

**ELBARN**  
**PART C: FINAL TECHNICAL ACTIVITY REPORT**

**COUNCIL REGULATION (EC) N° 870/2004 of 26 April 2004  
establishing a Community programme on the conservation, characterisation,  
collection and utilisation of genetic resources in agriculture**

**AGRI GEN RES 066**

**Acronym: ELBARN**

**Action title: European Livestock Breeds Ark and Rescue Net**

<p><b>FINAL TECHNICAL ACTIVITY REPORT No. 01</b> <b>Reporting period from 01.06.2007 to 31.05.2010</b></p>
--

<b>Action starting date:</b>	01.06.2007
<b>Action closure date:</b>	31.05.2010
<b>Action duration (in months)</b>	36 months
<b>Total budget</b>	€ 497.550
<b>EC contribution:</b>	€ 398.040
<b>(%) of total costs</b>	80%
<b>(%) of eligible costs</b>	80%

Data Coordinator

<b>Name of the coordinator (Partner no 00)</b>	EURONATUR
<b>Contact person</b>	Mr Gabriel Schwaderer
<b>Postal address</b>	Konstanzerstr.22, 78315 Radolfzell
<b>Telephone</b>	+49 7732 92720
<b>Fax:</b>	+49 7732 927222
<b>E-mail</b>	gabriel.schwaderer@euronatur.org
<b>Action Website</b>	<a href="http://www.elbarn.net">www.elbarn.net</a>

Data Co-beneficiaries

<b>Partner no 01</b>	<p><b>Safeguard for Agricultural Varieties in Europe/SAVE</b> Ms Elli Broxham SAVE - Head Office Joseph-Belli-Weg 5 D-78467 Konstanz Germany</p>
<b>Partner no 02</b>	<p><b>Gesellschaft zur Erhaltung alter und gefährdeter Haustierrassen/ GEH</b> Ms Antje Feldmann Walburgerstr.2 D-37213 Witzenhausen Germany</p>

<b>Partner no 03</b>	<b>Steunpunt Levend Erfgoed/SLE</b> Mr Staf Van den Bergh Spiegel 1 9860 Oosterzele Belgium
<b>Partner no 04</b>	<b>Associazione Razze Autoctone a Rischio di Estinzione/RARE</b> Prof. Riccardo Fortina C.so G. Agnelli 32 10137 Torino Italy

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	6
• <i>Action objectives during the entire period of the action</i> .....	6
• <i>Summary of key deliverables and outputs</i> .....	7
2. DETAILED RESULTS ACHIEVED.....	8
• WP 1 - Central Workshop.....	8
○ Main objectives.....	8
○ Task 1: Logistics of the workshop.....	8
○ Task 2: Identification of participants.....	9
○ Task 3: National Reports .....	9
○ Task 4: Identifying regional issues .....	10
○ Task 5: Transnational Work Groups.....	11
○ Task 6: Area Coordinators.....	11
• WP 2 - Transnational Work Groups.....	12
○ Main objectives.....	12
○ Task 1: Meeting at Central Workshop and Provisional Reports.....	12
○ Task 2: Final Conclusions, Editing and Publication of Guidelines.....	12
• WP 3 - Questionnaire.....	13
○ Main objectives.....	13
○ Task 1: Design of questionnaire.....	13
○ Task 2: Distribution and request for participants.....	14
○ Task 3: Final Report.....	14
• WP 4 - Development of database.....	15
○ Main objectives.....	15
○ Task 1: Improving and expanding upon the pilot project.....	15
▪ Subtask 1, <i>www.elbarn.net</i> .....	15
• WP 5 - Area Workshops.....	16
○ Main objectives.....	16
○ Task 1: Logistics of the Area Workshops.....	16
▪ <i>Subtask 1, Location and Excursion</i> .....	16
▪ <i>Subtask 2, Identification of Participants</i> .....	19
▪ <i>Subtask 3, Identifying themes and speakers</i> .....	19
▪ <i>Subtask 4, Assessing the needs of the area</i> .....	20
▪ <i>Subtask 5, Work Groups</i> .....	20
○ Task 2, Completion of Area Action Plans .....	20
▪ <i>Subtask 1, Composition</i> .....	20
▪ <i>Subtask 2, Publication</i> .....	21
▪ <i>Subtask 3, Distribution</i> .....	21
• WP6 - Data Collection and Entry into the Database .....	22
○ Main objectives.....	22
○ Task 1, Preparation of already existing data, breed descriptions.....	22
○ Task 2, Verification and Publication of Data .....	23
▪ <i>Subtask 1, Verification tours</i> .....	23
▪ <i>Subtask 2, Publications online</i> .....	23
▪ <i>Subtask 3, National Contact Points</i> .....	24
▪ <i>Subtask 4, Collection of more data</i> .....	24
• WP7 - Final Report, Publicity, Motivation .....	25
○ Task 1, Final publications and PR .....	25
▪ <i>Subtask 1, Preparation of ELBARN book and flyers</i> .....	25
▪ <i>Subtask 2, Publication &amp; Distribution</i> .....	25

▪	<i>Subtask 3, Presentations &amp; Publicity</i> .....	26
▪	<i>Subtask 4, Task Force</i> .....	26
3.	PROGRESS OF ACTION.....	27
•	Detailed comparison of the planned and achieved deliverables.....	27
4.	TECHNICAL PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED (IF ANY).....	29
•	Technical problems and solutions proposed to solve them.....	29
5.	MANAGEMENT OF ACTION.....	30
•	Meetings, workshops and seminars (including conclusion).....	30
6.	DISSEMINATION OF THE RESULTS (INCLUDING CONCLUSION).....	38
7.	INPUT FOR THE DISSEMINATION OF THE FINAL RESULTS .....	41
8	ANNEXES.....	42

## 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- **Action objectives during the entire period of the action**

**Objective 1:** To hold a central workshop with participants from the whole of Europe in order to launch ELBARN, to identify national and regional issues and to begin the work of the Transnational Work Groups

**Objective 2:** Each Transnational Work Group produced a concept of how the issues of Rescue and Quarantine, Breeding, Characterisation and Marketing should be addressed by ELBARN in each Area. These concepts have been published as Guidelines and are also available to download on the ELBARN website.

**Objective 3:** To design and analyse an online questionnaire to collect data for the database and to investigate national and regional issues raised at the central workshop. The data collection was complete by the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> project year. A short report of the findings was produced in the 3<sup>rd</sup> project year.

**Objective 4:** Creation of a database supported website for the provision of the online publicly available information about ELBARN. The “database” was subsequently split into three components – the “ELBARN website” which publishes content about the project, the searchable database built upon the pilot project “Arca-Net” and the “breed descriptions”. In the 3<sup>rd</sup> project year all the data was fully integrated into the ELBARN website and made fully accessible to the public.

**Objective 5:** Organisation of four Area Workshops. Each Administrative Area held one Workshop to discuss issues relevant to the Area, to discuss the Action required to establish Ark and Rescue Centres in the Area and to appoint a First Contact person or institution to be contacted in connection with Rescue. This objective was completed with the publication and distribution of the Area Action Plans.

**Objective 6:** The updating and improving of the website and database content. The website is now user friendly, with various maps, publications and other data available. Data provided about A&RCs was verified by email and letter contact but also, more importantly, by three verification tours. National contact points were also identified and those people already in agreement are listed on the website.

**Objective 7:** The publication and distribution of a small book to be used as promotion material for the project. Alongside this, flyers have been produced in various languages. The project was presented, when possible, at conferences and workshops. A first step in implementing the Area Action Plans has been taken with the creation of a pan-European Task Force to help take ELBARN into a sustainable future.

## • Key results achieved and outputs

**Result 1:** The Central Workshop proved to be a great success, Reports submitted by participants provided both an overview of the whole of Europe and opinions of the participants. The Work Groups worked well together and covered a wide range of knowledge. Broadly speaking, the regional issues were identified at the Central Workshop. These issues were discussed in more detail at the respective Area Workshops.

**Result 2:** The ELBARN Guidelines were completed, edited and published in time for distribution at the Area Workshops. They were also published online on [www.elbarn.net](http://www.elbarn.net). These Guidelines outline the main themes of ELBARN: Rescue, Rescue in the Case of Disease; Ark and Rescue Centres; Conservation Breeding; Marketing of Services and Products

**Result 3:** The online questionnaire was widely distributed and the results for each Area were presented at the Area Workshops. The many addresses of potential Ark, Rescue or Quarantine Centres were compiled, some already entered into the Database. An analysis of all the comments made in the questionnaire has also been compiled. A final report on the questionnaire is available for download on the ELBARN website and was also announced on DAD-Net.

**Result 4:** The pilot project of the ELBARN database [www.arca-net.info](http://www.arca-net.info) was expanded to include 43 European countries. Information is being gathered, verified and stored in the database and made available through the ELBARN website. The ELBARN website was completed and put online by the end of month 15, to coincide with the publication of the questionnaire. The Work Package “database” was split into three components – the “ELBARN website” which publishes content about the project. This provides general information about agrobiodiversity, information about the ELBARN project, the publications, events etc. It also provides links to many interesting and related websites. The searchable “breed descriptions” linked to EFABIS which currently includes 505 Breed Descriptions entered as part of WP6. “Ark Centres” can be found via a map tool and also by a text search. The searchable database built upon the pilot project “Arca-Net” was been improved and security of the database improved. Finally the website layout was completed and the data fully integrated.

**Result 5:** Four Area Workshops. Each Administrative Area held a Workshop to discuss issues relevant to the Area, to discuss the Action required to establish Ark and Rescue Centres in the Area and to appoint, where possible, a First Contact person or institution to be contacted in connection with Rescue. The Area Action Plans were written, published and distributed. They were also announced on DAD-Net.

**Result 6:** The verification tours resulted in 23 agreements with potential Rescue Centre in 8 countries from a list of 29. The various publications of ELBARN have been made available online and the information shared via appropriate channels. Data collected via the questionnaire and also through internet and literature research has been prepared and, partially, entered into the database. The National Contact Points were published online.

**Result 7:** The promotion materials (Book & Flyer) were published and distributed. ELBARN was presented at 13 conferences and workshops.

## 2. DETAILED RESULTS ACHIEVED

<b>Work package number</b>	<b>WP 1</b>	<b>Start date 01.06.2007</b>	<b>Month 1</b>
<b>Work package title: Central Workshop</b>			
<b>No of lead partner</b>	1		
<b>No of participating partner(s)</b>	0	2	3
<b>Total person-months</b>	7,7		
<b>• Main objectives</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Objective 1: To hold a central workshop with participants from the whole of Europe in order to launch ELBARN, to identify national and regional issues and to begin the work of the Transnational Work Groups.</i></li> </ul>			
<b>• Task 1: Logistics of the Workshop</b>			
<b>Sub-task: -</b>		<b>Start date.01.06.2007</b>	
<b>No of participating partner(s)</b>	0	1	2
		3	4
<p>In the grant application it had been written that it should take place in a “centrally located, EU country”.</p> <p>SAVE was interested in holding the workshop near Prague, Vienna or Bratislava. Suggestions from the other project partners included the region of the lake of Constance or northern Italy (Bra). An excursion to see a concrete example of conservation in action in Kladruby nad Labem, the home of the Old Kladrubian horses was also arranged. This national stud shows a great example of how a breed that is near to extinction can be rescued through good breed management practice.</p> <p>Due to the distance from Prague, a location closer to Kladruby nad Labem was searched for. As soon as the UNESCO heritage site of Kutna Hora was found, it became clear that this was the right place for the workshop. As Vera Matlova (Animal NC for Czech Republic) said in her opening speech: “I am not sure who of the organizers selected the site, maybe it just chanced to be but to me there is something symbolic between the history of this unique town and the history of our breeds.”</p> <p>The hotel/conference centre was located purely on a price/facility basis, combined with the ability to actually communicate with the owners, either in English or German. The Medinek proved perfectly suitable on all these scores.</p> <p>Due to the distance between the airport and Kutna Hora, a shuttle service was found. This was chosen on the basis of price and flexibility.</p> <p>Also included in the logistics and planning of the workshop were matters such as the invitations, answering enquiries from participants etc.</p> <p>The actual choice of participants will be dealt with as a separate task.</p> <p>The full invitation can be found as Annex 1 of this report.</p> <p><b>CONCLUSION: The workshop logistics proved to be a great success, shown in the smooth running of the whole workshop. Many of the participants complimented SAVE, not only on the actual workshop, but also on the quality of information that they received prior to the workshop.</b></p>			

• Task 2: Identification of Experts Invited to the CW								
Sub-task: -							Start date.01.06.2007	
No of participating partner(s)	0	1	2	3	4			
<p>This task proved to be very time consuming. The participants at the workshop needed to fulfil certain criteria, mainly experience and knowledge for contributing to one of the four work groups (WP2). It was intended that the wide range of opinions would throw up interesting ideas, some of which had not been considered before. They also needed to represent as many European countries as possible.</p> <p>Invitations were initially sent out to 60 people, with the aim of having between 30 and 40 participants attending. The final number attending was 35.</p> <p>The complete participants list is to be found as Annex 2 of this report.</p> <p><b>CONCLUSION: The final list of participants reflected well our intention of a balanced representation at the Workshop. We would have liked to have had every country represented but this was not achieved. In the end there were 35 participants from 16 countries, representing NGOs, GOs and academic institutes.</b></p>								

• Task 3: National Reports								
Sub-task: -							Start date 09.2007	
No of participating partner(s)	1							
<p>The idea behind this task was that every representative at the Central Workshop would present the state of Agrobiodiversity in their country. However, in the course of the preparations it became clear that this was not the best option available.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the publication of the FAO's State of the World's Animal Genetic Diversity for Food and Agriculture made the reports superfluous.</li> <li>2. the fact that not all countries were represented and some had more than one person participating meant that country reports presented by each participant may become tedious and, in the case of disagreement, end in argument rather than constructive work.</li> <li>3. a presentation from each participant would take a significant amount of time – time that would be better spent actually working.</li> </ol> <p>Due to these factors it was decided that each participant should prepare a short report about the topic of their Work Group (see WP2) in the context of their country or organisation. These reports were put online for all other participants to read before the Workshop (<a href="http://www.save-foundation.net/ELBARN/reports.htm">http://www.save-foundation.net/ELBARN/reports.htm</a>) and the full scope of the reports was both used as preparation for the Work Groups as well as being synthesised into a presentation, given at the Workshop (see Annexes).</p> <p><b>CONCLUSION: Although the planned task (a national report from each country) was no longer required, the adaptation of this task proved to be more than useful - both as an overview of the whole of Europe and opinions of the participants, as well as for the preparations for WP2.</b></p>								

• **Task 4: Regional issues**

**Sub-task 1: -**

**Start date.** 02.2008

**No of participating partner(s)**

0

1

2

3

4

As already mentioned, the task of the National Reports mutated into a different kind of report. However, from the reports contributed and the discussions that took place, it was clear that there are significantly different regional needs, as anticipated.

At the end of the workshop, participants were arranged into “geographical groups” which reflect the areas of the Area Workshops (WP5). These groups discussed, more specifically, the needs of the areas.

**In the North West Europe group the following opinion was generally agreed upon:**

Animal breeding in these countries is well organised and maybe even over regulated. Rare breeds are mostly well described, registered and the animals and probably also their holders are identified. The focus of this area workshop therefore has to be on regulation of animal breeding, on regulation of animal transport both within a EU-country and within the EU, on dealing with contagious diseases. Regulation usually is directed at commercial animal breeding and ignores or does not take into account the specific situation of rare breeds.

**In the Central and North East Europe group the following opinion was generally agreed upon:**

It became clear that the contact, especially to countries in the North East, would have to be through the national coordinators appointed by the FAO and also contacts available through GEH and SAVE. National NGOs are only in their beginning phase. In the research into the status quo of the various breeds, databases such as DAD-IS/EAAP or EFABIS and data from SAVE can be made use of.

**In the South East Europe group the following opinion was generally agreed upon:**

ELBARN offers a good opportunity to start with joint projects to preserve the breeds having the aim to support conservation of local breeds. Preservation of old breeds is not a key political issue. For the tourism the preservation of the agro-diversity is important especially in the mountains. Action Plans are important – with clear vision and programme. Old breeds are crucial for the maintenance of the “living systems” (= cultural landscape) typical for SEE. Traditional principles can solve as modern solutions in breeding, regional development and conservation.

**In the Mediterranean and South West Europe group the following opinion was generally agreed upon:**

The participants believe that it will be much more difficult to find institutions to become evaluated for ELBARN in the Mediterranean area than in other regions of the continent. The “South” is not so organised and e.g. Ark Farms are quite not known. However, interest in ELBARN is great. Such a network could be very helpful to support the live conservation of rare breeds in the area.

***CONCLUSION: Broadly speaking, the regional issues have been identified. These issues will be discussed in more detail at the respective Area Workshops.***

• Task 5: Transnational Work Groups								
Sub-task: -						Start date 09.2007		
No of participating partner(s)	0	1	2	3	4			
<p>Part of the selection of participants involved the pre-selection into Work Groups. It was decided, in the interests of time saving at the Workshop, to invite people to take part in one Work Group that was felt to best reflect their area of expertise. They were also given the option of choosing a second option or requesting to be moved to a different work group. It was attempted to accommodate all the requests for changes, we also left room for participants to change groups after the plenum session on the second day of the workshop (see workshop programme Annex 9.3).</p> <p><b>CONCLUSION: The selection of the TNWGs before the Workshop occurred proved to be more successful than the original idea of selecting at the Workshop. The Work Groups created worked well together and covered a wide range of knowledge.</b></p>								

• Task 6: Area Coordinators								
Sub-task: -						Start date.02.2008		
No of participating partner(s)	0	1	2	3	4			
<p>For the North West Europe Area Staf Van den Bergh proposed that the Belgian rare breeds organisation Steunpunt Levend Erfgoed (SLE) act as Area Coordinator. SLE hired Jef AERTS for this job. The Area Workshop took place in Gent, Belgium.</p> <p>For the Central and North East Europe Area GEH performed the function of Area Coordinator. The Area Workshop took place in Roznov, Czech Republic.</p> <p>The Bulgarian organisation Bulgarian Biodiversity Foundation was Area Coordinator for the South East Europe Area. The Workshop took place in Blagoevgrad, Bulgaria.</p> <p>For the Mediterranean and South West Europe RARE acted as Area Coordinator and appointed Laura Milone for this task. The Workshop took place in Legnaro, Italy.</p> <p><b>CONCLUSION: The Area Coordinators were meant as “on the ground” assistance to the partners. If it was deemed feasible that the partner organised the Area Workshop without the support of local help, then the appointment of an Area Coordinator was seen as superfluous</b></p>								

Work package number	WP 2	Start date	02.2008	Month	8	
Work package title: Transnational Work Groups						
No of lead partner	0,1,2,3,4					
No of participating partner(s)		0	1	2	3	
Total person-months	5,8					
<b>• Main objectives</b>						
<p><i>Each Transnational Work Group will produce a concept of how the issues of Rescue and Quarantine, Breeding, Characterisation and Marketing should be addressed by ELBARN in each Area.</i></p>						
<b>• Task 1: Meeting at Central Workshop</b>						
Sub-task: -					Start date	02.2008
No of participating partner(s)		0	1	2	3	4
<p>The transnational work groups met for one day of the Central Workshop in Kutna Hora. Each group was chaired by a member of the ELBARN Partner team, who had prepared the agenda for each group discussion. After Kutna Hora, a report from each meeting was prepared by the resp. chairs and sent to all participants of the Work Group. Once these reports were given the all-clear by the Work Group, they were put online for all Central Workshop participants to read and comment upon. The Guidelines, which are the result of this process, have been subsequently published, see Annexes.</p> <p><b>CONCLUSION: This long process ended successfully with gaps in knowledge being closed and the guidelines being published and distributed at the area workshops.</b></p>						

<b>• Task 2: Final Conclusions, Editing and Publication of Guidelines</b>						
Sub-task: -					Start date	02.2008
No of participating partner(s)		0	1	2	3	4
<p>With the publication of the “ELBARN Guidelines” (see Annexes) this WP has finally been closed. Differently to the planned action, there was very little external assistance required for this work package. It had been assumed that experts would have to be contracted to find the information that was required – however, the official bodies, when approached by the SAVE Foundation to provide information, were happy to help and gave their time for free. This meant that the main financial outgoings for this work package were personnel costs and, also, travel costs for the SAVE Foundation.</p> <p>The purpose of the WP was to create usable guidelines for people interested in taking part in ELBARN. The subject matter divided into four parts and reflected the work groups formed at the Central Workshop (completed WP1) : 1 – Rescue and Quarantine, 2 – Characterisation of Ark and Rescue Centres, 3 – Breeding and 4 – Marketing of Products and Services.</p> <p><b>CONCLUSION: The ELBARN Partners are satisfied that the ELBARN Guidelines (s. Annexes) provide a usable document upon which future work can be built. We are very grateful for all the assistance we received in writing these guidelines. The Guidelines were distributed at the Area Workshops, where they were received positively. They are also published on the website and copies have been sent to the Animal Genetic Resources Group at the FAO.</b></p>						

<b>Work package number</b>	<b>WP3.</b>	<b>Start date</b> 01.02.2008				<b>Month</b> 8			
<b>Work package title: Questionnaire</b>									
<b>No of lead partner</b>	1								
<b>No of participating partner(s)</b>	0	2	3	4					
<b>Total person-months</b>	8,1								
• <b>Main objectives</b>									
<i>To design and analyse an online questionnaire to collect data for the database and to investigate national and regional issues raised at the central workshop.</i>									
• <b>Task 1: Design of questionnaire</b>									
<b>Sub-task: -</b>							<b>Start date</b> 01.02.2008		
<b>No of participating partner(s)</b>	0	1	2	3	4				
<p>The purpose of the questionnaire was to gather as much information as possible about potential ark and rescue centres in Europe. It was seen as a “fact finding” task. The 17 questions asked in the questionnaire were designed by SAVE and discussed with the other ELBARN partners. Suggestions made by the partners were then incorporated into the questionnaire. It was decided to ask questions about all the subjects that are of interest within ELBARN, including questions about regulations and breed management. Due to the discussions within the Work Groups at Kutna Hora, it was also decided to split the question about Ark and Rescue Centres into three: Ark Centres, Rescue Centres and Quarantine Centres.</p> <p>It was intended to make the questionnaire as accessible as possible and, therefore, it was translated into 19 languages: Albanian, Bulgarian, Croatian, Czech, Danish, Dutch, English, Finish, French, German, Greek, Hungarian, Italian, Polish, Portuguese, Serbian, Slovenian, Slovakian and Spanish. Online submission was possible in any of those languages, though English, German or French were stated as the preferred languages. In order to speed up the analysis, the questionnaire was constructed as an online form that would save answers directly into a database. This online form was only in English, but the translations were provided in the file formats .pdf and .doc, also on the ELBARN website. Users were given the option to download the files in their preferred language and submit it via email after answering it. Participants were also given the option of printing out the questionnaire and sending it to SAVE by fax, post or email. As the online form was the easiest option, it was assumed that people would use this option and that there would be very little work involved in dealing with the data. Unfortunately, some participants did not seem to want to use the online form or even understand how it worked – it was a very simple process to type in the answers and then click on submit, so we were very surprised by this reluctance. C. 85 responses were submitted on paper and had to be typed into the database by SAVE. Additionally, some of the comments were written in a variety of languages (we had asked, when possible, for participants to respond in English, German or French). SAVE was able to cope with this work load through the assistance on T. Mayer, who was temporarily employed in Konstanz. The combination of his language skills and also the voluntary help of SAVE contacts meant that the questionnaire replies could be typed into the database without too much trouble. However, this work required many hours of work, especially when answers were handwritten and not typed.</p> <p><b>CONCLUSION: There were surprising difficulties with the online submission of the questionnaire. It would seem that many of the stakeholders approached had little experience of filling in forms online. However, after a larger than expected time investment, the questionnaires were prepared for the analysis.</b></p>									

• Task 2: Distribution of questionnaire								
Sub-task: -							Start date 01.08.2008	
No of participating partner(s)	0	1	2	3	4			
<p>It was intended to send out the questionnaires to as many people as possible, on all stakeholder levels, to get as broad a range of answers back as possible. The aim was to get about 5 answers back per country but certainly a representation of government agencies, universities as well as NGOs/farmers.</p> <p>To this end a list was made of all the contacts from the partner organisations, Arca-Net and through internet research. These people were then invited to take part in the survey by email:</p> <p>The call to participate was also announced in the SAVE eNews 3/08 <a href="http://www.save-foundation.net/english/PDF/news/SAVE_eNews_08_3en.pdf">http://www.save-foundation.net/english/PDF/news/SAVE_eNews_08_3en.pdf</a></p> <p>It was intended that the questionnaires would all be returned by the end of December 2008. However, this was not the case. There was a lot of effort required to motivate people to take part. The people who had been invited but had not yet given an answer were sent reminders in the first weeks of January. It was decided at the ELBARN partner meeting on 19-20<sup>th</sup> January, to link the payment of travel costs to the Area Workshops to the questionnaire. It is usual practice for SAVE to link payment of costs to some kind of paper or other work that should be submitted prior to workshops. It was considered vital for the success of the Area Workshops that as many questionnaires were submitted as possible. Therefore this solution seemed to be a good idea. However, with this decision came the knowledge that, due to the staggered timing of the workshops, we would not be able to produce an overview of the whole of Europe for any workshops but the last. It also meant that the final analysis of all the results would be delayed.</p> <p><b>CONCLUSION: There were many problems in getting people to respond to our requests to take part in the questionnaire. By the last workshop, our goal had been more or less achieved with 162 answers from 36 of the 38 countries approached. Some countries are better represented than others in the answers.</b></p>								
• Task 3: Final Report on Results of Questionnaire								
Sub-task: -							Start date.1.6.2009	
No of participating partner(s)	0	1						
<p>Interim results were presented at each of the workshops. The reasons for not having a complete set of results ready has already been outlined above. By the end of the second project year the main “factual” answers (lists of addresses etc) had been summarised and an analysis of all the results had been made. It was then necessary to review the remaining data to see if any other information can be obtained from it (e.g. from a statistical analysis). It was decided that the design of the questionnaire made it unsuitable for a statistical analysis that would yield reliable results, especially as the sample used was not representative. Essentially, this questionnaire was designed as a very simple fact-finding survey.</p> <p>The presentation of the results in the report reflects this. Factual results are presented along with an analysis of the comments (achieved through a system of ‘theme coding’ based on Grounded Theory). The full report is to be found within the annexes.</p> <p><b>CONCLUSION: There are still many questions left unanswered about the state of conservation of autochthonous breeds in Europe. There is still much data to be verified. However, the results of this questionnaire go some way to providing an overview of the European situation and the opinions of the participants and is of great use to the project and, perhaps, also to a wider group of stakeholders.</b></p> <p><b>The state of conservation of autochthonous breeds in Europe is far from homogenous. Future European policy should reflect this. At present, the Common Agricultural Policy provides measures for supporting autochthonous breeds as a part of its aims to reduce the risks of environmental degradation and enhance the sustainability of agro-ecosystems. The direct payments for agri-environmental measures, which can be used to support indigenous breeds fall under the Rural Development Programme regulation (EC) 1698/2005 Axis 2 articles 39 (1)</b></p>								

*and 39 (4), under 39 (5) there is support for conservation of AnGR on a national/regional level. Additionally, regulation (EC) 1974/2006, articles 27(4) and 28(3) provide support for autochthonous breeds (and plant varieties). Research into the effectiveness of the above programmes indicates that some Member States have proposed operations for the conservation of genetic resources. Further research needs to be undertaken to see how effective these programmes are in protecting indigenous breeds and the landscapes and systems they inhabit.*

*The 12<sup>th</sup> Regular Session of the Commission on Genetic Resources, which met in late 2009, acknowledged the important contributions of small-scale livestock keepers as custodians of much of the world's animal genetic resources and their full and effective incorporation and participation in conservation work was called for. Respondents to the ELBARN questionnaire indicated that financial support for rural areas in the southern and south-eastern Europe should help maintain traditional systems where they still exist and, also, encourage their renewal in places where they have been neglected and forgotten. These systems are often perceived as being not only important for autochthonous breeds, they are also important for economic stability, rural development and nature conservation. It was also indicated that many conservation breeders in the north and north-western parts of Europe feel that important breeding work is undertaken by small scale 'hobby' farmers. These hobby farmers are an important factor in sustainable conservation of autochthonous and endangered breeds and future agricultural policy needs to reflect this.*

*Overall, the ELBARN questionnaire provided some information on the state of conservation of autochthonous and endangered breeds in Europe and, also, the opinions of the people who are working to protect these breeds. These opinions need to be taken seriously and the concerns expressed need to be analysed in further research. Most importantly, however, was the fact-finding aspect of the questionnaire, which provided many addresses and clues to where the ELBARN partners could find suitable organisations, breeders and existing establishments for the network of Ark and Rescue Stations.*

Work package number	WP 4		Start date 01.06.2007				Month 0			
Work package title: Development of Database										
No of lead partner	1									
No of participating partner(s)	0	2	3	4						
Total person-months	15,8									
<b>• Main objectives</b>										
<i>Provision of the online publicly available information about ELBARN</i>										
<b>• Task 1: Improving and expanding upon the pilot project</b>										
Sub-task 1: www.elbarn.net							Start date 01.01.2008			
No of participating partner(s)	0	1	2	3	4					
<p>There were numerous problems to present the data collected in the project in a suitable way. In order to help move from a pilot project (Arca-Net, the basis of the ELBARN database; see <a href="http://www.arca-net.info">www.arca-net.info</a> and <a href="http://www.save-foundation.net/english/PDF/Rescue.PDF">http://www.save-foundation.net/english/PDF/Rescue.PDF</a>) to the full ELBARN version, external assistance was appointed via a tender process. However, this contract was cancelled after it was decided that the task was far more complex than previously expected. It was decided to concentrate on presenting the data of ELBARN satisfactorily so that members of the public and other interested people would be able to make use of the resource. Much work has been put into this process and also into making the whole package faster and more secure.</p> <p>The ELBARN website is online and, statistics show, has been regularly visited since going live. The content and layout of the website is continuously improved in response to suggestions received. The questionnaire was run via the website plus all information about the Area Workshops (registration</p>										

etc) was made available there. After the workshops, the presentations and photos were also published online (with permission from authors).

The Guidelines (product of WP2) are also online and can be downloaded as a pdf. The 505 Breed Descriptions prepared by SAVE for the ELBARN website are now online and fully searchable. A Google map and a text search of all the Ark Centres is also available. The Area Action plans are available, with summaries in 18 languages. The ELBARN book is available to download. There is also a selection of links, to other institutions and projects and FAQ section about agrobiodiversity in general. [www.elbarn.net](http://www.elbarn.net)

The database now includes over c. 400 addresses - these are verified, updated and sorted into categories (Ark Centre etc) in WP6. All centres included have been motivated to update their own entries, to look at the website and to suggest more institutions. The c.100 addresses that were contributed via the questionnaire have also be verified via online research, categorised and added to the database. This work was undertaken by SAVE through the temporary employment of H-P Grunenfelder in Year 2.

**CONCLUSION: The ELBARN website provides an attractive and informative information source about the ELBARN project. It can be continually improved upon and new content added. The Breed Descriptions have been completed and have received interest from various stakeholders. It has been requested by the FAO that this information gets sent to all the European National Coordinators so that the direct links can be included into the DAD-IS breed data. There have also been discussions with other GENRES projects about how a data exchange can take place to integrate the Heritage Sheep and EURECA breed descriptions into ELBARN.**

<b>Work package number</b>	<b>WP5</b>	<b>Start date</b> 02.2008				<b>Month</b> 8			
<b>Work package title: Area Workshops</b>									
<b>No of lead partner</b>	1								
<b>No of participating partner(s)</b>	0	2	3	4					
<b>Total person-months</b>	26,8								
<b>• Main objectives</b>									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To organise four Area Workshops. Each Administrative Area will hold one Workshop to discuss issues relevant to the Area, to discuss the Action required to establish Ark and Rescue Centres in the Area and to appoint a First Contact person or institution to be contacted in connection with Rescue.</li> </ul>									
<b>• Task 1: Logistics of the Area Workshops</b>									
<b>Sub-task 1: Location and excursion</b>								<b>Start date</b> 02.2008	
<b>No of participating partner(s)</b>	0	1	2	3	4				
<p>This work package contained four workshops run by four of the partner organisations – SLE, GEH, RARE, EuroNatur. Each organisation has reported on their workshop for this report. SAVE helped with preparing all of the workshops, especially the content and also led work groups and plenary sessions. The preparation included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Presentations about ELBARN and the work so far,</li> <li>○ interim reports on the questionnaire,</li> <li>○ “reserve” presentations in case a speaker was unable to attend (used three times),</li> <li>○ question lists for the work group discussions,</li> <li>○ a discussion framework for the plenary sessions,</li> <li>○ a framework for preparing the AAPs.</li> </ul> <p>Alongside the preparation work, SAVE was represented by at least two members of staff at each workshop. This was very useful for passing on impressions, suggestions and ideas to the organisers of the next workshop and was essential to a good information flow between the partners and other stakeholders.</p>									

Over all it can be said that:

- The Area Workshops were very important for the implementation of the project
- There was a high level of discussion and good motivation of participants
- Very profitable knowledge exchange between organisers and participants facilitated by the transboundary approach of ELBARN
- The ELBARN idea is liked very much among the AW-attendees.
- International workshops are a very important tool for knowledge transfer
- A good communication network is needed to carry the concept into the future, some participants felt that the idea was too ambitious but many felt that it could work in their country
- ELBARN has very high interest potential for the public.
- A need was identified for a “committee” or “task force” for ELBARN on an Area or even European level. This need was addressed in the third year of the project (see WP7).
- The workshops were very important for raising awareness of the needs for adequate rescue and breeding programmes in the conservation of rare livestock breeds.

#### **Logistics of the North West Area Workshop in Gent (SLE):**

The North West Area Workshop was coordinated by Steunpunt Levend Erfgoed (SLE), the Belgian partner of the ELBARN project. The workshop was held in Monasterium PoortAckere, an old monastery in the city centre of Ghent. The accommodation was easily accessible by public transport and by car. The Monasterium offered all seminar facilities (rooms, meeting rooms, meals, etc.) in the same place and for a reasonable price. In the 'satisfaction questionnaire' all participants indicated to be very pleased with the accommodation.

For the excursion on 7th March SLE invited the participants to their Living Heritage Park in Wachtebeke where all Belgian rare breeds are shown. This park is a very good example of an Ark Centre and might also be used as a Rescue Station in future.

#### **Logistics of the Central and North East Workshop in Roznov pod Radhostem (GEH):**

The work of organizing the logistics for the workshop was undertaken by GEH. Due to the fact that the Czech Republic is holding the Presidency of the Council of the European Union in the first half of 2009 it was deemed appropriate to hold the workshop in the Czech Republic. Hotel Relax was used for the accommodation as well as for the actual workshop meetings it was chosen after an internet research for suitable premises. The Czech Government delegated Dr. Michal Milerski from the Research Institute of Animal Production in Uhrineves to welcome the participants. He did this in the traditional dress of a Wallachian shepherd of the Roznov region, playing a traditional pipe tune before giving a scientific presentation on the state of animal genetic resources in the Czech Republic.

Though 90% (out of 19 persons) of the answered satisfaction questionnaires in the category “Hotel” gave the marks 4 and 5 it was criticised that there was a lack of organic or traditional food. The organizers take this as a very good suggestion for further meetings etc.

The Wallachian Museum in Roznov was an ideal destination for an excursion and was well received by the participants. There was a tour through the museum from the staff member Dr. Vlk with an emphasis on the traditional livestock breeds they have there, first of all the herd of Wallachian sheeps. Afterwards there was a visit to Petr Simecek, a breeder from Wallachian Sheeps and Red Silesian cattle in Stare Hamry (20 km from Roznov).

#### **Logistics of the Mediterranean and South West Workshop in Legnaro (RARE):**

L. Milone from RARE organised the meeting with the help of SAVE staff. The first location chosen was Agerola, near Napoli. For the foreseen date 24 to 26 April about 30 rooms were booked by V. Peretti, a RARE member of Naples, who supported L. Milone locally on a voluntary basis. But a problem with the hotel occurred, and at the beginning of March the hotel cancelled the reservation and offered another day for the workshop (end of May). SAVE and RARE, after discussion with the project partners in Gent, refused this solution and changed the venue of the workshop, that finally took place in Legnaro, near Padova. The location was chosen by L. Milone with the voluntary support of E. Pastore, a RARE member living near Padova. By 10 March 2009 all logistic details were clarified and the already prepared invitations were adapted to the new venue and sent out one week

later. The foreseen budget was sufficient also for the workshop organised in Padova. The workshop was held at the "Corte Benedettina", home of the "Veneto Agricoltura" Editor and facility of the Faculty of Agraria of the University of Padova. As there was an interest in providing an excursion to see a concrete example of conservation of rare breeds, it was organized a visit to the barn of the nearby Faculty of Agriculture of the University of Padova, where some local sheep breeds are kept, and a second excursion to the town of Polverara, home of the biggest Italian rescue centre for poultry breeds. Improvements that could have been made (according to satisfaction questionnaires) were: 1) more time for discussion on a 1 to 1 basis; 2) the contribution of speakers could have been more participative; 3) more speakers invited.

#### **Logistics of the South East Workshop in Blagoevgrad (EuroNatur):**

The choice of the hosting country was in this case restricted to EU-members. For SEE, only Bulgaria and Romania fulfil this requirement.

The Area Workshop (AW) for South East Europe (SEE) was the only one organised by a local Area Coordinator who is not part of the organisation, as foreseen in the Annex I of the Grant Agreement. For the decision of the appointment of the Area Coordinator to support us with the organisation of the logistics, we were looking for possible partners with the best references. The choice was taken on the Bulgarian Biodiversity Fund (BBF) due to their experience in this matter: the IUCN SEE meeting 2008 was arranged by them

Looking for a suitable location for the workshop, a few criteria had to be fulfilled:

1. good accessibility
2. nearby an interesting place for the topic-related excursion
3. suitable conference and accommodation facilities available

The region around Blagoevgrad seemed to be the ideal venue for the workshop: only 100 km away from Sofia Airport, next to the old breeds arc farm of Semperviva Society in Vlahi / Pirin Mountains and with appropriate hotel & conference infrastructure. BBF made a visit on the spot and submitted tenders of two different locations who had the requested capacities available in the foreseen period of 7 to 10 May 2009. Hotel Kristo in Blagoevgrad was chosen because they could offer all facilities – enough guest and conference rooms and a restaurant – on the same spot.

Due to the fact that most of countries of the area defined in the Grant Agreement are non-EU-members, it was foreseeable that the organisation of the SEE AW would take quite a lot of time and effort. Without the professional help of the appointed area coordinator, BBF, the set up of the workshop logistics would have been a huge problem. The cooperation with BBF was very satisfactory and their contribution to the AW indispensable.

The excursion to the Ark & Rescue Centre in Vlahi turned out to be a highlight for the participants, because it is a prime example for A & RC in the region. Such a well managed breed centre is quite unusual for the area; the visitors were very interested to see a real ark farm keeping old breeds such as Karakachan sheep, dogs and horses as well as Kalofer goats.

According to the results of the satisfaction questionnaires, the majority of the participants were very satisfied and satisfied with the logistics of the AW in Bulgaria (85,52%). Medium satisfaction was marked by 11, 84%, only 2,86 % evaluated the venue as being rather bad. We consider these to be very good results.

***CONCLUSION: Apart from the cancellation of the hotel in Italy, the logistics of all the workshops were successful and appreciated by the participants. The smooth running of the workshops was instrumental in promoting a relaxed atmosphere amongst the participants and this aided the discussions.***

Sub-task 2: Identification of Participants for the AWs						Start date 08.2008		
No of participating partner(s)	0	1	2	3	4			
<p>With the support of the SAVE staff, each Area Coordinator made a list of potential invitees to include Ark Farms, NGO people, Universities, Governments, agro-environmental organisations, veterinaries, national coordinators FAO, breed organisations, etc. It was planned to have about 40 participants for each workshop. Due to various reasons, such as budget, difficulty contacting people, cancellations etc, this target was not reached but each workshop had a good range of participants from most countries and stakeholder levels. Attendance ranged from 27-35, depending on the Area.</p> <p><b>CONCLUSION: A very constructive working atmosphere occurred among the attendees, which led to very productive discussions. People participating at the workshop were very interested and cooperative and stated that they had been inspired to try out the ELBARN idea in their own countries. The contribution of the numerous participants from non-EU-countries were invaluable and we acknowledge the fact that the AGRI GENRES Team allowed all of them to attend the workshop. There was good cooperation between organising partners for each workshop.</b></p>								
Sub-task 3: Identifying Themes and Speakers for the AWs						Start date 10.2008		
No of participating partner(s)	0	1	2	3	4			
<p>After the Central Workshop in Kutna Hora it became clear that ELBARN would need more input about specific regulations in case of diseases, transport and quarantine. During the partner meeting in Kozard (June 2008) it was decided that the North West Area workshop would also focus on this topic. By choosing Belgium and the Brussels area as place to hold the workshop, it became easier to invite specialists from EU and OIE to discuss regulation, diseases and contingency plans for Rare Breed conservation.</p> <p>Four speakers where invited: two veterinaries from the European Commission and OIE, and two speakers who discussed their experiences with past outbreaks in their country. Information from these presentations was subsequently presented as a summary at the other three workshops. See Annexes.</p> <p>The emphasis for the area North and Central Europe was on the sustainable use and management of genetic resources, including the questions how to sustain Ark and Rescue Centres in the long term and the experience of different marketing strategies.</p> <p>Five speakers were chosen to introduce the themes of the workshop in Legnaro:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) an overview of the situation of the agrobiodiversity in two Mediterranean countries.</li> <li>2) examples of practical projects for the conservation of animal biodiversity.</li> </ol> <p>As the SEE region is lagging behind in the development of rescue centres, a country was selected which is leading in the preservation of old breeds. In SEE this is clearly Croatia, where since the early 1990s a programme for the preservation of old breeds is active.</p> <p><b>CONCLUSION:</b>  <b>The presentations were very helpful in closing gaps in knowledge and for inspiring with new ideas. They provided a good entry to the work group discussions and AAP preparation process.</b></p>								

Sub-task 4: Assessing the needs of the Area						Start date 10.2008		
No of participating partner(s)	0	1	2	3	4			
<p>The questionnaire, coupled with experience, provided good methods of assessing the needs of the Areas. The discussion that followed the presentation of the questionnaire results of each area was a good way of provoking participants to talk about specific needs of the area. All areas were identified as “unique” in some respects and most participants had the feeling that they had the biggest problems with animal diseases compared to the rest of Europe. The participants in the north of Europe felt that rare breeds were generally well managed but required better promotion and structures. It was clear that there is room for improvement on the structural level as well – even though there are breed organisations, there is no quality control of the work they are doing. Good communication between the different stakeholder levels and agents (breeder, government, vets etc) is essential.</p> <p>In the southern areas there was a feeling that the discourse on animal genetic resources is dominated by the northern countries, whilst much of the diversity is in the south of Europe. It was also pointed out that many southern and eastern animal breeders are still farming in traditional structures and are upholding not only breeds but also whole ecosystems with their activities. In contrast, the northern keepers are often hobby farmers or farmers with commercial herds who keep rare breeds as a side-line. It was felt that this disparity was not sufficiently addressed by European and national policies and, also, in all areas the participants considered that awareness and interest are too limited in favour of conservation farming systems.</p> <p><b>CONCLUSION:</b>  <i>Discussing the needs of the areas led to some very lively and interesting debates and discussions, which often carried on during coffee breaks and meals. Through the questionnaire and the involvement in the Area Workshops, each participant and organiser has a good overview of their own area. Due to taking part in all the workshops, SAVE is now fortunate enough to have a good overview of the situation in the whole of Europe – especially the opinions of the grassroots stakeholders.</i></p>								
Sub-task 5: Work Groups						Start date 03.2009		
No of participating partner(s)	0	1	2	3	4			
<p>At each Area Workshop, participants were divided into work groups (voluntary division) to discuss the issues of the rescue process and conservation and, in the other work group, sustainability. In Roznov, it was decided to split into three work groups and tackle the question ‘rescue in the case of disease’ separately to ‘how to save nucleus herds’.</p> <p><b>CONCLUSION: these work group discussions were very productive with many misunderstandings being clarified and, also, many questions or uncertain points being addressed. The work group discussions form the basis of the Area Action Plans (see Annexes)</b></p>								
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Task 2: Completion of Area Action Plans</b></li> </ul>								
Sub-task 1: Composition						Start date 1.6.2009		
No of participating partner(s)	0	1	2	3	4			
<p>The Area Action Plans (AAPs) have been composed from the discussions at the Area Workshops. They include an overview of the Area plus a ‘vision’ of how the participants could see ELBARN functioning in their Area. The necessary action discussed at the workshops is also presented.</p> <p>Each partner wrote the AAP that belonged to the Area they had administered for the Area Workshops. Participants from the Area Workshops were encouraged to take part in this process. Although not every participant took part in the process, when the drafts of the AAPs were sent round for approval, there were no negative comments. From this it is assumed that the AAPs can be seen as representing the opinions of the participants at the Area Workshops.</p>								

The basic format for the AAPs had already been proposed in a joint draft by EuroNatur and SAVE and the AAP for the south eastern Europe Area, written by EuroNatur and SAVE together, was available as a resource for the other partners to glean ideas from. The AAP preparation was a very interesting tool to compare and relate the different countries and participants.

**CONCLUSION: The writing of the AAPs was relatively labour intensive but was an excellent process to distil the essence of what the Area Workshop participants actually want and expect from ELBARN and from fellow stakeholders. As a guide to future action in Europe, these documents are essential.**

**Sub-task 2: Publication**

**Start date**1.6.2009

<b>No of participating partner(s)</b>	0	1	2	3	4				
---------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	--	--	--	--

In order to publish a high-quality and useful document, it was decided to make use of a copyreader. A tender process (see annexes) was undertaken and it was decided to use the services of Miss V. Harley. Due to the fact that the publications were to be made in English and were largely contributed to and written by non-native English speakers, using a copywriter was very helpful in producing a well written and standardised text.

The graphic design and layout of the publications matches the previously chosen design of the guidelines. Some of the lessons learnt from the difficulties in the Guideline publication process helped greatly to speed up the process of publication of the AAPs. However, there were still difficulties encountered, often exacerbated by the geographical distance between the partners making it difficult to discuss.

It was decided to include a one page summary of the AAPs at the beginning of each and to translate this summary into the languages of the Area in order to make it more accessible. Partners sought out translators in their Areas, generally approaching the people who had already helped with the questionnaire translations or people who had become involved in the ELBARN process.

**CONCLUSION: The preparation and publication of the AAPs was also a labour intensive and difficult process. However, the partners are happy with the results of the effort and the AAPs are well received.**

**Sub-task 3: Distribution**

**Start date**1.6.2009

<b>No of participating partner(s)</b>	0	1	2	3	4				
---------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	--	--	--	--

- Each Area Coordinator (AC) was responsible for the dissemination of his/her AAPs
- EuroNatur prepared, with the help of SAVE, a standard letter to go with the AAPs and forwarded it to all partners
- Each workshop participant and each author of pictures received 2 – 3 prints
- National Contact Points should receive more copies
- Each AC decided, which Ark Centres should receive AAPs and how many
- The same applies for organisers of relevant conferences, meetings and seminars.
- To avoid overlaps, the AC contacted SAVE as they also have AAPs of all four regions to disseminate them at such events.

- Everyone had to find out the best way to disseminate the AAPs for themselves
- A name list with number of received copies was kept by all ACs as an evidence of the distribution of copies.
- The AAPs were announced on DAD-Net as available on the ELBARN website as a pdf to download and, also, per post in return for a contribution to P&P.
- **CONCLUSION: The process of distributing began immediately after the partners received copies at the partner meeting in June 2009. The process of distributing the AAPs is ongoing as some AAPs have been reserved for events taking place later in the year – e.g. the SLE Expo, the SAVE annual meeting etc. It is intended to distribute all of the AAPs to stakeholders throughout Europe.**

<b>Work package number</b>	<b>WP6</b>	<b>Start date</b> 01.12.2008				<b>Month</b> 18			
<b>Work package title: Data Collection and Entry into the Database</b>									
<b>No of lead partner</b>	1								
<b>No of participating partner(s)</b>		0	2	3	4				
<b>Total person-months</b>	7,9								

• **Main objectives**

*To collect and enter data into the ELBARN Database*

• **Task 1: preparation of already existing data, breed descriptions**

<b>Sub-task: -</b>					<b>Start date</b> 01.12.2008			
<b>No of participating partner(s)</b>	0	1	2	3	4			

Work Package 6: Data Collection and Entry into the Database was due to start in month 22. In fact, this WP started early in month 18. Although the database was not yet ready to receive data at this point, the concept was prepared as part of WP3: Questionnaire. The data was then prepared, this entailed entering the questionnaire answers into the online form (please see the section on WP3 for exact details on this) and also entering all the provided addresses of potential Ark Centres into the old Arca-Net database, so that they could be simply transferred into the new database when the time came.

Lastly, the “Breed Descriptions” as described in the section on WP4 Database were entered into an Access database. Thus, a large amount of data has already been processed – this meant that, when the database was updated, it already had a range of data in it for people to look at and use. The process then began to verify and complete the data:

- Collection of more breed data - datasets on breeds not already included were requested from partners and organisations.
- Collection of more potential A&RC addresses – participants from the Area Workshops plus other partners and organisations were asked to provide more addresses.
- Expert volunteers were asked to visit interesting potential A&RCs to verify their existence and suitability. This was especially necessary for Rescue Centres and also A&RCs offering a unique feature which may be interesting to other A&RCs. These volunteers needed to have a good knowledge of the project and of the needs of the area they visit. A list of suitability criteria for these volunteers was drawn up by the project partners.

Criteria for suitability as volunteer “verifier” of A&RCs:

- Good understanding of the aims and objectives of ELBARN
- Knowledge of the area especially: the needs of the area, the objectives of the Area Action Plan, the agricultural systems and breeds found in the area
- Trusted and proven working relationship with the ELBARN partners

**CONCLUSION: There is now a lot of data in the database and it is all made available on the ELBARN website [www.elbarn.net](http://www.elbarn.net)**

• **Task 2: Verification and Publication of Data**

<b>Sub-task 1: Verification Tours</b>							<b>Start date</b> 1.06.2009	
<b>No of participating partner(s)</b>		1						

The data collected from the questionnaires needed to be checked and completed. Partners agreed on following procedure at the Partner Meeting 16-17 June 2009:

- SAVE should provide the list of potential stations to the PPs
- A list of criteria for rescue centres should be made
- Expert volunteers will be asked to visit interesting potential A&RCs to verify their existence and suitability, travel costs will be reimbursed but no personnel costs.
- The process of visiting the sites has to start in early autumn

This process was further discussed at the next Partner Meeting 29-30 October 2009. The discussion led to following results:

- Partners should send out a questionnaire (inventory, free space available, choice if their addresses will be published online) to the listed possible A&RC's of 'their' area
- Partners should subsequently send out a reminder
- Decision to be made about necessary visit tours
- Decision about deliverables (inventory/letter of intent/agreement/contract)
- If no A&RC available, an approach could be developed together with national contact point and/or national organisations. SAVE will ask, if the persons on the first-contact-list would be ready to answer questions regarding ELBARN and/or translate and pass it to SAVE
- The process of sending out questionnaires was not successful, hardly any rescue centres could be verified by this process as the reply level was low to non-existent. Search tours were already implemented by SAVE to south eastern Europe to visit interesting potential A&RCs to verify their existence and suitability. This was especially necessary for Rescue Centres and also A&RCs offering a unique feature which may be interesting to other A&RCs. The criteria for suitable volunteers to undertake this work was already drawn up and mentioned in the last section.

In the light of the above, SAVE volunteered to send Mr. H-P Grünenfelder on a number of tours. The decision to make two tours already in the late autumn, before the 3<sup>rd</sup> partner meeting, was made due to the onset of winter making travel more difficult. A report of the tours was submitted by Mr. Grünenfelder for the use of the ELBARN project and is included in the annexes.

***CONCLUSION: Three verification tours have been undertaken. The success of these tours shows that this concept could be useful in other parts of Europe, especially in those regions where contact to stakeholders is weak. As with all the further work required ELBARN, this idea will be incorporated into other, ongoing projects and/or become a small project in its own right.***

<b>Sub-task 2: Publications online</b>							<b>Start date</b> 1.06.2009	
<b>No of participating partner(s)</b>		0	1					

The printed publications from the project were prepared by EuroNatur for publication online. These were then added to the website by SAVE so that the full range of the project documents is available to the public.

In order to present the visitor with a multi-lingual option, the translated summaries of the Area Action Plans have been incorporated into a map. These summaries also include the national contact point, where there is one available. In this way, the visitor who does not understand English has a means to find out more about the project, making the project more accessible.

The visitor data for [www.elbarn.net](http://www.elbarn.net) shows that the site is regularly visited 400-500 times per month (unique visitors). Visitors look at all the information available and not just at the homepage.

**CONCLUSION: The website now includes the full range of the ELBARN publications and information. This makes it an interesting and useful website to visit.**

<b>Sub-task 3: National Contact Points</b>						<b>Start date</b> 1.06.2009		
<b>No of participating partner(s)</b>		1						

At the beginning of December 2009, a letter was sent out to an agreed (by project partners) list of potential 'national contact points'. 15 people have already agreed to have their name included into the contact list. For the remaining countries either a reminder to the person contacted is needed or a more suitable person needs to be identified. This task is a part of the ongoing process.

Countries with contact points:

Albania, Belgium, Croatia, Denmark, France, FYROM, Greece, Italy, Kosovo, Lithuania, Netherlands, Norway, Serbia, (Spain), Switzerland, UK.

**CONCLUSION: in 15 cases, people have immediately agreed to take part in ELBARN as a national contact person. For many of the other countries in Europe, the ELBARN project partners have already approached the most likely seeming people. This list will have to be reassessed and potential contact points either re-contacted or alternatives found. This process will continue.**

<b>Sub-task 4: Collection of more data A&amp;RCs and Breed Descriptions</b>						<b>Start date</b> 1.06.2009		
<b>No of participating partner(s)</b>		0	1	2	3	4		

As has already been mentioned, the Breed Descriptions already prepared in the 2<sup>nd</sup> project year have been published online. There has been a lot of interest in these descriptions and enquiries about data-sharing or incorporating other information into the database. This exchange is on-going: data from Spanish organisations is being prepared for incorporation into ELBARN. Also, the ELBARN Breed Descriptions have been sent via the FAO to all National Coordinators and a link between ELBARN and the other relevant GENRES projects is being established.

The collection of information on Ark Centres continues. Some further Ark Centres have been discovered on the already mentioned Rescue Centre verification tours and, also, potential Ark Centres have been reported to us by email. It is expected that Ark Centres will reach saturation point at ca. 500 centres – albeit some are only suitable for inclusion in Arca-Net as they do not all fulfil the ELBARN criteria or they are only concerned with plant genetic resources.

**CONCLUSION: This subtask will remain on-going as long as further data is received.**

<b>Work package number</b>	<b>WP7</b>	<b>Start date</b> 01.06.2009	<b>Month</b> 24
<b>Work package title:</b> <i>Final Report, Publicity, Motivation</i>			
<b>No of lead partner</b>	0,1		
<b>No of participating partner(s)</b>	2	3	4
<b>Total person-months</b>	10,2		

• **Main objectives**

*To produce a Final Report on the state of ELBARN and the future plans. To produce publicity material to promote the Database. To motivate governments, institutions and individuals to become involved in ELBARN, by use of relevantly translated publicity material.*

• **Task 1: Final Publications and PR**

<b>Sub-task 1: Preparation of the ELBARN book and Flyers</b>	<b>Start date</b> 01.06.2009
<b>No of participating partner(s)</b>	0

The idea to write a 'book' rather than a 'report' on ELBARN as part of this work package came out of discussions at the Area Workshops where it was asked how to better present information about livestock breeds conservation to the public and to the media. This idea was first broached at the partner meeting 16-17 June 2009. A rough idea was then worked out bilaterally between EuroNatur and SAVE and was subsequently presented to the project partners at the partner meeting in October 2009.

It was decided to address the issues around conservation, explaining what agrobiodiversity is, why it is endangered, why it is important and how ELBARN contributes to conservation.

This rough plan was then made more concrete at the partner meeting 29-30 October 2009 where it was decided that EuroNatur and SAVE should coordinate this process based on the discussion between the partners. It was decided that the book should also include a large amount of case studies, should be interesting to flick through with plenty of pictures and should also present a small profile of each of the project partners. A list of possible case studies and people to contact was also drawn up at the partner meeting.

The road map set out the exact timing of each step of the publication process and, also, the responsibilities. Each partner was given case studies to produce and was also asked to find suitable photos. The editing of the publication as well as the main texts of the book were undertaken by SAVE.

The flyers were created alongside the book, with a similar layout. They were then translated into 9 languages. The flyers contain some basic information about ELBARN, list the information and publications available, give contact details and also have a form for requesting or providing more information.

***CONCLUSION: The process of producing the text for the book proceeded exceedingly well and it made clear how the ELBARN team worked together, which was a good reflection of the previous years of the project. It was very helpful to have face-to-face meetings during this process as many points cannot be properly explained by email. Over all, this was an enriching experience for all involved.***

<b>Sub-task 2: Publication and Distribution</b>	<b>Start date</b> 01.06.2009
<b>No of participating partner(s)</b>	0

The copy reading and editorial help was, as with the AAPs, provided by Miss V. Harley. This assistance from a professional copy reader and native English speaker helped the process incredibly and led to the desired result of a highly accessible text to compliment the range of photos and information.

The graphic design and layout of the book followed in the same style as the previous publications, which has resulted in a pleasing presentation package for ELBARN containing Guidelines, AAPs, Book and Flyer.

Both the book and the flyers have been widely distributed (see annexes). The book has been especially well received, so well that a re-print has already been made.

**CONCLUSION: The book has been exceedingly well received and the partners all have copies that still need to be distributed. This distribution will continue after the end of the project period, many copies are already reserved for various fairs, workshops and conferences taking place in the next year.**

**Sub-task 3: Presentations and Publicity**

**Start date** 01.06.2009

<b>No of participating partner(s)</b>	0	1	2	3	4			
---------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	--	--	--

ELBARN and its results and ideas have been presented at various conferences and workshops. The presentations are included in the annexes. The list of events that ELBARN was presented at plus publications is to be found in the section Dissemination of Results:

**CONCLUSION: it was possible to present ELBARN to a variety of audiences throughout the year. The presentations were all received with interest and usually resulted in questions or subsequent contact by email. Various articles were also published about ELBARN and also resulted in contacts and questions. From this it is possible to assume that there is a growing amount of people who are interested in seeing ELBARN continue into the future.**

**Sub-task 4: Task Force**

**Start date.....**

<b>No of participating partner(s)</b>	P..							
---------------------------------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

The Area Workshops emphasised the need for a pan-European group who would communicate the national and area interests of stakeholders up to a governmental level.

To gain recognition for problems and needs on a national level and also act as a lobbying instrument to improve EU legislation affecting autochthonous breeds.

The ELBARN project partners decided to already create a small but effective Task Force to tackle some of the most pressing needs made up of ELBARN partner organisations and other people who have shown interest and commitment to the project.

**CONCLUSION:**  
**The three year concerted action has resulted in a well-networked and motivated group of people, this resource needs to be cared for and maintained for the future continuation of the project.**

**This kind of work is exceedingly difficult to fund, especially for an NGO partnership relying on grants and sponsorship. It is the opinion of the ELBARN Task Force that this type of coordination work - collaborative, cross-border, inclusive of all stakeholder levels – is essential for the long-term success of conservation.**

**Therefore, we feel it is essential that a new work programme that includes such concerted actions is prepared by the Commission so that the good work started under the current work programme can continue on a European level.**

### 3. PROGRESS OF ACTION

#### Overview of deliverables

<i>Deliverable number</i>	<i>Planned completion</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Status</i>		
			<i>Achieved</i>	<i>On going*</i>	<i>Not started yet*</i>
D.1	Month 8	Central Workshop	Month 8		
D.2	Month 22	Products of Transnational Work Groups	Month 22		
D.3	Month 22	Questionnaire	Month 29		
D 3.1	Month 22	Database ready for data to be entered	Month 24		
D.4	Month 22	Area Workshop	Month 22-24		
D.5	Month 22	Area Action Plans	Month 33		
D.6	Month 22	Database online	Month 24		
D.7	Month 36	Final Report [ELBARN Book]	Month 35		
D.8	Month 36	Publicity Material	Month 35		

\*: If applicable, enter a **X** in the appropriate cell

**Overview of milestones**

<i>Milestone number</i>	<i>Planned completion</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Status</i>		
			<i>Achieved</i>	<i>On going*</i>	<i>Not started yet*</i>
M.1	Month 8	Central Workshop	Month 8		
M.2	Month 22	Questionnaire	Month 29		
M 2.1	Month 22	Database ready for data to be entered	Month 24		
M.3	Month 22	Area Workshops	Month 22-24		
M.4	Month 36	Database (WP6)	Month 36		
M.5	Month 22	Area Action Plans	Month 33		
M.6	Month 36	Final Report [ELBARN Book]	Month 36		

\*: If applicable, enter a **X** in the appropriate cell

#### 4. SUMMARY OF TECHNICAL PROBLEM(S) ENCOUNTERED (IF ANY)

- *Changes in the action's management structure (if any)*

**NO CHANGES**

## 5. SUMMARY OF THE MANAGEMENT OF THE ACTION

- **Meetings, workshops and seminars organised by the coordinator and the partners**

### Meetings and Workshops

In order to improve the internal communication, several partner meetings were organised during the three years of the project.

Sep. 2007	Partner meeting, Guastalla, Italy
Jun. 2008	Partner meeting, Kozard, Hungary
Jan. 2009	Partner meeting, Radolfzell, Germany
Mar. 2009	Partner meeting and Area Workshop North West Europe, Ghent, Belgium
Jun. 2009	Partner meeting, Radolfzell, Germany
Oct. 2009	Partner meeting, Radolfzell, Germany
Feb. 2010	Partner meeting, Radolfzell, Germany

Partners met also during the workshops that were essential parts of the project implementation.

Feb. 2008	Central Workshop, Kutna Hora, Czech Republic
Mar. 2009	Area Workshop Central and North East Europe, Roznov, Czech Republic
Apr. 2009	Area Workshop Mediterranean Area, Legnaro, Italy
May 2009	Area Workshop South Eastern Europe, Blagoevgrad, Bulgaria

Additionally, there were bilateral meetings between SAVE and EuroNatur – in the final year on monthly basis.

It turned out that the partner meetings were very useful and improved the work flow and the communication among all partners. There have also been numerous emails sent to keep partners informed, to ask questions, share information. Also the communication on the phone was very intensive.

### Summary of reasons for the budget changes

#### Personnel Costs

The Commission's decision to consider the expenses for Mr. J. Aerts as "External assistance" – not as Personnel costs – is the most important amendment of budget in the third year. As described already in the previous report, the budget line "External assistance" has been significantly less used than was foreseen. Instead, the partner organizations required more means for personnel costs.

The consequence of these developments was that fundamental changes of the budget were not necessary after the above mentioned rearrangement of the costs by AGRI GEN RES. But the budget in the cost category "Personnel costs", which was initially allocated for five organizations, was in fact spent by only four NGOs. Essential reasons for this were:

- The organization of the Area Workshops was done by the project partners themselves and not, as planned, by appointed external Area Coordinators.
- Further in-house efforts that were not planned in the application, e.g. the efforts for the obtainment of the cost-free translations for the publications, the labour done for the database and website etc.
- The audit held in May 2010, which was time-consuming in the preparation, realization and post-processing.

- The general administrative work for the project coordination, which was not foreseeable in this dimension, and was – in our opinion – entailed by over-regulation, the complexity of the policies and procedures and also the very detailed justifications that were required; for example the question whether it would be possible to use Zurich airport for travels within the project or the question regarding meals in connection with meetings and workshops.

The overall expenditures for personnel exceed the initially budgeted amount with almost 4 TEUR, whereof 2.2 TEUR can be covered by a shift from the category “Consumables”. This shift does not exceed the 10% ceiling.

### **External Assistance**

The funds of this budget category were, as shown in the interim reports, used less in the first and second project year. This changed after the new classification of the costs for Mr. J. Aerts by AGRI GEN RES and in consequence a shift in the amount of 4 TEUR from “Travel costs” to “External assistance” became necessary. This amount is below the 10 % ceiling. The expenditures of “External assistance” are - despite of this shift - not covered completely by the budget.

### **Consumables**

Large parts of the expenditures in this category fell upon printed matter. Despite a re-print of the ELBARN book the budget for “Consumables” could not be spent entirely. 2.2 TEUR of the remaining sum could be transferred to the category “Personnel costs”, at which this amount lies as well below the 10% ceiling.

### **Travel costs**

Reduction of costs through synergy effects led to the consequence that the budget line „Travel costs“ has not been spent completely. This made it possible to shift funds in the amount of 4 TEUR to “External assistance” with the aim to cover at least some of the additional costs in that category.

## **Discrepancies in person months between the action description and the final report**

### **General clarification of the use of person months :**

The reasons for the discrepancies in person-months between the action description and this report are versatile. One of the general reasons for the increase is the relation to the budget changes between ‘personnel’ and ‘external assistance’ costs, outlined already on page 32 – 33 of the final report.

Another reason for the mentioned discrepancy is the difference between the assumed daily rate used in the application and the real daily rate from the financial statement. Apparently the daily rate for all staff which was working for the ELBARN project was lower, which gave us the opportunity to invest more person months.

### **Specific clarification of the use of person months for WP 2 (Transnational Work Groups):**

Excerpt from the additional technical information to the first interim technical report (2008), page 4:

*The non-reported problem of using more man hours than initially budgeted for is acknowledged. As the expert rightfully states, this increase is reasonable. The Work Groups 1 & 4, in particular, have led to considerably more work than we anticipated when drawing up the project in 2005. Some of the extra time used for WP2 was “borrowed” from WP1 as there was considerable overlap in the tasks of preparing for the Central Workshop and preparing for the Work Groups – which met at the CW.*

*Work Group 1 has gaps in knowledge (highlighted in report and reflected in survey of participants) which need to be closed. Significant time was spent prior to the workshop to seek out participants for this work group that would provide the knowledge required. It would seem that very few people actually fully understand the legislation in Europe. [...]*

Excerpt from the second interim technical report (2009), page 62:

*[...] For WP 2 and 3, more time was needed than was planned. In the planning phase, the time required was underestimated. In particular, in WP2 it was planned to gain input from external assistance, however, this was not required. [...]*

The original project budget contained estimated costs in the category 'external assistance' allocated for Transnational Work Groups in the amount of 24'240 Euro (Form A 3.7).

Excerpt from the additional technical information to the second interim technical report (2009), page 1:

*[...] As stated in the Interim Technical Report (p 62) the number of person/months used for WP 2 (5.8) was higher than planned (2.5). The main reason that led to this development was the complexity of subject matters and the appearance of new questions during the work group discussions with the participating specialists and stakeholders. The Guidelines were originally intended to be no more than the minutes of the work group meetings of the Central Workshop in Kutna Hora, Feb. 2008. However, as there were many open questions and ideas that needed further work, the Guidelines took longer to produce than foreseen. This led to an increased need of manpower, but the further progress of the action clearly showed that these efforts have been very much appreciated by the target group of ELBARN and improved its implementation. The publication of the Guidelines, both in printed form and online, has been welcomed by many stakeholders in Europe. The ideas contained within them are being incorporated into similar projects, even as far away as South America. [...]*

### **Specific clarification of the use of person months for WP 3 (Questionnaire):**

Excerpt from the second interim technical report (2009), page 10:

*It was intended to make the questionnaire as accessible as possible and, therefore, it was translated into 19 languages. In order to speed up the analysis, the questionnaire was constructed as an online form that would save answers directly into a database. This online form was only in English, but the translations were provided as PDFs, also on the ELBARN website. Participants were also given the option of printing out the questionnaire and sending it to SAVE by fax, post or email. As the online option was the easiest, it was assumed that people would use this option and that there would be very little work involved in dealing with the data. Unfortunately, some participants did not seem to want to use the online version or even understand how it worked – it was a very simple process to type in the answers and then click on submit, so we were very surprised by this reluctance. In response to this, the options to download the questionnaire as a Word document or as a PDF form were also offered on the ELBARN*

website. However, c. 85 responses were submitted on paper and had to be typed into the database by SAVE. Additionally, some of the comments were written in a variety of languages (we had asked, when possible, for participants to respond in English, German or French). SAVE was able to cope with this work load through the assistance on T. Mayer, who was temporarily employed in Konstanz. The combination of his language skills and also the voluntary help of SAVE contacts meant that the questionnaire replies could be typed into the database without too much trouble. However, this work required many hours of work, especially when answers were handwritten and not typed.

**CONCLUSION: There were surprising difficulties with the online submission of the questionnaire. It would seem that many of the stakeholders approached had little experience of filling in forms online. However, after a larger than expected time investment, the questionnaires were prepared for the analysis.**

Excerpt from the second interim technical report (2009), page 11:

*[...] As can be seen from the above email, it was intended that the questionnaires would all be returned by the end of December 2008. However, this was not the case. There was a lot of effort required to motivate people to take part. The people who had been invited but had not yet given an answer were sent reminders in the first weeks of January. [...]*

Excerpt from the second interim technical report (2009), page 62:

*[...] For WP 2 and 3, more time was needed than was planned. In the planning phase, the time required was underestimated. [...] WP3 also had external assistance planned in – however, this was compensated with work times from the project partners. [...]*

The original project budget contained estimated costs in the category 'external assistance' allocated for Questionnaire translations in the amount of 6'000 Euro (Form A 3.7).

#### **Specific clarification of the use of person months for WP 4 (Development of Database):**

Excerpt from the additional technical information to the first interim technical report (2008), page 1:

*[...] An unforeseen problem occurred (July/August 2008, after the submission of the Technical Report) – the database was “hacked” by an unknown, external person/entity. This led to the database being removed from the internet, it was then repaired. Options for identifying and closing any security gaps are currently being explored. The database remains on schedule to be completed by month 22, in time for the Area Workshops. [...]*

Excerpt from the third interim technical report (2010), page 24:

*A problem that has accompanied the whole project has been the presentation of the data on the website. In the second project year, it was decided to use external assistance. A tender process led to the choice of G.E.T Internet Services to provide this assistance. Unfortunately, the tasks required of G.E.T Internet Services proved to be more complex than anticipated and it was decided (at the partner meetings) to cancel the contract with G.E.T Internet Services and to find a new solution. Mr. Grant of G.E.T Internet Services agreed to this solution and signed a letter to this effect (see annexes). The website was completed by SAVE Foundation using the suggestions of the whole ELBARN team. We are now satisfied that the website meets the expectations of the project.*

### **Specific clarification of the use of person months for WP 5 (Area Workshops) :**

Excerpt from the second interim technical report (2009), pages 56/57:

*Many members of the ELBARN Team who were responsible for the Workshops attended at least two workshops, this lead to recommendations and ideas for improvements – the “lessons learnt” from the first workshop were one of the main discussion points at the partner meeting in Ghent. A similar de-briefing occurred within SAVE after each of the following workshops as SAVE carried the main responsibility for the work group discussions and the plenary sessions. It was also possible to pass comments and opinions from the participants (e.g. via the satisfaction questionnaire) on to the next organiser so that improvements could be made.*

*Due to the above outlined delays of the Area Workshops, the planned completion of the Area Action Plans has been delayed until 31st August (deadline set in agreement with all project partners). However, this is not the only reason for the delay. At the workshops it became clear that much more groundwork was needed to help participants to understand the aims and goals of the project. This ranged from not seeing the need for rescue through not understanding the concept of an Ark station to wanting to move the discussion outside of the parameters of the project. Many of the participants very much enjoyed the chance to exchange experience, ideas and knowledge on an international level and also meeting new people. Networking is an important aspect of creating an Ark and Rescue Net and this side of the workshop was encouraged. The strict question catalogue prepared for the work groups helped to focus the discussion upon the issues really under scrutiny and this work was essential to provide direction for the last plenary session, which focussed on the Area Action Plans. In the planning phase it was expected that the discussion in this last plenary session would end in a first rough draft of an Area Action Plan. However, the above mentioned factors influenced the discussion. Another, unexpected, factor was the exhaustion of the participants. The participants in Ghent drew attention to the fact that, for many people, two days speaking English was very hard work and the discussions in the work group had been very intense. This lead to a decision to run the last plenary session slightly differently, this*

*was most successful in Blagoevgrad. The participants were presented with a summary of their conclusions in the plenary and asked to say where they agreed and where they wanted additions or changes made.*

*This means that the process in Blagoevgrad has taken us closer to the desired goal of a “first rough draft”. However, in compiling the discussions in Ghent, for example, it is possible to see that the material for the AAP is all present, it just needs much sorting and editing. As already mentioned the deadline of 31st August has now been fixed and the Area Action Plans will then be published as a part of WP7.*

Excerpt from the additional technical information to the second interim technical report (2009), page 3:

*a) Discrepancy between Grant Agreement and Technical Report concerning lead partners:*

*For this WP, Partners 0,2,3 and 4 were foreseen in the Grant Agreement (p 58) as lead partners. According to this information, the participation of SAVE was not foreseen. But the possibility of organisational changes for this WP is mentioned in the “Detailed Implementation Plan” on p 52 of the Grant Agreement: “As explained above, organisation of the Area Workshops will ideally be delegated to the Area Coordinators. As a contingency, SAVE and/or the Project Partners will organise the Area Workshops.”*

*As described in the report, we have not appointed any external Area Coordinators for the running of the Area Workshops. Instead, SAVE and the partner organisations took over the workload. Of course, a certain overall coordination and management was needed, a task perfectly fulfilled again by SAVE (e.g. set up of a catalogue of questions and tasks for the work groups, taking over the chair of work groups, presence at all Area Workshops, guidance regarding invitation lists etc.) But, as the evaluator has correctly remarked, the workshop leadership was carried out by the individual partner – with background help from SAVE.*

*b) Why several problems mentioned in the report have not been taken into account during the planning of the Workshop logistics:*

*It was hard to anticipate all possible problems in detail, because some of the problems occurred were not foreseeable, e.g. hotel difficulties in Italy: The location was booked and suddenly the hotel came up with the information that there was a double booking and the workshop cannot be held there. Incidents like these have their cause outside of the sphere of influence of the organisers. Other problems occurred were experienced for the first time by the organisers.*

The original project budget contained estimated costs in the category ‘external assistance’ allocated for Area Workshop Local Coordination in the amount of 6’000 Euro (Form A 3.7).

**Specific clarification of the use of person months for WP 6 (Data collection and entry into the database):**

Excerpt from the second interim technical report (2009), page 10:

*[...] However, c. 85 responses were submitted on paper and had to be typed into the database by SAVE. Additionally, some of the comments were written in a variety of languages (we had asked, when possible, for participants to respond in English, German or French). SAVE was able to cope with this work load through the assistance on T. Mayer, who was temporarily employed in Konstanz. The combination of his language skills and also the voluntary help of SAVE contacts meant that the questionnaire replies could be typed into the database without too much trouble. However, this work required many hours of work, especially when answers were handwritten and not typed. [...]*

Excerpt from the additional technical information to the second interim technical report (2009), pages 4/5:

*a) Discrepancy between Grant Agreement and Technical Report concerning the use of person/month:*

*In order to put a working database online it is necessary to have data within it. Due to this, SAVE employed a researcher on a temporary contract (6 months – Dec. 2009 to May 2009) to help with the collection of data, as well as some other aspects within ELBARN. The researcher contacted experts and website administrators who were known to have the information we needed for the basis data of the database of “breed descriptions” - this included EFABIS, regional or national organisations as well as private persons. By this method it was possible to gain a lot of data. This was then sorted, sometimes translated and fed into the database. The breed descriptions are currently being integrated into the ELBARN website.*

The original project budget contained estimated costs in the category ‘external assistance’ allocated for Data entry in database in the amount of 10’000 Euro (Form A 3.7).

**Specific clarification of the use of person months for WP 7:**

Excerpt from the third interim technical report (2010), page 24:

*The amount of time required to produce the publications Area Action Plans and the ELBARN book was considerably more than had been anticipated. The geographical distance between the partners often made communication difficult when it came to decision making about photographs and corrections. The lessons learnt from the production of the Area Action Plans were immediately put into use to improve the process with the book, for example, a bi-lateral meeting between EuroNatur and SAVE to choose all the photos certainly sped up the process, even though some of the photos were subsequently exchanged for others.*

**CONCLUSION:**

Roughly, the overall expenditures of the project are in line with the budget, although there have been changes in the disposition of funds in the budget categories “Personnel costs” and “External assistance”. Both necessary shifts were within the stipulated 10% ceiling, up to which adjustments can be made between budget categories without permission of AGRI GEN RES.

The workshops organized by ELBARN were very successful in furthering the aims of the project. They resulted in the collection of valuable data, of the establishment of national contact points and the task force. They also were the main contribution to the Guidelines and Area Action Plans.

The partner and bilateral meetings were essential for the smooth running of the project. The five NGOs implemented this important project successfully.

We thank the European Commission, especially AGRI GEN RES, for the financial support and the constructive cooperation during the last three years.

## 6. SUMMARY OF THE DISSEMINATION OF ALL THE RESULTS

### Preceding Years:

- SAVE eNews 1/2007 – Article: The project “Rescue Stations” has a new name: ‘European Livestock Breeds Ark and Rescue Net’ or ELBARN
- 29th September, Guastalla, Italy – presentation “ELBARN: a concept for the future” by Elli Broxham (SAVE) at the international conference: “Use it or lose it – conservation of livestock breeds in Europe”
- 13-16 November 2007, Sibenik, Croatia – presentation "European Livestock Breeds Ark and Rescue Net - a chance for the future" by H-P Grünenfelder, (excutive chairman of SAVE) at the international conference "Native Breeds and Varieties as part of natural and cultural Heritage".
- SAVE eNews 2/2008 – Article: European Livestock Breeds Ark and Rescue Net (ELBARN) report on Central Workshop, Kutna Hora, CZ
- ARCHE NOVA, Newsletter 7/2007 page 15 from the Society for the Conservation of old and endangered Livestock Breeds in Germany (GEH)
- Description of ELBARN on Euronatur website
- EuroNatur-magazine 4/2007 – Article: Every Month a livestock breed dies out
- EuroNatur magazine 2/2008 - information about the Central Workshop in Kutna Hora
- EuroNatur website – report about Central Workshop
- RARE - Press release about Central Workshop
- ELBARN on RARE website
- RARE Newsletter October 07
- RARE Newsletter March 08
- ELBARN in De Ark (SLE Magazine)
- Central Workshop in De Ark
- *SAVE/DAGENE Conference*: 12-14 June 2008 at Kozard, Hungary, annual meeting of the SAVE Network and DAGENE, a joint conference on „Local products and rural tourism“
- *ERFP Annual Meeting*: 23/8 - 23/8 2008, Vilnius, Lithuania. Presentation about the ELBARN Project to FAO National Coordinators.
- *National Steering Committee, Stakeholder Meeting*: 15 November 2008, Ringe, Denmark. Presentation about SAVE, NGOs and ELBARN
- *FAO International Technical Working Group AnGR, 5<sup>th</sup> Session*: 28<sup>th</sup> January 2009, Rome. Side Event: European Livestock Breeds Ark and Rescue Net (ELBARN) as a Response System for Breeds at Risk. (presentation in Annexes)
- EuroNatur Magazine
- SAVE: eNews 3/2008 - Questionnaire promotion
- SAVE: eNews 1/2009 – Area Workshops
- GEH: Arche Nova Newsletter
- SLE: De Ark 2009-2 p50, Area Workshops
- RARE: Newsletter 06/2009
- Press Releases for Roznov and Blagoevgrad
- ERFP Newsletters: Issue 4, Central Workshop and announcement Vilnius Meeting and Issue 5, Vilnius Meeting report
- European Federation of City Farms Newsletter 1/2009 – Area Workshop, Ghent
- Zeldzaam huisdier Newsletter 2/2009 p19 - Area Workshop, Ghent
- Guidelines distribution at all Area Workshops

Final Year :

- International Agrobiodiversity Seminar, Gent - ELBARN, 2nd year and future perspectives (Broxham)
- 2nd International conference on the organic sector development in Central/Eastern European and Central Asian countries - Use of Geographical Indications to Support Locally Adapted Agriculture (Broxham)
- Budapest (Donath)
- GENRES Committee Meeting – A Network for Rare Breeds (Schwaderer)
- Livestock Biodiversity Workshop - European Livestock Breeds Ark and Rescue Net (Broxham)
- Publications and PR:
- Article „Rote Kühe und tauchende Schweine“ (Red Cattle and diving pigs) published in the EuroNatur-Magazine 2/2009 – overall information about the link between agrobiodiversity and landscape protection, presentation of ELBARN
- Article „Zukunft für bedrohte Nutztierassen“ (Future for endangered livestock breeds) in the Magazine „Natur und Landschaft“, July 2009 – a general information about ELBARN in one of the most renowned journals for nature conservation and landscape management in Germany.
- Article „Chance für alte Rassen“ (chance for old breeds) in the regional newspaper „Südkurier“, November 2009 – basic information about ELBARN for the broad public and interview with M. Schneider-Jacoby
- Press-Information „Rettungsnetz für Stiefelgeiß & Co.“ (rescue net for the Booted Goat & Co.), Mai 2010 – presentation of ELBARN on the occasion of the international day of biodiversity
- Article about ELBARN in the magazin „Arche Nova“ 3/2009, page 16
- GEH-Workshop with topic on Arkfarms including ELBARN-Guidelines, Witzenhausen
- Flyers about ELBARN on the infodesk of GEH at the International Green Week, Berlin
- Annual Meeting with presentation of actual activities in ELBARN-Project, Frauenchiemsee
- Talking about ELBARN at the International Symposium of League of Pastoral People at Castle of Lichtenberg, showing ELBARN-Book and Flyers
- Presenting ELBARN-Book and Flyers on the infodesk of GEH at the fair „Natur auf der Spur“ from The Hessian Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, Stadtallendorf
- "De ARK 2009-2" article on the North-West European Area workshop which took place at the beginning of March 2009 in Ghent. The article gives a description of what ELBARN is all about. It also gives an overview of the countries that were presented and of the speakers addressing the participants at the workshop.
- "De ARK 2009-4" article on the annual meeting of SAVE, which took place in August 2009 in Ghent. One of the discussion points at the annual meeting was the ELBARN project and briefly described in the article as well.
- August 2009 - interview with a journalist of "De Bond", a weekly "family" publication (300.000 copies). The interview was published on 14 August 2009 and covered a whole page dealing with rare breeds, Steunpunt Levend Erfgoed, SAVE and ELBARN. As far as the latter is concerned the article gave a description of ELBARN and the main achievements of the project at the moment of publication.
- SAVE eNews 2/09 - ELBARN Area Workshops: Interesting and fruitful discussions with stakeholders throughout Europe
- ERFP Newsletter Issue 6 June 2009, NEWS: ELBARN Project
- Paper for CONBIAND Symposium, Columbia presented by Prof. Delgado – Estaciones de rescate, arca y cuarentena como alternativa en la conservacion ex situ
- European Federation of City Farms Newsletter 2/2010 – announcement of publication of AAPs [http://www.cityfarms.org/files/newsletters/.68/efcf\\_newsletter2\\_2010.pdf](http://www.cityfarms.org/files/newsletters/.68/efcf_newsletter2_2010.pdf)

- Area Action Plans distribution to all workshop participants and interested stakeholders
- ELBARN book distribution to interested parties, on going.
- Flyers
- n. 4 "RARE newsletter" (April 2010, January 2010, June 2009, March 2009)
- ELBARN AAPs (cover sheet) are presented on n. 46 of "Animal Genetic Diversity", FAO, Rome
- Short presentation of ELBARN and distribution of Med AAPs to all Italian Regional Councillors at the meeting for the Italian National Plan for Agrobiodiversity (Ministry of Agriculture, Rome, February 2010)
- Short presentation of ELBARN at the seminar "Verso una banca nazionale delle risorse genetiche animali" (Milano, 16th June, tomorrow!) and distribution of Med AAPs and (some) books to speakers
- ELBARN is cited or linked at the following websites (in Italian):  
<http://www.cascinabriccovillois.it/rare.html>  
<http://www.aiol.it/contenuti/percorsi-culturali/storia/agricoltura/gli-animale-di-una-volta>  
[www.quotidianolavoce.it/Pagine/20Aprile2010/5.pdf](http://www.quotidianolavoce.it/Pagine/20Aprile2010/5.pdf)  
[http://www.rivistadiagraria.org/riviste/vedi.php?news\\_id=225&cat\\_id=75](http://www.rivistadiagraria.org/riviste/vedi.php?news_id=225&cat_id=75)
- ELBARN is on the University websites of Riccardo Fortina (Torino) and Daniele Bigi (Bologna)  
[www.campusnet.unito.it/agraria/docenti/att/rfortina.cv.doc](http://www.campusnet.unito.it/agraria/docenti/att/rfortina.cv.doc)  
<http://www.unibo.it/SitoWebDocente/default.htm?mat=030750&TabControl1=TabCV>
- DAI Meeting - In three slides Martin Schneider-Jacoby presented the ELBARN.net to the members of the Dinaric Arc Initiative. (<http://www.cbddinaricarc.com/content/view/13/28/>). The initiative is a forum of the main international organisation working in the Western Balkans (UNESCO; UNDP, UNEP, SNV, IUCN, WWF, EuroNatur). The SEE Action Plan was given to all participants and the website presented.
- Nature Park Lonjsko Polje – During the Biodiversity Day, Martin Schneider-Jacoby, presented the ELBARN book and case study Lonjsko Polje to the participants of the guide tours. Two film teams from Austria and Germany were present. 2 boxes with books and See AP were left to the nature Park to promote ELBARN in connection with the preservation of old breeds in the Sava Wetlands.
- The Croatian Institute of Nature Protection in Zagreb was visited by Martin Schneider-Jacoby and 1 box with ELBARN books and one with SEE APs was left for distribution.
- During the workshop of a delegation from Livanjsko Polje (Kanton 10) in the Nature Park Lonsjko Polje each the 18 participants received a ELBARN book and an introduction to the ELBARN.net website. The case study Lonjsko Polje was presented by Martin Schneider-Jacoby to the participants of the study trip.
- European Stork Village Network - The European Stork Village Network is promoting White Stork protection based on sustainable rural development. The ELBARN book was presented to the 40 participants from 8 countries and the link to the ELBARN.net website for questions related to old breeds.

## 7. INPUT FOR THE COORDINATOR'S WEB SITE

All the requirements of this section are met on the project website [www.elbarn.net](http://www.elbarn.net)

Executive summary for the dissemination of the final results on the coordinator's web site

**==> Please see Annex 8**

## 8. ANNEXES

- **ANNEX 1:** *Guidelines*
- **ANNEX 2.1:** *Questionnaire final report*
- **ANNEX 2.2:** *ELBARN Questionnaire English*
- **ANNEX 3.1:** *Area Action Plan Central and Northeast Europe*
- **ANNEX 3.2:** *Area Action Plan Mediterranean*
- **ANNEX 3.3:** *Area Action Plan Northwest Europe*
- **ANNEX 3.4:** *Area Action Plan Southeast Europe*
- **ANNEX 4:** *ELBARN book*
- **ANNEX 5.1:** *ELBARN Flyer Croatian*
- **ANNEX 5.2:** *ELBARN Flyer Danish*
- **ANNEX 5.3:** *ELBARN Flyer Dutch*
- **ANNEX 5.4:** *ELBARN Flyer English*
- **ANNEX 5.5:** *ELBARN Flyer French*
- **ANNEX 5.6:** *ELBARN Flyer German*
- **ANNEX 5.7:** *ELBARN Flyer Italian*
- **ANNEX 5.8:** *ELBARN Flyer Russian*
- **ANNEX 5.9:** *ELBARN Flyer Spanish*
- **ANNEX 6:** *Rescue Centre List*
- **ANNEX 7.1:** *Partner Meeting Sept 2007 - Minutes*
- **ANNEX 7.2:** *Partner Meeting Jun 2008 - Minutes*
- **ANNEX 7.3:** *Partner Meeting Jan 2009 - Minutes*
- **ANNEX 7.4:** *Partner Meeting Mar 2009 - Minutes*
- **ANNEX 7.5:** *Partner Meeting Jun 2009 - Minutes*
- **ANNEX 7.6:** *Partner Meeting Oct 2009 - Minutes*
- **ANNEX 7.7:** *Partner Meeting Feb 2010 - Minutes*

- **ANNEX 8:** *Executive summary for the dissemination of the final results*
- **ANNEX 9.1:** *Central Workshop - Invitation*
- **ANNEX 9.2:** *Central Workshop - Participant List*
- **ANNEX 9.3:** *Central Workshop - Programme*
- **ANNEX 10:** *Tender process proof-reader*
- **ANNEX 11.1:** *Verification Tour Western Balkans*
- **ANNEX 11.2:** *Verification Tour Hungary-Romania-Ukraine*
- **ANNEX 11.3:** *Verification Tour Poland & Baltic States*
- **ANNEX 12:** *List of presentations at the Area Workshops*
- **ANNEX 13:** *List of recipients of the ELBARN book & flyer*
- **ANNEX 14:** *List of recipients of the Area Action Plans*

## **9. SUMMARY OF MANPOWER BY WORK PACKAGE FOR THE ENTIRE PERIOD OF THE ACTION**

Please see the separate excel file