tool to assist genetic improvement.
To maintain diversity	*** Highly desirable, when possible. Possibly subsidized but could be high cost due to continuous demand for subsidies.	** Institute herds may be useful but possibly are vulnerable and may lack diversity due to small initial sample and population size maintained.	** Low cost. Should involve regular re-sampling.
Rehabilitation after crisis		* Can provide support. Advantage to have females. Need to protect by special regulations and isolation from the threats (disease, civil unrest, etc.).	*** The only guaranteed safeguard against crisis.
Insurance for future needs	** Highly desirable if feasible to do so, but may not be feasible if not of current use.	* Can support <i>in situ</i> .	** Supports <i>in situ</i> , and is crucial if <i>in situ</i> is impossible.
Cultural/historical value	** Highly desirable but may not be achievable in short term if of low current value.	* Desirable but may not be achievable if of low current value.	** Low risk strategy, with high likelihood of future use if economy develops.
Bequest	*** The only possible form of conservation of bequest value.		
Ecological	*** Conservation of ecosystems requires continued use of animals in the relevant environment.	* Backup for <i>in situ</i> population.	* Backup to live population.
Research/education	** Continued use provides most relevant environment but can be difficult to obtain information.	** Best situation for collection of good information but may not be most relevant environment.	* Useful as a backup for live animal populations and for providing historical controls or supply of germplasm for comparisons across multiple locations.

*=Relative importance of role. A large number of * indicates greater suitability.

flowing between the different conservation approaches. For example, germplasm from a cryopreserved semen bank might be used to refresh the germplasm in a government herd, which then distributes animals to farmers, while semen is routinely collected from either or both the farmers' and government animals for replenishment of the cryobank.

Finding 8: A framework was identified that can guide decision-making, at national, regional and international levels, on a suitable combination of conservation strategies for a given FAnGR. The framework is based on the severity and speed of the threats the FAnGR is exposed to, the nature of the value of the FAnGR and the capacity for action.

As illustrated earlier (Figure 1) it was observed that threats to FAnGR can be broadly categorized according to the severity of the impact caused by the threat and timescale over which the endangerment caused by the threat was operating. Furthermore it was recognized that the preferred method of conservation was affected by the impact and timescale of the threat. A working group attempted to identify what conservation approaches were most likely to be successful for each of the five clusters of threats. Their results are illustrated in Figure 2.

In general, threats operating over longer timescales and with lower impact, such as climate change, were more likely to be dealt with through live-animal conservation approaches, with low impact and long time horizons particularly favouring *in situ*




Figure 2. Assessment of preferred methods of conservation for various threats clustered according to timescale and severity of the threat.

conservation. Threats with high impact operating over short time horizons, such as epidemic diseases, are most likely to require *in vitro* conservation to ensure survival.

It was recognized that threats would likely vary substantially across breeds and regions. For example, cross-breeding may have little impact and/or operate very slowly if backed by suitable policy and well-informed farmers. Conversely, cross-breeding might pose a very severe threat over a very short timescale if driven by inappropriate policy pushing highly subsidized germplasm into the farming system. It is clear that the threats will need to be rated separately for each FAnGR in order to identify the optimum conservation strategies on a case-by-case basis. But it was felt that an appropriately constructed survey instrument could be used to solicit expert assessments of the severity and timescale of threats to FAnGR on a species-by-region basis. A principal components analysis could then be used to group threats separately for species and regions; when combined with species-specific factors influencing the feasibility of different conservation approaches, this could yield a regional analysis of relative needs for different approaches to conservation. The workshop attempted such an analysis based on a quickly drawn-up survey form completed by all participants. Useful groupings did result, illustrating the power of the approach, but it was clear that considerable thought would have to be given to the design and explanation of the survey forms before a practical application was attempted.

The most appropriate conservation strategy for a given resource exposed to a defined severity and timescale of threat will also depend on factors such as the nature of the value of the resource and the capacity to take action. For example, where a live-animal conservation strategy might normally be the preferred route but the country has little capacity to act, then *in vitro* conservation in a regional or international cryobank may be the safest conservation option. Or, in case of severe and rapid threats to an FAnGR that has substantial current value, *in vitro* conservation would usually be considered the safest option to protect the FAnGR but substantial effort would also be put into live-animal conservation.

Finding 9: There is a need to establish early warning and response systems to protect FAnGR against emergency threats such as civil unrest and outbreak of disease; such response systems need to be established and operated by the key agencies that deal with the threat.

Several working groups recognized that the ideal would be to anticipate all threats to FAnGR and take advance action to protect FAnGR against such threats. In many cases however there will be an immediate need to put in place early warning systems to detect major threats as they develop and to initiate a response system. Rarely, if ever, would it be feasible or sensible to put into place an early warning and response system solely to protect FAnGR. Rather, the early warning and response systems will need to be embedded within such systems already established or in process of establishment for other purposes. This requires that the warning signals for FAnGR and the mechanisms of response need to be integrated within the operating plans of the key agencies that deal with the threat.

As an example, in the case of epidemic disease outbreak, the various veterinary and government agencies, and in some cases inter-government agencies, that deal with the disease outbreak will need to be aware of and have plans for the protection of key FAnGR. For example, stimulated by the Foot and Mouth Disease (FMD) epidemic of 2001, recent European Union legislation now allows for exemptions (including special isolation rules and use of vaccination) for endangered FAnGR in the case where slaughter policies are used to control disease outbreaks. Similarly, the UK was able to rapidly implement emergency semen collection programmes as a back-up for several threatened sheep resources during the 2001 FMD outbreak and, based on this experience, is now better prepared to implement emergency measures in the future. Many countries will not be nearly as able to respond rapidly to such threats and it will be particularly important to have in place formal policy and strategies to respond to threats well ahead of the threats emerging. FAnGR conservation has to become part of contingency planning.

Finding 10: Information on current status, future needs, current and future values and nature and severity of threats will remain imperfect for the foreseeable future. There is clear need to take action now rather than wait for substantially better information to become available.

As highlighted in the needs for information and actions below, there is urgent need to improve the information available in a wide variety of areas. Having improved information will improve the ability to make appropriate decisions on conservation and utilization of FAnGR. But it was a finding of the workshop that threats to FAnGR have accelerated in recent years and there is an urgent need to act now before a substantial proportion of FAnGR are lost. There was strong consensus that such action to conserve FAnGR cannot wait for improved information to become available.

While the situation is far from ideal, several of the outcomes of the workshop, coupled with the papers presented at the workshop and a considerable body of existing guidelines, provide frameworks for immediate decision-making in conservation. It is recognized that gathering and making available the desired level of information on current status, future needs, current and future values and nature and severity of threats will take many years. Thus the additional and more advanced tools that are being developed to assist decision-making in conservation and use of FAnGR will need to be able to function effectively with imperfect information.

Finding 11: There are many issues in common between conservation of FAnGR and conservation of other components of agrobiodiversity. There will be considerable benefits from sharing resources and knowledge with other areas of agrobiodiversity.

It was noted on several occasions during the workshop that many of the issues involved in preparing for and taking action on conservation of FAnGR were the same as or similar to those for several other areas of agrobiodiversity. Examples include the

development of methods for optimization of resource use in conservation, methods for valuing genetic resources, approaches to data acquisition and development of information systems, policy and legal frameworks and methods of conservation. Given the scarce resources available for conservation of agrobiodiversity, it seems prudent to take every opportunity to seek synergies between conservation of FAnGR and other areas of agrobiodiversity. This applies particularly to the institutions supporting research, and development and government and inter-government processes, but could also apply to the action of conservation. For example, the workshop noted a need for cryopreservation in both fish and livestock. Given the overhead costs of establishing and running cryopreservation centres, there should be opportunities to combine cryopreservation of livestock and fish in the same facilities.

Key knowledge and information gaps

At the conclusion of the workshop, participants reviewed the outcomes of the presentations, working groups and workshop discussions to determine what had been identified as key gaps in knowledge or information. These key gaps are summarized below.

Poorly developed knowledge and information systems and low levels of information gathering. Throughout the workshop a recurring issue was the lack of high-quality information about the status, characteristics, current and future values of most FAnGR. It was noted that much of the information that does exist is not easily accessible and does not appear in existing FAnGR information systems. It was also noted that the rate at which new information is being collected is low. Since good information is key for all decision-making, the current levels of information limit the quality of decision-making on conservation and utilization of FAnGR.

A lack of analysis and design of policy and regulatory frameworks. There has been little work examining how existing policies affect threats to FAnGR or how they affect conservation efforts. No inventory of such policies exists. This lack of information limits the ability to advise governments and other agencies on how to develop policies that promote appropriate conservation and utilization of FAnGR.

Lack of knowledge about how to prioritize, design and operate conservation and utilization programmes that will be sustainable in the medium to long term. The workshop identified a series of factors that would likely affect the ability of conservation and utilization schemes to be sustained over prolonged periods, but recognized that the outcomes of this workshop are not sufficient to guide the development of specific conservation programmes. There is a lack of detailed knowledge about the conditions under which all forms of conservation, *in situ*, *ex situ in vivo* and *in vitro*, can be established and sustained. Decision-making frameworks are lacking. There are few case studies for conservation systems in the developing world. Knowledge of indigenous breeding systems is very limited. Tools are being developed to assist in the prioritization of resource allocation for conservation efforts. While such tools are already instructive, they require substantial further development to be able to deal with the complexities of real-world decision-making.

Limited understanding of methods suitable for valuing FAnGR and limited information on the value of the benefits and the costs of conservation. Valuation of FAnGR is an important component of determining the costs and benefits of conservation, of setting priorities for conservation, of determining the sustainability of different conservation options and for determining breeding objectives of FAnGR. Valuation of FAnGR in low-input systems of most developing countries presents a series of additional complexities compared to the valuation of FAnGR in intensive

production systems in the developed world, for which the majority of existing literature has been developed. There have in recent years been several advances in development and testing of valuation methods more appropriate to the developing world. But there remains a need for development and testing of a wider range of methods and for application of existing methods. In particular, the costs and the benefits of different conservation methods remain poorly articulated and this is hampering the development of conservation on the scale required.

Priorities for action

At the conclusion of the workshop, participants reviewed the outcomes of the presentations, working group and plenary discussions and identified key priorities for action to ensure that the immediate needs for conservation of FAnGR in the developing world are met. These actions are summarized below.

General priorities

Action 1: Develop policy that promotes use of appropriate FAnGR and supports conservation of FAnGR. It was noted continuously throughout the workshop that many existing national and international policies promoted threats to FAnGR or did not provide enabling support to the development of conservation of FAnGR or did not support the utilization of appropriate FAnGR. The workshop was unable to undertake a detailed analysis of the needs in this area, but noted that there were diverse and substantial problems that needed to be resolved and that no analysis of the policies affecting FAnGR had been undertaken. Such analysis is urgently required. It was also noted that, to be effective, appropriate policy would have to be embedded in international frameworks for management of biodiversity and integrated with food security and regional and national policies on agricultural development and economic growth. Actions on policy include raising awareness of the need for appropriate policy and the development of appropriate policy.

Action 2: Show the benefits and costs of conservation and raise awareness of the issues. Conservation of FAnGR has not achieved a high priority in the strategies of governments or funding agencies. The value of conservation has not been well articulated and governments and donor agencies are unclear about the costs. There is a need to develop authoritative assessments of both the costs and the benefits of conservation. There is also need for a concerted effort to raise awareness across a broad spectrum of society and to recognize that raising awareness will require different approaches for different audiences in different countries, and in many instances will need to be done on a case-by-case basis.

Action 3: Establish international funding mechanisms, legal frameworks and advocacy to support the actions of developing countries in conserving FAnGR. Conservation actions should ideally be undertaken at the country level, but many countries lack capacity to be able to undertake conservation unassisted. In some cases, it will be impossible for a country to develop sufficient capacity to maintain important genetic resources in the short term, and regional or international mechanisms to conserve such resources will be required.

Action 4: Develop policy and guidelines for biosecurity, exchange, ownership, access and benefit-sharing of FAnGR. The most pressing need is to develop

policy and guidelines for cryopreserved FAnGR where material is held in regional or international cryobanks. Similar needs will arise if live animal populations are maintained outside their country of origin at the request of the country of origin, though this will probably be a rather rare situation. In other situations, FAnGR are already exchanged under a variety of commercial arrangements and existing zoosanitary and biosecurity regulations, and as such there was no consensus that new arrangements to regulate exchange and trade in FAnGR were required.

Conservation priorities

Action 5: Develop capacity for cryopreservation, including the development of human and technical resources. A key finding of the workshop was the urgent need to undertake the cryopreservation of a wide range of FAnGR. The majority of developing countries have little or no existing capacity for cryopreservation and will need assistance to develop this capacity where it is appropriate to do so. But it was noted that the development of cryopreservation facilities requires a number of supporting infrastructures, which can benefit from large economies of scale if linked to existing breeding infrastructure such as artificial insemination (AI) centres. If such facilities are used solely to conserve a small number of FAnGR the costs will be very high and the facilities will be unlikely to be sustainable. Thus, in many cases, effective cryopreservation will require either regional or international facilities to be developed.

Action 6: Determine the most appropriate system for regional and/or international cryopreservation programmes as a back-up for developing world FAnGR. As noted in the previous action, there is a need for regional or international cryobanks for FAnGR but it is not clear what structures will be most appropriate to meet this need. Suitable structures need to be defined, and the appropriate regional or international facilities developed as soon as possible.

Action 7: Identify hotspots of diversity and identify the most threatened FAnGR within those hotspots and take action to conserve them now. Given the urgency for action and the inadequate information currently available, an international priority should be to identify hotspots of FAnGR diversity, identify the most endangered breeds within those hotspots and then work with countries concerned to ensure conservation of the priority FAnGR. A similar process should take place within each country to ensure that high-priority genetic resources are not lost while waiting for better information or resources.

Action 8: Establish early warning and response systems for emergency threats to FAnGR. The rationale for this priority action has been given under Finding 9.

Research and information priorities

Action 9: Capture all existing information on FAnGR in an internationally accessible information system and couple this with tools for analysis and

interpretation of information and for decision-making. Information on the status and characteristics of FAnGR is widely scattered and much of it is in old publications or ones that are not widely available. Current electronic information systems capture only a small proportion of that information. It is an achievable goal to collate the majority of information on the majority of FAnGR into a single electronic information system. This information system will need to have functions well beyond those of current information systems and should provide access to all the key tools for analysis of information on FAnGR, as well as to decision-making aids and guides for conservation and utilization of FAnGR.

Action 10: Improve the level of knowledge about how to prioritize, design and operate conservation and utilization programmes that will be sustainable in the medium to long term. This action is aimed at overcoming the information and knowledge gap (see page 33). Work is required to further elaborate the frameworks developed by this workshop to the point at which they can provide reliable aids to assessments of options for conservation. Work is also required to extend decision aids for resource allocation that have recently been developed to deal with more complex, more realistic situations. There is also a need to undertake detailed analyses of successes and failures in conservation as case studies for future conservation.

Action 11: Complete global surveys of the molecular genetic diversity of the major livestock species. In the absence of extensive and high-quality information on the genetic characteristics of the majority of FAnGR of the developing world, estimates of genetic diversity provided by molecular genetic markers are useful in identifying populations that may contain distinct genetic features and in assessing the degree to which populations are distinct from each other. Such information can contribute to resource allocation and structure of conservation, to utilization of FAnGR and to further research on FAnGR. Substantial activity has already been undertaken in molecular genetic diversity of the major livestock species. But much of this effort has been in small surveys that are proving difficult to combine to build a global assessment of genetic diversity. Concerted collaborative action is required to overcome these constraints and focus resources into completing global surveys.

Action 12: Undertake a critical analysis of the economies of scale for various conservation actions and interventions. It is clear that there are substantial economies of scale in a wide variety of activities in the conservation of FAnGR. An obvious example is creation of cryobanks, where costs can be quite low if the cryobank can utilize existing infrastructure and expertise, such as where there is already a self-sustaining AI system. But costs will be high and feasibility low if a cryobank has to be specially created to support a small number of FAnGR. Similar economies of scale will apply to virtually all activities related to conservation of FAnGR. Such economies of scale suggest that countries will benefit from working together on a variety of activities. While the existence of economies of scale is undoubted, the size of those economies of scale is unclear and will vary between activities. Once

the economies of scale have been more clearly defined the benefits of collaboration within regions or internationally will be better understood and can then be promoted and acted upon where appropriate to do so.

Action 13: Improve the technologies and reduce costs of cryopreservation of gametes, embryos and somatic cells of most species of FAnGR. Such developments are needed because technical complexities and costs limit the ability of many countries to implement cryopreservation programmes. It is recognized that technical developments are most likely to come from developed-country research programmes attempting to reduce costs of advanced reproductive technologies used in commercial production and genetic improvement.

Appendix 1: Summary of workshop objectives, procedure and report format

Noting the rapid changes in agriculture globally and the potential impacts on farm animal genetic resources (FAnGR), and noting the advances in technology and knowledge over the past decade, a workshop was convened to review and analyze the options and strategies for conserving farm animal genetic resources (FAnGR).

The workshop was convened by the System-wide Genetic Resources Programme (SGRP) of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR), in association with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), AGROPOLIS, France, and the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ) GmbH, Germany, and held at AGROPOLIS, Montpellier, France, from 7 to 10 November 2005. The primary emphasis was on the needs of developing countries. The workshop brought together 63 participants from 28 countries. The participants included scientists, managers of conservation programmes and other experts involved with FAnGR from around the world and from the centres of the CGIAR, FAO, the French scientific community, including the Institut national de la recherche agronomique (INRA) and the Centre de coopération internationale en recherche agronomique pour le développement (CIRAD), and the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ) GmbH, Germany. The participants are listed in Appendix 2.

The workshop was designed to identify priorities for action and to contribute to the development of a global framework for the conservation of FAnGR. It also aimed to assist the SGRP and the CGIAR centres in refining the role and contribution of the CGIAR to conservation of FAnGR. The outputs of the workshop are expected to contribute to the preparation of the First Report on the State of the World's Animal Genetic Resources and the advancement of the Global Strategy for the Management of Farm Animal Genetic Resources that is developed by FAO under guidance of the Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture.

The workshop consisted of 22 invited short presentations, short small-group discussions and detailed breakout group discussions. The invited speakers provided short papers that summarized the state of the art or provided summaries of background information relevant to the major areas of investigation of the workshop. Extended summaries of these papers are provided in the Annex to this report (available on CD-ROM). Typically, several presentations were made after which a short discussion took place in small groups and participants summarized their understanding of the key issues. Larger breakout groups then tackled major issues and reported back to the workshop, where consensus was sought on findings of the breakout groups. The workshop steering group (see Appendix 3) reviewed each day's progress and adapted the schedule of each day to ensure that there was sufficient time to fully explore areas of discussion as they emerged from the overall workshop framework. The framework of the workshop was to consider each of the following areas: Why is conservation of FAnGR needed? What are the nature and

status of threats to FAnGR? What forms of conservation will be required? What are the key knowledge and information gaps? What are the priorities for action?

The workshop facilitators kept a detailed record of all discussions, comment cards and working group reports. This detailed record is available from the SGRP Secretariat c/o IPGRI. A writing group (see Appendix 3) prepared this report, which summarizes the outcomes of the workshop, including the key points of discussion and consensus. Eleven major findings are presented, with an explanation of each finding. Four broad areas were noted where information or knowledge is currently inadequate and 13 priorities for action were identified; in each case a brief explanation follows each knowledge gap or action.

Appendix 2: Workshop participants

Annick Audiot

Ingénieur de Recherche
L'Institut national de la recherche
agronomique (INRA)
Chemin de Borde-Rouge Auzeville
BP 52627
31326 Castanet-Tolosan Cedex
France
Tel: +33 5 6128 5028/+33 5 6128 5085
Fax: +33 5 6173 2077
Email: audiot@inra.fr

Kassahum Awgichew

National Coordinator for the SoW AnGR
Institute of Biodiversity Conservation
PO Box 30726
Addis Ababa
Ethiopia
Tel: +251 11 651 2038/+251 11 661 2244
Fax: +251 11 661 3722/+251 11 662 7730
Email: awgichew@yahoo.com

Workneh Ayalew

Animal Scientist, Research Officer
International Livestock Research Institute
(ILRI)
PO Box 5689
Addis Ababa
Ethiopia
Tel: +251 11 6463215
Fax: +251 11 6461252
Email: w.ayalew@cgiar.org

Desire M.A. Belemsaga

Centre international de recherche-
développement sur l'élevage en zone
subhumide (CIRDES)
01 BP 454
Bobo-Dioulado 01
Burkina Faso
Tel: +226 7017 2728
Fax: +226 2097 3093
Email: belemsaga.dma@coraf.org or
belemsagadma@hotmail.com

Harvey Blackburn

Coordinator, National Animal Germplasm
Program
United States Department of Agriculture
Agricultural Research Service
National Center for Genetic Resources
Preservation
1111 South Mason Street
Fort Collins, CO 80521-4500
United States of America
Tel: +1 970 495-326
Fax: +1 970 221-1427
Email: hblackburn@lamar.colostate.edu

Didier Boichard

Senior Scientific Advisor, Animal Genetics
Department
L'Institut national de la recherche
agronomique (INRA)
78352 Jouy en Josas
France
Tel: +33 1 3465 2842
Fax: +33 1 3465 2210
Email: didier.boichard@jouy.inra.fr

Michèle Boichard

Directrice, UMR Génétique diversité animale
L'Institut national de la recherche agronomique (INRA)
78352 Jouy en Josas
France
Tel: +33 1 3465 2178
Fax: +33 1 3465 2210
Email: michele.boichard@jouy.inra.fr

Jean Boyazoglu

Mondiale de la Santé Animale
51 Porte De France
06500 Menton
France
Tel: +33 4 9328 4617
Fax: +33 4 9328 4617
Email: jean.boyazoglu@wanadoo.fr

Jean-Pierre Brillard

L'Institut national de la recherche agronomique (INRA)
Tours Research Centre
37380 Nouzilly
France
Tel: +33 2 4742 78 22
Fax: +33 2 47 42 79 95
Email: brillard@tours.inra.fr

Ricardo Cardellino

Senior Officer, Animal Genetic Resources
Animal Production and Health Division
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)
Via delle Terme di Caracalla
00100 Rome
Italy
Tel: +39 06 5705 5620
Fax: +39 06 5705 3927
Email: ricardo.cardellino@fao.org

Coralie Danchin

Executive Secretary
French National Cryobank
Institut de L'Elevage
149 rue Bercy
75595 Paris Cedex 12
France
Tel: +33 1 40 04 5284
Fax: +33 1 40 04 4950
Email: coralie.danchin@inst-elevage.asso.fr

Mamadou Diop

National AnGR Coordinator
Ministry of Agriculture
Institut Senegalais de Recherche Agricoles (ISRA)
Laboratoire national de l'élevage et des recherches vétérinaires (LINERV)
PO Box 2057
Dakar-Hann
Senegal
Tel: +221 832 3678
Fax: +221 8322118
Email: mamadiop@refer.sn

Adam Drucker

Environmental Economist
International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI)
PO Box 5689
Addis Ababa
Ethiopia
Tel: +251 11 6463215
Fax: +251 11 6461252
Email: a.drucker@cgiar.org

Jacque Francois Els

Chief Agricultural Research Officer
Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry
PO Box 13184
Windhoek
Namibia
Tel: +264 61 240426
Fax: +264 61 2087034
Email: elsj@mawrd.gov.na

Abdou Fall

Regional Research Coordinator
International Trypanotolerance Centre
PMB 14
Banjul
The Gambia
Tel: +220 4463270
Email: abdou.fall@itc.gm

Bernard Faye

Centre de coopération internationale
en recherche agronomique pour le
développement (CIRAD)
Avenue Agropolis
34398 Montpellier Cedex 5
France
Tel: +33 4 67 61 58 00
Fax: +33 4 67 61 59 86
Email: Bernard.faye@cirad.fr

Antje Feldmann

The Society for the Conservation of Old and
Endangered Livestock Breeds (GEH)
Am Eschenbornrasen 11
Postfach 1218
D-37213 Witzzenhausen
Germany
Tel: +49 5542 1864
Fax: +49 5542 72560
Email: feldmann@g-e-h.de or
feldmannantje@web.de

Erling Fimland

Director
Nordic Genebank for Domestic Animals
(NGH)
PO Box 5025
N-1432 Aas
Norway
Tel: +47 64948017
Fax: +47 64947960
Email: Erling.Fimland@nordgen.org

Emile Frison

Programme Leader, CGIAR System-wide
Genetic Resources Programme (SGRP)
Director General, IPGRI
International Plant Genetic Resources
Institute (IPGRI)
Via dei Tre Denari 472/a
00057 Maccarese (Fiumicino)
Rome
Italy
Tel: +39 06 61181
Fax: +39 06 61979661
Email: e.frison@cgiar.org

Sunil Gamage

National AnGR Coordinator
Veterinary Research Institute
Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, Land
and Irrigation
Gannoruwa
Peradeniya
Sri Lanka
Tel: +94 81 2421735
Email: deego@sltnet.lk

Gustavo Gandini

Professore Associato
Chairman, EAAP-WG-AnGR
Dipartimento di Scienze e Tecnologie
Veterinarie per la Sicurezza Alimentare (VSA)
Università degli Studi di Milano
Via Celoria 10
20122 Milan
Italy
Tel: +39 02 5031 8046
Fax: +39 02 5031 7898
Email: gustavo.gandini@unimi.it

John Gibson

Professor
Director, The Institute for Genetics and
Bioinformatics
CJ Hawkins Homestead
University of New England
Armidale, NSW 2351
Australia
Tel: +61 2 67732930
Fax: +61 2 67732930
Email: john.gibson@une.edu.au

Eildert Groeneveld

Director and Professor
Institute for Animal Breeding
Federal Agricultural Research Centre
Holtstr 70
31535 Neustadt
Germany
Tel: +49 5034871155
Email: eg@tzv.fal.de

Olivier Hanotte

Project Leader, Animal Genetic Resources
International Livestock Research Institute
(ILRI)
PO Box 30709
Nairobi 00100
Kenya
Tel: +254 20 4223000
Fax: +254 20 4223001
Email: o.hanotte@cgiar.org

Sipke J Hiemstra

Head, Animal Genetic Resources
Centre for Genetic Resources, the
Netherlands (CGN)
Wageningen University and Research Centre
PO Box 65
Lelystad NL-8200 AB
The Netherlands
Tel: +31 320 23 8009
Fax: +31 320 23 8094
Email: sipkejoost.hiemstra@wur.nl

Irene Hoffmann

Chief, Animal Production Service
Animal Production and Health Division
Food and Agriculture Organization of the
United Nations (FAO)
Via delle Terme di Caracalla
00100 Rome
Italy
Tel: +39 06 5705 2796
Fax: +39 06 5705 3152
Email: irene.hoffmann@fao.org

Jasmin Holness

Deputy Director of Research for Livestock
Ministry of Agriculture
Hope Gardens
Kingston 6
Jamaica
Tel: +876 983 2842/3
Fax: +876 983 2088
Email: jaholness@moa.gov.jm

Yang Hongjie

Deputy Division Chief
National Animal Husbandry and Veterinary
Services
Ministry of Agriculture
Str Mai Zi Dian 20
Chao Yang District
100026 Beijing
China
Tel: +86 10 64194610
Fax: +86 10 64194611
Email: yanghj67@yahoo.com

Christian Hoste

Coordinator
 International Organizations, Mediterranean
 and Bilateral Europe
 Centre de coopération internationale
 en recherche agronomique pour le
 développement (CIRAD)
 42, rue Scheffer
 75116 Paris
 France
 Tel: +33 1 5370 2230 / +33 4 67617559
 Fax: +33 1 53 70 2133
 Email: christian.hoste@cirad.fr

Quazi Md. Emdadul Huque

Director General
 Bangladesh Livestock Research Institute
 Ministry of Fisheries and Livestock
 Saver, Dhakar-1341
 Bangladesh
 Tel: +880 2 7708326
 Fax: +880 2 7708325
 Email: qmehuque@gangla.net

Luis Iñiguez

Senior Small Ruminant Scientist
 International Center for Agricultural
 Research in the Dry Areas (ICARDA)
 PO Box 5466
 Aleppo
 Syrian Arab Republic
 Tel: +963 21 221 3433
 Fax: +963 21 221 3490
 Email: l.iniguez@cgiar.org

Han Jianlin

Scientist
 International Livestock Research Institute
 (ILRI)
 PO Box 30709
 Nairobi 00100
 Kenya
 Tel: +254 20 4223000
 Fax: +254 20 4223001
 Email: h.jianlin@cgiar.org

Muhammad Sajjad Khan

Chairman/Associate Professor
 Department of Animal Breeding
 University of Agriculture
 Faisalabad
 Pakistan
 Tel: +92 41 9200 161 ext 3202
 Fax: +92 41 2625 191
 Email: drsajjad@fsd.paknet.com.pk

Pieter Knap

Sygen International
 PO Box 1630
 24826 Schleswig
 Germany
 Email: pieter.knap@pic.com

Saverio Kratli

Institute of Development Studies
 University of Sussex
 Brighton BN1 9RE
 United Kingdom
 Tel: +44 1273 606261
 Fax: +44 1273 621202
 Email: s.kratli@sussex.ac.uk

Renaud Lancelot

Directeur Adjoint
 Chargé des Affaires Scientifiques
 TA30/B Campus
 International de Baillarguet
 34398 Montpellier Cedex 5
 France
 Tel: +33 4 6759 3717
 Fax: +33 4 6759 3795
 Email: renaud.lancelot@cirad.fr

Valérie Loywyck

Institut national agronomique Paris-Grignon
(INA-PG)
16 Rue Claude Bernard
75231 Paris Cedex 5
France
Tel: +33 1 4408 8648
Fax: +33 1 4408 8622
Email: loywyck@inapg.fr

Jean-Charles Maillard

Research Officer, CIRAD-Emvt
Centre de coopération internationale
en recherche agronomique pour le
développement (CIRAD)
Département d'élevage et médecine
vétérinaire
c/o National Institute for Animal
Husbandry (NIAH)
Thuy Phuong Tu Liem
Hanoi
Vietnam
Tel: +84 4 838 8068
Fax: +84 4 757 2177
Email: jean-charles.maillard@cirad.fr

Daniele Manzella

Legal Office, Development Law Service
Food and Agriculture Organization of the
United Nations (FAO)
Via delle Terme di Caracalla
00100 Rome
Italy
Tel: +39 06 57051
Fax: +39 06 5705 3152
Email: daniele.manzella@fao.org

Paolo Ajmone Marsan

Istituto di Zootechnica
Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore
Via E Parmense 84
29100 Piacenza
Italy
Tel: +39 0523 599204
Fax: +39 0523 599276
Email: paolo.ajmone@unicatt.it

Guillermo Martinez Velazquez

Instituto Nacional de Investigaciones
Agrícolas, Forestales y Pecuarias (INIFAP)
Enfermeria # 13
Fracc. Los Limones
Tepic, Nayarit
México CP 63174
Mexico
Email: martinez.guillermo@inifap.gob.mx

Elzbieta Martyniuk

National Research Institute of Animal
Productions
National Focal Point for Animal Genetic
Resources
Department of Animal Genetics and Breeding
Faculty of Animal Sciences
Warsaw Agricultural University
ul Ciszewskiego 8
02-786 Warszawa
Poland
Tel: +48 22 623 1056
Fax: +48 22 623 1714
Email: martyniuk@alpha.sggw.waw.pl or
Elzbieta.Martyniuk@minrol.gov.pl

Evelyn Mathias

League for Pastoral Peoples and
Endogenous Livestock Development
Weizenfeld 4
51467 Bergisch Gladbach
Germany
Tel: +49 2202 932921
Fax: +49 2202 932922
Email: evelyn@mamud.com

David R. Notter

Professor
 Animal and Poultry Sciences (0306)
 3090 Litton Reaves Hall
 Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State
 University
 Blacksburg VA 24061
 United States of America
 Tel: +1 540 2315135
 Fax: +1 540 9517515
 Email: drnotter@vt.edu

Kor Oldenbroek

Agrobiodiversity and Animal Genetic
 Resources Policies
 Centre for Genetic Resources
 Wageningen University and Research Centre
 PO Box 16
 6700 AA Wageningen
 The Netherlands
 Tel: +313 1 747 5898
 Email: kor.oldenbroek@wur.nl

Louis Ollivier

L'Institut national de la recherche
 agronomique (INRA)
 Station de génétique quantitative appliquée
 (SGQA)
 Domaine de Vilvert
 78352 Jouy-en-Josas Cedex
 France
 Tel: +33 1 3465 2190
 Fax: +33 1 3465 2210
 Email: louis.ollivier@dga.jouy.inra.fr

Jean-Paul Poivey

Centre de coopération internationale
 en recherche agronomique pour le
 développement (CIRAD)
 Avenue Agropolis
 34398 Montpellier Cedex 5
 France
 Tel: +33 4 67 61 5800
 Fax: +33 4 67 61 5986
 Email: jean-paul.poivey@cirad.fr

Roger Pullin

7A Legaspi Park View
 134 Legaspi Street
 Makati City
 The Philippines
 Tel: +63 2 818 0870
 Fax: + 63 2 840 2630
 Email: karoger@pacific.net.ph

Adrien Raymond

Senior Research Officer
 Ministry of Agriculture and Agro-based
 Industries
 Department of Veterinary Services
 Federal Government Administrative Centre
 62630 Putrajaya
 Malaysia
 Tel: +60 3 8870 2226
 Fax: +60 3 8888 6949
 Email: adrien@jph.gov.my

Ed Rege

Director of Theme 4 – Biotechnology
 International Livestock Research Institute
 (ILRI)
 PO Box 30907
 Nairobi 00100
 Kenya
 Tel: +254 20 422 3000
 Fax: +254 20 422 3001
 Email: e.rege@cgiar.org

Chancharat Reodecha

Director of Agricultural Research
 The Thailand Research Fund
 14th SM Tower
 Phaholyothin Rd
 Phyathai
 Bangkok 10400
 Thailand
 Tel: +66 22 98 04 55 ext. 246
 Email: chancharat@trf.or.th

Didier Richard

UPR-Systèmes d'élevage et produits animaux
Centre de coopération internationale
en recherche agronomique pour le
développement (CIRAD)
Avenue Agropolis
34398 Montpellier Cedex 5
France
Tel: +33 4 67 61 58 00
Fax: +33 4 67 61 59 86
Email: richard.didier@cirad.fr

Barbara Rischkowsky

Animal Production Officer, Animal
Production Service
Animal Production and Health Division
Food and Agriculture Organization of the
United Nations (FAO)
Via delle Terme di Caracalla
00100 Rome
Italy
Tel: +39 06 57051
Fax: +39 06 57053152
Email: barbara.rischkowsky@fao.org

Luis Carlos Rodriguez

International Livestock Research Institute
(ILRI)
PO Box 30709
Nairobi 00100
Kenya
Tel: +254 20 422 3000
Fax: +254 20 422 3001
Email: l.c.rodriguez@cgiar.org

Mike Roper

Advisor on Livestock and Meat
Department of Environment, Food and
Rural Affairs (DEFRA)
Area SC, Millbank
c/o Nobel House
17 Smith Square
London SW1P 3JR
United Kingdom
Tel: +44 20 7238 3150
Fax: +44 20 7238 6609
Email: m.roper@defra.gsi.gov.uk

Marieta Sakalian

Program Management Officer,
Agrobiodiversity
Division of Global Environment Facility
Coordination
United Nations Environment Programme
(UNEP)
PO Box 30552
Nairobi 00100
Kenya
Tel: +254 20 624 352
Fax: +254 20 624 041/617
Email: Marieta.Sakalian@unep.org

Beate Scherf

Animal Production Officer, Genetic Resources
Animal Production Service
Animal Production and Health Division
Food and Agriculture Organization of the
United Nations (FAO)
Via delle Terme di Caracalla
00100 Rome
Italy
Tel: +39 06 5705 3540
Fax: +39 06 5705 3152
Email: beate.scherf@fao.org

Daniel Semambo

Executive Director
 National Animal Genetic Resources Centre
 and Data Bank
 Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industries
 and Fisheries
 PO Box 183
 Entebbe
 Uganda
 Tel: +256 41 3200831
 Fax: +256 41 349422
 Email: cattbrd@infocom.co.ug

Sophie Thévenon

UMR-Trypanosomoses
 Centre de coopération internationale
 en recherche agronomique pour le
 développement (CIRAD)
 TA30/G Campus International de Baillarguet
 34398 Montpellier Cedex 5
 France
 Tel: +33 4 67 61 58 00
 Fax: +33 4 67 61 59 86
 Email: sophie.thevenon@cirad.fr

Jane Toll

Coordinator, CGIAR System-wide Genetic
 Resources Programme (SGRP)
 Director, Global Partnerships Programme
 International Plant Genetic Resources
 Institute (IPGRI)
 Via dei Tre Denari 472/a
 00057 Maccarese (Fiumicino)
 Rome
 Italy
 Tel: +39 06 6118225
 Fax: +39 06 61979661
 Email: j.toll@cgiar.org

Ugyen Tshewang

National Biodiversity Centre (NBC)
 Ministry of Agriculture
 Serbithang Thimphu
 PO Box 875
 Bhutan
 Tel: +975 2351416
 Fax: +975 2351219
 Email: nbc@druknet.bt

Etienne Verrier

Coordinator, Animal Genetic Resources
 L'institut national de la recherche
 agronomique (INRA)
 Domaine de Vilvert
 Batiment 211
 78352 Jouy-en-Josas Cedex
 France
 Tel: +33 1 34652121
 Fax: +33 1 34652210
 Email: verrier@inapg.fr

Annette von Lossau

Project Officer
 Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische
 Zusammenarbeit (GTZ) GmbH
 Postfach 5180
 Eschborn 65726
 Germany
 Tel: +49 6196 791473
 Fax: +49 6196 796554
 Email: annette.lossau-von@gtz.de

Facilitation

Jürgen Hagmann

Consultant/Facilitator for Innovation
Processes and Change Management

Postnet Suite 341

Pbag X10

Elarduspark 0047

South Africa

Mobile: +27 83 536 4501

Fax: +27 12 347 0406

Email: jhagmann@aol.com

Henning Peter

Co-Facilitator/Documentalist

Durlacher Allee 23

D-75045 Walzbachtal

Germany

Tel: +49 7203 925 285

Email: wald.meister@web.de

Logistics

Tamara Bruce

Programme Assistant to the Director, Global

Partnership Programme

International Plant Genetic Resources

Institute (IPGRI)

Via dei Tre Denari 472/a

00057 Maccarese (Fiumicino)

Rome

Italy

Tel: +39 06 6118281

Fax: +39 06 61979661

Email: t.bruce@cgiar.org

Appendix 3: Members of the workshop steering and report writing groups

Workshop process steering group

Abdou Fall (ITC)

Sunil Gamage (Sri Lanka)

John Gibson (Australia)

Olivier Hanotte (ILRI, CGIAR)

Juergen Hagmann (Workshop facilitator, Germany)

Irene Hoffman (FAO)

Luis Iñiguez (ICARDA, CGIAR)

Annette von Lossau (Germany)

Jean Charles Maillard (France)

Jane Toll (SGRP, CGIAR)

Report writing group

Sunil Gamage (Sri Lanka)

John Gibson (Chair) (Australia)

Olivier Hanotte (ILRI, CGIAR)

Luis Iñiguez (ICARDA, CGIAR)

Jean Charles Maillard (France)

Barbara Rischowsky (FAO)

Daniel Semambo (Uganda)

Jane Toll (SGRP, CGIAR)

Appendix 4: Acronyms and abbreviations

AI	Artificial insemination
CGIAR	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
CIRAD	Centre de coopération internationale en recherche agronomique pour le développement
FAnGR	Farm animal genetic resources
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FMD	Foot and mouth disease
GTZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit GmbH
ICARDA	International Center for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas
ILRI	International Livestock Research Institute
INRA	Institut national de la recherche agronomique
IPGRI	International Plant Genetic Resources Institute
SGRP	CGIAR System-wide Genetic Resources Programme
WTO	World Trade Organization

