



## **WORKSHOP REPORT**

### **ENABLING SUSTAINABLE MANAGEMENT OF NON-WOOD FOREST PRODUCTS IN SOUTH EAST EUROPE – SPECIAL FOCUS ON MEDICINAL AND AROMATIC PLANTS**

**21 - 25 September 2011**

**at**

**German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation**

**International Academy for Nature Conservation, Isle of Vilm**

**FINAL MINUTES**

**Compiled by**

**Kristina Rodina and Anastasiya Timoshyna**

© 2011 BfN, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and TRAFFIC International

All rights reserved.

All material appearing in this publication is copyrighted and may only be reproduced with permission. Any reproduction in full or in part of this publication must credit BfN, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and TRAFFIC International as the copyright owners.

**Disclaimer:**

The views of the author expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect those of BfN, FAO or the TRAFFIC network, WWF and IUCN. The designations of geographical entities in this publication, and the presentation of the material, do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of BfN, FAO, TRAFFIC or its supporting organizations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, or area, or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

TRAFFIC, the wildlife trade monitoring network, works to ensure that trade in wild plants and animals is not a threat to the conservation of nature

This document is free and available online at:

[http://www.bfn.de/0610\\_vortraege+M52087573ab0.html](http://www.bfn.de/0610_vortraege+M52087573ab0.html)

**Contents**

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS ..... 4

1 INTRODUCTION..... 6

2 SUMMARY ..... 10

3 SUSTAINABLE MANAGEMENT OF NWFPs IN SEE – Day 1..... 14

    3.1 Introduction ..... 14

    3.2 Management of non-wood forest products in SEE:Country experiences ..... 15

    3.3 Opportunities of sustainable management of wild plant non wood forest products in SEE ..... 19

4 WORKING GROUPS DISCUSSION ON SUSTAINABLE MANAGEMENT OF NWFPs in SEE – Day 2..... 22

    4.1 Introduction ..... 22

    4.2 Working group discussion ..... 22

    4.3 Country presentations on results of the discussion about the main challenges in MAP sector ..... 22

5 WORKING GROUPS DISCUSSION ON REGIONAL PROJECT IDEAS..... 27

Day 3 ..... 27

    5.1 Working group discussion ..... 27

    5.2 Working group presentations on resource assessment and regional project ideas ..... 27

ANNEX 1 Output 1: Medicinal and Aromatic Plants/Non-Wood Forest Products in South East Europe: Identifying challenges and actions to address them ..... 34

ANNEX 2 Output 2: Regional project proposals provided by country working groups ..... 48

ANNEX 4 Workshop agenda ..... 59

ANNEX 5 List of participants..... 63

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

### Abbreviations of Participants' Names

AN	-	Aleksandar Nikolovski
AM	-	Aleksandra Mladenovic
AT	-	Anastasiya Timoshyna
BBP	-	Biljana Bauer Petrovska
BD	-	Branko Djuric
BM	-	Bryony Morgan
BS	-	Boris Spalevic
CK	-	Christina Krug
DJL	-	Danna Leaman
EB	-	Elvira Bazina
ER	-	Elizabeth Radford
FPD	-	Frosina Pandrushka Dramikjanin
HS	-	Heiko Schindler
GA	-	Goran Angelovski
GS	-	Gisela Stolpe
IB	-	Igor Borsic
IH	-	Ismail Hetemaj
KJ	-	Kristaq Jorgji
KR	-	Kristina Rodina
LP	-	Laszlo Percze
NA	-	Natalija Angelova
ND	-	Nevenka Dalac
NK	-	Naser Krasniqi
PV	-	Paul Vantomme
SS	-	Sasa Stamatovic
RG	-	Ralf Grunewald
VD	-	Vuk Djukic
ZD	-	Zora Dajic
ZR	-	Zsuzsanna Rathonyi
XH	-	Xevit Hysenaj
WK	-	Wolfgang Kathe

### Other abbreviations used

AMAPSEEC	Association for Medicinal and Aromatic Plants of Southeast European Countries
BfN	German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CITES	Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora
EPCA	Essence Producers and Cultivators Association
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation

FWS	FairWild Standard
GSPC	Global Strategy for Plant Conservation
IMO	Institute of Marketecology
INA	InternationalAcademy for Nature Conservation
IPA	Important Plants Areas
ISSC-MAP	International Standard for Sustainable Wild Collection of Medicinal and Aromatic Plants
MAPs	Medicinal and aromatic plants
MBG	Martin Bauer Group
NWFPs	Non-wood forest products
RCI	Regional Competitiveness Initiative
SEE	South Eastern Europe
TCP	Technical Cooperation Programme
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

# 1 INTRODUCTION

The workshop “Enabling sustainable management of Non-Wood Forest Products in South East Europe – Special focus on Medicinal and Aromatic Plants” (21 - 25 September 2011) was carried out by BfN/INA in cooperation with TRAFFIC and FAO. The workshop was facilitated by TRAFFIC, BfN and FAO. Over 30 participants from more than 10 countries took part in the workshop (for Participants List see Annex 5). The workshop brought together experts in MAP trade, conservation and regulations from a variety of sectors in South East Europe and beyond, including representatives of government, private sector, non-governmental and international organizations.

The German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation (BfN) has been instrumental in supporting the development of the International Standard for Sustainable Wild Collection of Medicinal and Aromatic Plants (ISSC-MAP). Since 2003, the agency has provided valuable scientific, technical and financial support to this initiative. A series of workshops at the agencies International Academy for Nature Conservation (INA) on the Isle of Vilm in the past years has contributed to the development of the ISSC-MAP, the inception and evaluation of case studies and related pilot implementation projects, the transition of standard management and oversight from the ISSC-MAP Decision Group to the FairWild Foundation, and integration of the ISSC-MAP and FairWild standards in the FairWild Standard 2.0.

An estimated 50,000 to 70,000 plant species are used in traditional and modern medicine systems throughout the world. While some medicinal and aromatic plant (MAP) species, in particular those with high volumes in demand from national and international markets, are currently sourced from cultivation, the majority of MAP species used in medicine is still – and will be over the long term – provided by collection from the wild. A considerable portion of the world’s MAP species and populations are threatened due to over-harvesting and habitat loss.

Approaches to wild MAP collection that balance the needs of local, regional and international markets with the need for conservation and sustainable use are urgently needed. Industry, governments, organic certifiers, resource managers and collectors are concerned about declining MAP populations and supplies, and are asking for a means to assess whether wild collection is sustainable. Consumers also want evidence that products are produced sustainably and ethically. To meet this need, the German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation (BfN), the IUCN Medicinal Plant Specialist Group, WWF Germany and TRAFFIC, developed the International Standard for Sustainable Wild Collection of Medicinal and Aromatic Plants (ISSC-MAP) in a joint initiative, started in 2004. The initial core group has expanded to include industry and certification expertise and expand regional expertise. Version 1.0 of the Standard was launched in February 2007 and a number of ISSC-MAP implementation projects were conducted to improve the Standard based on field experiences. Since 2008 ISSC-MAP merged with FairWild Standards under the umbrella of the FairWild Foundation.

The fully integrated FairWild Standard Version 2.0 combining the ecological and social sustainability criteria of wild plants harvesting and use has been finalized during the previous Vilm Workshop in May 2010 and in the time of the present workshop is available for implementation as certification scheme, voluntary compliance mechanism, and a tool to improve sustainability of wild plant resources management at national, regional and international levels.

## **Medicinal and aromatic plants in South East Europe**

South Eastern European (SEE) countries are species-rich sources of wild plants used for food, aromatic, medicinal, and cosmetics purposes, for both domestic use and export, including to Western Europe. In all countries of SEE, especially in rural areas, collection, use,

processing, and trade of non-wood forest products (NWFPs) are important contributors to the livelihoods of local people.

Increasing commercial demand for wild plant NWFPs in SEE countries is believed to drive the high – and potentially unsustainable - levels of harvest and trade in this region. A large-scale, integrated approach to better management of these resources is required to successfully address the potential problem of unsustainable use leading to resource depletion. Such an approach would need to include the implementation of effective conservation measures for these economically important wild plant resources, together with the provision of necessary incentives for sustainable harvesting and trade by collectors and industry. Availability of tools, methodologies and capacity for sustainable wild collection of plants, including appropriate and practical guidance for resource assessment, monitoring, and adaptive management, are also essential for sustainable management.

The output-oriented 2020 targets of the revised Global Strategy for Plant Conservation (GSPC) of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), particularly targets 5, 11, 12 and 13, provide a useful framework for sustainable use and conservation of wild plant NWFPs on the national and regional scale.

With the FairWild Standard ([www.fairwild.org](http://www.fairwild.org)), a comprehensive set of principles, criteria, and indicators to support the ecological, social, and economic dimensions of sustainable resource use, focusing on sustainable harvest of target resource populations, conservation of species and their habitats, fair arrangements for access and benefit-sharing, and good collection and business practices is now available. The Standard was implemented in pilot projects in Bosnia and Herzegovina and in a number of other countries globally through a range of implementation arrangements that include third-party audited certification, company adoption of voluntary codes of practice, improved national resource management and regulation, and improved implementation of international agreements and commitments such as the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) and the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation (GSPC) of the CBD.

Elements of the FairWild Standard are being evaluated as a basis for non-detriment findings required for perennial plant species included in CITES Appendix II1, many of which are NWFPs. Guidance for resource assessment, including development of a system for evaluating risks of unsustainable harvest, have benefitted from work supported by FAO2. Building this capacity will enable SEE countries to deliver concrete progress on Targets 11, 12 and 13 of the GSPC. Meeting the conservation needs of these species will also require area-based conservation approaches, for example by identifying “Important Plant Areas” that include priority NWFP species, and enabling their integration into national and regional protected areas management systems3.

A need to integrate sustainable use of NWFPs into various sectoral policies, including rural development, health, environmental, and economic has been identified among most necessary follow-up needed on national and regional levels4. However, the promotion and development of sustainable use of NWFPs as well as informed policy decision making requires the gathering, analysis and dissemination of key technical information on NWFPs,

---

<sup>1</sup> CITES (2010b): Non-detriment findings for timber, medicinal plants and agarwood. – CoP15 Doc. 16.3. Fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties Doha (Qatar), 13-25 March 2010. Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora. Retrieved from <http://www.cites.org/eng/cop/15/doc/E15-16-03.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> Wong, J.L.G., K. Thornber and N. Baker. 2001. *Resource Assessment of Non-wood Products: Experience and Biometric Principles*. Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations (FAO).

<sup>3</sup> Plantlife International (2004) *Identifying and Protecting the World's Most Important Plant Areas: A Guide to Implementing Target 5 of the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation*. Salisbury, UK: Plantlife International.

<sup>4</sup> FAO and TRAFFIC, 2010, Budapest, Report FAO/TRAFFIC Expert Consultation on *Institutional Needs for Sustainable Non-Wood Forest Product Sector in South-East Europe* Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina – 10-12 February 2010

including full appraisal of the socio-economic contribution of NWFPs to sustainable development as well as improved networking among individuals and organizations dealing with NWFPs.

### **Workshop objectives**

The main objective of the workshop was to bring together experts, government and industry representatives and other stakeholders dealing with wild plants / NWFPs in SEE, in particular medicinal and aromatic plants (MAPs), their sustainable use and conservation, to identify best practices and approaches towards sustainable and economically viable management strategies for priority NWFP species such as MAPs in the region, as well as to identify potential funding for future implementation of such strategies.

The workshop aimed to:

- Provide a plenum for dialogue on sustainable use of MAPs in SEE between relevant stakeholder groups
- Evaluate the current situation and update the figures based on the 2003 study (Kathe et al. 2003) and questionnaire responses of the FAO/TRAFFIC Expert Consultation (2010)
- Define priority MAP species, conservation approaches, geographical priorities for conservation
- Develop strategies for sustainable management and use
- Introduce FairWild objectives and approach to the relevant stakeholders
- Share experiences from FairWild, Plantlife, FAO, WWF, and other relevant projects.

This workshop follows up and builds on previous work by TRAFFIC, WWF, IUCN and partners in developing and implementing guidance for ecologically and socially sustainable harvesting and trade in wild plants (in particular, development and implementation of the FairWild Standard<sup>5</sup>). It also follows up and builds upon a joint expert consultation organized by FAO and TRAFFIC in Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina, in February 2010 that brought together representatives of six SEE countries and international organizations to discuss the status and institutional capacities of the NWFP sector in those countries, and to identify needs in the sector<sup>6</sup>.

FAO, mandated through its mission to improve the sustainable utilization of NWFP in order to contribute to the wise management of the world's forests, to conserve their biodiversity, and to improve income generation and food security, also cooperated with TRAFFIC and BfN in organizing and financing this workshop. Several experts from FAO participated not only in the workshop, but also worked on a pre-workshop study.

Workshop expected outputs:

- Identify priority actions and formulate action plan for wild plants conservation in each participating country
- Confirm the institutional, technical capacities (e.g. resource assessment, management planning) gaps in SEE countries and identify steps to address those steps (including technical support, raising funds for joint projects, regional collaboration)

---

<sup>5</sup> [www.fairwild.org](http://www.fairwild.org) and <http://www.traffic.org/home/2010/9/15/sustainable-wild-plant-harvesting-proves-a-global-success.html>

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.traffic.org/home/2010/5/4/expert-consultation-on-non-wood-forest-products-trade-in-se.html>



- Establish the functioning platform for collaboration between governments, NGOs, academia, private sector, IGOs in the area of sustainable trade in wild plants in SEE.

The Workshop was held at the International Academy for Nature Conservaton on Isle of Vilm in Germany from 21 - 25 September 2011).

## 2 SUMMARY

The aim of this workshop was at the same time to (1) update the information on MAP sector development in seven countries of South East Europe; (2) develop actions in response to the existing bottlenecks/challenges in various areas of MAP sector development, including regulatory, socio-economic, environmental, and institutional; (3) develop ideas for SEE regional project to support the sustainable development of the MAP sector. In order to achieve this, workshop was divided into three sections:

On day 1, presentations introduced participants to the current status of:

1. Wild plants and NWFPs in South-East Europe
2. FairWild Standard as the tool towards sustainability of wild plant resource management
3. SEE countries experiences with the management of wild plant non wood forest products, with participants from Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Kosovo, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (further in text referred to as Macedonia), Montenegro and Serbia presenting latest updates on sector in their respective countries
4. Opportunities for sustainable management of wild plants in SEE, which included FairWild certification experiences and a business perspective on FairWild, FAO statement on NWFPs work and importance in the region, and Important Plants Areas (IPA) work accounts relevant to the conservation of wild plants diversity.

(See also Annex 4, for Agenda of workshop)

On day 2 working groups were formed that worked on the following topics:

**National working groups:** mixture of participants from same country and other organizations:

1. Serbia and Montenegro;
2. Albania and Kosovo;
3. Bosnia and Herzegovina and Croatia;
4. Macedonia.

Prior to the workshop, TRAFFIC and FAO put together the Background Information Non-Wood Forest Products In South East Europe and the List of priority NWFP species (both of economic and conservation importance), based on the desk-top review of:

- a) MAPs in Albania, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia and Romania (Kathe W., Honnef S., Heym, A. 2003): A study of the collection of and trade in MAPs, relevant legislation and the potential of MAP use for financing, nature conservation and protected areas. This study was carried out by WWF Deutschland and TRAFFIC Europe-Germany on behalf of the German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation (BfN), Bonn and Vilm in May 2003;
- b) Results of the Needs Assessment Questionnaires filled-in by different stakeholders prior to FAO/TRAFFIC Expert Consultation on - Institutional Needs for Sustainable Non-Wood Forest Product (NWFP) Sector in South-East Europe (SEE) organized in Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina, 10-12 February 2010;
- c) Results of the presentations provided by different stakeholders during FAO/TRAFFIC Expert Consultation on - Institutional Needs for Sustainable Non-Wood Forest

Product (NWFP) Sector in South-East Europe (SEE) organized in Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina, 10-12 February 2010.

During the working groups at day 2 each country was asked to:

1. Update the information in Background Information document;
2. Identify priority challenges/bottlenecks for sustainable development of MAP sector in the country, and action points to address those, including – where possible – responsible institutions and desirable timeline.

It was agreed that the Background document will be updated following the workshop, after all countries' contributions are received. For the development of action points, each group filled-in same format table, which were made available to participants prior to further discussion. For the outcomes of Action planning by each of seven countries see Annex 1.

### ***Resource assessment for low-risk species working group***

This working group played a special role in the course of the workshop in the fact that it continued over 1,5 days, with the discussion and technical work on how the Resource Assessments can be conducted for Low Risk target plants from South Eastern Europe. Results from this discussion should be fed into the Technical Committee of the FairWild Foundation in order to develop a policy or similar guidance document for producers in alike settings. The group worked on the Resource Assessment for Low Risk Species draft and the draft List of Priority SEE species.

On day 3, the Resource Assessment group continued and other newworking groups,(a mix of participants from various countries) were working towards the development of the Regional project proposals on following topics, identified as priorities and potential for regional work in SEE during days 1 and 2.

### **Development of regional project ideas**

- Future of MAP production in changing rural economies (preservation of collection traditions, transition from collection to farming)
- Research project ideas: (1) *Helichrysum italicum* transnational resource assessment and management plan and (2) Survey on MAP ethnobotany and traditional use
- Regional branding/marketing/product development (e.g. certification obstacles, promotion of MAP products from SEE, etc.)
- Wild plant resources management (e.g. addressing: Inappropriate harvesting practices; identification of key threats to MAP populations; overexploitation of certain species; uncontrolled harvesting; alternatives to quota systems; GPS mapping, etc.).

All groups followed the same structure of presenting results, which offered a basic project development logic, including the elaboration of:

**Rationale** (why- explain the issue)→**Scope** (what, where)→**Objectives and aims**→**Activities** (what exactly)→**Timeline** (when/by when)→**Partners** (who) →**Funds** (for how much) →**Potential donors** (who can pay for this) →**Risks and obstacles** (why not).

Results of the working groups were presented on the afternoon of day 2 and day 3 and discussed among all participants. See Annexes 1, 2 and 3 for the outcomes of working groups of days 2 and 3.

Working groups presentations on day 3 were followed-up by the discussion of outstanding issues, and the follow-up actions, as well as conclusions and workshop closure.

Overall, it was considered that the expected outputs of workshop were delivered, through both the presentation of countries and the tools for sustainable development of MAP sector in SEE, and working groups that focus on the development of most relevant action points for the MAP sector in each participating SEE country. Workshop contributed to the discussion between the expert of MAP sector in the region, and identified ideas for future regional collaboration between the countries.

The follow-up was discussed extensively during the day 3, and ideas regarding further development of MAP sector in SEE and the development of project proposals on regional work included following:

- Participants called FAO for the establishment of the Technical Cooperation Programme (TCP) Facility in SEE, and make it available for further development of regional project concept, and following TCP;
- Preliminary regional project proposals focused on 1) regional branding and marketing of NWFP products, 2) research (Ethnobotanical study of MAPs in SEE and development of sustainable management practices for *Helichrysum italicum* harvesting and trade in SEE), 3) future of MAPs production in changing rural economies, and 4) Sustainable wild plant resources management. These topics to be included in the follow-up work following the workshop;
- FairWild Standard principles and approach introduced and promoted to various stakeholders, is suggested as the useful approach for governmental authorities and private sector for the development of sustainable management practices;
- Work to continue on the finalization of the Resource Assessment guidelines for Low Risk Species by the FairWild Technical Committee to support implementation of the FairWild Standard, and be used as a potential instrument in the development of sustainable management practices for MAPs harvesting in SEE;
- Priority MAP species South Eastern Europe are suggested to be included in IUCN European Red Listing project;
- Current situation of the MAPs sector in SEE and List of Priority Species to be updated by the workshop participants. The Background information document on NWFPs in SEE to be updated accordingly later;
- TRAFFIC suggested structured follow-up on identified action points by SEE countries and formulation of project proposals, where TRAFFIC can see its active role with regard to environmental and social sustainability of wild harvesting and trade in MAPs;
- AMAPSEEC to offer a platform for collaboration and communication in the are of MAP sector in South East Europe;
- USAID Regional Competitiveness Initiative (RCI) focusing on herbs and spices, agriculture and tourism was suggested as the potential vehicle for funding the promotion and technical development of the MAP Sector.

Following steps and deadlines were identified for workshop proceedings and further actions:

**As related to the workshop proceedings**

1. Updates to the Background documents and List of Priority species to be sent by participants to TRAFFIC by October 10, 2011 to be further incorporated into the document and the List of Species.
2. Workshop Report
  - By 15<sup>th</sup> of October 2011 – Organizers to prepare and circulate the draft report.
  - By 22<sup>th</sup> of October 2011 – Participants are welcome to provide comments.
  - By 31<sup>st</sup> of October 2011 – Workshop Report finalization.

**As related to further actions**

1. Lobbying at relevant ministries in all SEE countries by workshop participants about the importance of MAP topic and workshop outcomes to start immediately after final workshop report is available;
2. FAO to start Technical Cooperation Programme Facility (consultancy for proposal development) – tentatively from January 2011.
3. Regional Technical Cooperation Programme FAO (potential for 2 years) – following the TCP Facility.

See Annex 4 for the workshop agenda, Annex 5 for the List of Participants, and Annexes1-3 for the results of the workshop working groups.

This document reflects the discussions at the workshop; further workshop documentation materials, such as presentations held, are available on CD (to be requested at BfN, [martina.finger@bfm-vilm.de](mailto:martina.finger@bfm-vilm.de)).

### 3 SUSTAINABLE MANAGEMENT OF NWFPs IN SEE – Day 1

#### 3.1 Introduction

09.00 **Welcome, introduction to the agenda and workshop goals**(*Anastasiya Timoshyna, TRAFFIC and Aleksandar Nikolovski, FAO*) – See power point presentation

- Introduction to the TRAFFIC activities
- Objectives of the workshop

09.20 **Introduction round** (Participants expectations)

09.40 **Wild plant non-wood forest products in South East Europe**(*Wolfgang Kathe and Anastasiya Timoshyna*) – See power point presentation

- The use of wild plants in the region
- Trade and sustainability of wild collection; international and national policies, voluntary frameworks
- Summary of the 2010 FAO-TRAFFIC Expert Consultation and outcomes

#### Discussion

ER: The outcomes of the 2010 events include information sharing at the Plantlife workshop in 2011 and participation of MES and Plantlife in the Vilm event now. So, information/network sharing outcome worked.

SS: Comment on the trade slide: 1) estimation of the *value of wild/cultivated MAPs* instead of volume/species harvest would be most useful.

ER: Is the information included only on plants in international trade, or also illegal harvesting and local consumption.

WK: Yes.

GS: You mentioned two types of the collectors (local and outsiders). Are there some changes in types nowadays?

WK: No, there are no significant shifts in tendency. Local collectors (private lands) take care of the MAPs collection and use. In case of state land the situation is different. There is a quota set for collecting. In addition, there is a need for permission in order to collect and use MAPs. The system with certain social control is more stable and strong.

XH: What would you prefer buying: MAPs collected from the wild or cultivated?

WK: It is a personal choice. Quality of processing and cultivation matters. In case of the equal quality, MAPs collected from the wild are more preferable.

10.20 **Towards sustainability of wild plants sourcing: FairWild Standard** (*Danna Leaman*) -See power point presentation

- FairWild Standard and accompanying guidance documents
- Variety of uses of FairWild Standard: regulations, certification, international policy

- Implementation of FairWild Standard.

### **Discussion**

EB: Why export countries would be interested in implementing FairWild Standards (FWS)? What is the cost of it? What is the competitive advantage versus other types of certification?

DJL: Lots of supporting info and education provided by the export/operating companies for the consumers; Increasing the social and ecological responsibility is important; There is a need to educate the consumers. This would create a necessary incentive.

## **3.2 Management of non-wood forest products in SEE:Country experiences<sup>7</sup>**

### *11.30 Albania (Elvira Bazina)*

See power point presentation on “*Albanian Herbs and Spices Industry*”

### **Discussion**

DJL: Sage cultivation – same species/source material?

EB: Most of the cultivated plants are domestic. Most routine practice is use of wild collected cuttings and planting them in an open field. So, most of it is domestic source material for cultivation.

KR: Who is representing consolidators?

EB: People who are subcontracted by exporters (one or several). Consolidators are based primarily in villages owing in most of the cases consolidation centres.

FP: What can be done with this illegal cross-border collection between Albania-Macedonia and Macedonia-Kosovo?

EB: Training and education is needed, in particular at the local level. Increasing awareness on market products demand and prices, regional cooperation with exporters needed.

ER: What is the Latin name of Savory?

EB: *Saturea Montana*.

ER: FWS tested in Albania. Do you know anything about this?

EB: No.

BM: Some initial actions and negotiations were already taken in 2010 between UK and Albanian companies.

HS: Any success related to the 2002 Publication? What happened after, did the exporters do lab tests?

---

<sup>7</sup>15 min presentation + 10 min for questions each

- EB: Before the ASTA (American Spice Trade Association) manual publication in 2002: no specialized labs and/or testing centres existed in Albania. Export products were processed and shipped in big bags without knowing the real chemical and biological properties of these products. After ASTA's publication in 2002 publication and with great support of USAID/Albania, export companies increased awareness on the need for establishing minilaboratories at their processing facilities. Exporters got familiar with processing procedures and equipment thanks to the training seminars organized by local and international USAID funded projects staff. So there are many minilabs in place at present and MAPs processing has been significantly improved; ASTA has been definitively the Bible to all Albanian exporters in reaching competitive export quality.
- XH: ASTA has been like the Bible for the Albanian exporters-it's true. Before the 2002 publication exporters sold the production in bulk, after USAID projects translated and implemented ASTA publication exporters know much better how to reach fine export quality (great help to exporters).

#### 11.50 **Serbia** (Zora Dajic Stefanovic)

See power point presentation on *"Sustainable use and conservation of medicinal and aromatic plants in Serbia"*

### **Discussion**

- DJL: What is the process for species listing in the State list? How quotas are determined on the national level?
- ZD: Every year there is a Committee formed in order to make a list of species. Internal experts from the Institute of Plant Protection are the members of the Committee. They are responsible for the preparation of a list of plants. External experts, doing some research in the fields and having experience/knowledge about species to be potentially included into the list are also the members of the Committee; there is no money for permanent monitoring of resources. In practice, a list proposal is sent to the Ministry for approval; then to the Government.
- WK: Do you have database?
- ZD: We have some, but the data is local and kept in the Institute of Plant Protection
- HS: How practical do you think it is to put responsibility for resource assessments (RA) on the private companies? How the companies can help to monitor MAP resources?
- ZD: We already have some information from the companies. The company have info about MAPs resources (amounts, volumes). They use this information to apply for quotas tenders. It can be formalized through the Association.
- SS: Are there training courses for collectors? How to prevent damage to MAPs? Officially quota tender means that a company applies and pays 10% of the market value to the Ministry of Environment. Company is also required to conduct trainings to collectors (including non-destructive).
- RG: What is the reason for extinction of MAP plants?
- ZD: It is not very clear. Assumption: it could be over collection (e.g. Marshmallows) + habitat destruction.



### 12.15 **Croatia** (Igor Borsic)

See power point presentation on “*Management of NWFPs in Croatia*”

#### **Discussion**

- DJL: Setting quota for MAPs; whether it has been considered as linking the regulation to specific good practice rather than to quota?
- IB: We set quota, there are some restrictions mentioned in the permission about volume to be collected; Examples of the good practices are not included into the permission.
- HS: Found it interesting that collectors are applying to obtain the permits. But in fact company that's processing/collecting applies for permit – something is a big gap how such system should work and works in reality. When company receives the license, it is not clear who and how much will be actually harvested.
- IB: Private collectors collecting on their own (but for purpose of processing, trading and other types of traffic), and not for companies, need to obtain permit themselves. Private collectors collecting for the company do not have to obtain permit themselves but it has to be done by the company.
- WK: Comment: Saw the similar system in Bulgaria, where company receives the permit, and needs to give a collection card to each harvester. Every collector receives the card and MAPs quantities to be collected and delivered to the company.
- IB: System like this exists in Croatia. Company receives a permit and private persons collecting for the company need to have certificate of the company that they are collecting for this company. This certificate has to include name and surname of private collector, her/his number of ID, address and the company they are collecting for.

### 14.00 **Kosovo** (Ismail Hetemaj)

See power point presentation on “*MAPs in Kosovo*”

#### **Discussion**

- ER: Is shepherds' burning the juniper a serious problem?
- ZD: Comment: In many countries burning is a normal agricultural measure for change of vegetation and restoration of ecosystem.
- WK: Are the numbers from inventory represented on the slide about MAPs volumes in Kosovo including berries, mushrooms?
- IH: It is just volume of resources; it can be harvested in the future.

### 14.25 **Macedonia** (Biljana Bauer Petrovska, Natalja Angelova)

See power point presentation on “*MAPs in Macedonia*”

#### 14.50 **Montenegro** (Boris Spalevic)

See power point presentation on “*Medicinal Herbs and Forest Products in Montenegro*”

#### **Discussion**

- DJL: Is there communication between the timber concession managers and NWFPs extraction people (in Canada, reasons for bilberry population reduction are not good management practices for timber)?
- BS: 95% of bilberry is exported, only 5% goes to the domestic market. People are collecting plenty of bilberries in August. They are driven by a need to prepare to the school year (2010 Austrian company bought in bulk). Countries in the region need to sit together and speak about the minimal prices to keep value in countries.
- XH: How to approach the issue of quality of products? The main problem is quality. The quality starts from harvesting. Do we have some plans implemented and some actions undertaken?
- BS: Training of the collectors is very important and needs to be repeated. Comment: cross-border cooperation needed, potential for cooperation in the future
- WK: Is there a regional brand or only brand on the country level?
- BS: Promotion of the international branding through national geographic books.
- AT: Funding opportunities to be discussed later; Example: EU funding – cultural priority, issues of sustainability + market.

#### 15.25 **Bosnia and Herzegovina** (Branco Djuric and Nevenka Dalac)

See power point presentation on “*MAPs in Bosnia and Herzegovina*”

#### **Discussion**

- PV: What is original data? Where does it come from? What data are we talking about? Is it official data? Do we really know what kind of data we are using?
- BD: Most of the data are based on estimations; some data are provided by the Chamber of Trade, personal communication, data from business sector, from the companies, especially from the field.
- WK: Trade data can be taken from the companies. But some companies are not happy with data sharing. Informal trade can provide different estimations.
- BD: Charging 5% of the total price. Companies don't show the real data related to the MAPs trade. People don't feel comfortable about sharing the trade info.
- SS: Gave an example about the Serbian case: data based on collection licenses in 2008 is available; Results of the survey also can be used as estimates. Big portion of data on MAPs personal use can be found in the registered data.
- BD: Data of export of essential oil doesn't exist.

16.10 Zsuzsanna Rathonyi/Laszlo Percze

See power point presentation on “Non-wood forest products of South East Europe: FAO experiences”

### **Discussion**

AT: What is about technical support which FAO can provide in this region?

PV: 1) FAO provide with access to lots of info (in English and even in Russian), Info can be found on the website. 2) Database (FAO lex) about forestry/agriculture legislation in the countries; 3) FAO activities are decided to initiated by government members; Government should address the issues and then FAO can provide some support. Official request from the Governments should be implemented. Information sharing is provided by FAO. The most accurate data is coming from the US Department of Agriculture. Limited financial support through technical cooperation (decentralized – FAO regional office) – FAO would be particularly interested in the regional Technical Cooperation Project. FAO does facilitation as well between countries. Example of European Forestry Commission meeting (every country comes with the priorities for the forestry actions, decides on budget – bi-annual character). Country efforts are needed for this.

### **3.3 Opportunities of sustainable management of wild plant non wood forest products in SEE**

16.30 *FairWild Implementation: An example of Wild Oregano in Turkey (Heiko Schindler)* - See power point presentation

### **Discussion**

KJ: Where the photo from the final pages taken?

HS: In Albania

EB: What is difference in price of conventional Oregano (per 100g, for instance) and FW certified Oregano?

HS: There are no price differences for a consumer side. Fairwild price should be at least 5% higher in comparison with the conventional price. Original price +extra 10% is an idea of the FW Fund.

PV: What is the management plan? Harvesting plan or something else?

HS: You cannot put all plants in the one pot. For common plants trade chain is transparent, we can still monitor prices. Collection is still sustainable. For low risk species, expectations from the management plan are not extremely extensive. For high risk species we need to have very precise information, resource assessment for each species, and detailed plan. Orchids are at high risk. There is a need to have more precise info about these species (area of growing, quantity, and exact type) in order to develop Management Plan. Reproduction methodology should be elaborated. Good management system is needed. It is important to look at any possibilities of sustainable collection.

GS: Is Fairtrade premium fund is a must?

HS: It is a real must once product is traded as FairWild certified.

WK: There is a number of levels at which we look at the Fairtrade issue: - basic price calculation (costs production: tools, time, travel costs) + additional discretionary income+ premiums (organic and Fairtrade (FairWild and Fair for Life). Fairtrade premium is a suggested as 10%.

ZD: Who is giving FW certificate?

HS: IMO is providing inspections and giving certifications. Fairwild is a private Standard. Anybody can certify the production. IMO is currently the only certification body accredited by FairWild Foundation for FW certification. Criteria influencing the costs for certification are 1) Local staff in the country and 2) Amount of days needed for inspection.

HS: Info about socio-economic aspects needed for Management plan is to be created. For example, requirements on limitation of child labor are included in the Fairwild criteria.

#### **16:40 Business perspective – purchasing sustainably (Christina Krug)**

See power point presentation

### **Discussion**

ER: Question about the Project in Bulgaria: Are the mountain people are integrated into the community? Are they still cultivating?

CK: Yes, they are.

XH: What's better for you: cultivated or wild-harvested (if same price)?

CK: Not every plant can be cultivated. So for some wild-collection there would be only one possibility. It is not about the plant. It is a matter of quality.

XH: What is the main problem with wild-cultivated plants?

CK: Cannot say in general. Every time we want to have a sample, and most of time we get sample and know that delivery will not be the same. The outlook is different.

FPD: Could you please provide more details about the project in Bulgaria? Year and amount of people involved?

CK: 2006 – start-up period of the Project; 50 people with the families.

DJL: If a country decides that they want to do a good resource assessment for priority list of species, how much of the burden can be taken by a company like Martin Bauer to feed into the management plan. Would it be more difficult for MBG to implement FRC?

CK: It makes work easier for us. If they do it professionally, this can be used for FairWild certification, and would lower costs of FairWild certification.

#### **17:25 Plantlife's work in South East Europe and on Medicinal Plants (Liz Radford)**

See power point presentation

## **Discussion**

PV: A lot of actions are overruled. How tourism can be fitted to the MAPs sector?

ER: The main point is not well managed tourism. Tourism can be a great development for the area concerned. But there is one obstacle – in case of one single incident registered in the place you can find tourism collapsed in the place concerned. Nobody wants to go to the place affected to the accident anymore. Besides, diversity is important for development; MAPs is a good industry to be developed.

DJL: From the practical level of looking: Is there a list of species concerned?

ER: We do have plants database. We didn't use flag listed species. But we have a list of species we are using in our work. Some plants are more common species.

### 17.45 Planning of Day 2:

- Discussion and definition of working group themes
- Working group set-up.

## **4 WORKING GROUPS DISCUSSION ON SUSTAINABLE MANAGEMENT OF NWFPs in SEE – Day 2**

### **4.1 Introduction**

09.00 Introduction to goals and expected outcomes for Day 2; General guidance for working groups.

#### **Working Groups**

- Country working groups: discussion of priority actions for country  
*For preparation see Background document on MAP/NWFPs sector in selected SEE countries and List of priority species in SEE. Updates of the information are welcome*
- Resource assessment for low-risk plant species working group  
*For preparation see the List of priority species in SEE and Resource Assessment Guidance documents (2008 and 2011)*

### **4.2 Working group discussion**

09.15 *Working groups: discussion*

12.05 *Resource Assessment Group: preliminary results*

- Revising the guidance on conducting resource assessment on low risk MAPs plants
- Implementing FWS to producers in Caucasus
- Document relevant to the country participants.

### **4.3 Country presentations on results of the discussion about the main challenges in MAP sector**

#### COUNTRIES WORKING GROUP 1: Albania+Kosovo

12.15 **ALBANIA** (*Elvira Bazina*)

#### **Discussion**

PV: I noticed that you have no actions and critical issues at the regional level. Is this a mission/purpose?

EB That's true. We have no such things at the regional level. But working with Kosovo in one WG we are planning to have some activities at the regional level in the future.

Kosovo includes some joint activities with Albania. In addition, we would like to implement regional cooperation with Kosovo, Serbia, and Macedonia.

DJL: Would you consider both resource assessment and identification of the sustainable harvesting practices to be implemented on the regional level?

EB: We will definitely do it. But, firstly we better start with assessment at the national level, then, we will move to regional level. Regional level requires more financial means. After being successful at the national level, we will go the regional for sure.

HS: Question about the contract with collectors? What will you include in it?

EB: We will include name of the exporter, collector, and village; the quantity expected, the price, the status (conventional or certified/any). The price will be the most critical issue. We have designed in the past some contracts with collectors. We may refer to it and consider it in the future while designing a new one.

#### 15.40 **KOSOVO** (*Ismail Hetemaj*)

##### **Discussion**

ER: Do you have any association of collectors in the country?

IH: We have small groups of collectors in the country, but they are not organized as an association.

#### **COUNTRIES WORKING GROUP 2: Bosnia and Herzegovina +Croatia**

#### 15.50 **BOSNIA-HERZEGOVINA** (*Branco Djuric*)

ZD: You mentioned that 10% is to pay back to the Forest Authorities. Is it applicable for state forests or also for private forests? How it works in practice?

BD: Yes, 10% is paid for using the state forests. I don't have info about private forests. As I know, in case of private forests, collectors need to pay. Also, it is important that private forests occupy small area in comparison with state forests. Sometimes, Forest Authorities make agreements with private forests owners.

BS: What people are doing with money which the Ministry collects?

BD: They use it how they want. Money is received by the Forest Authorities.

DJL: Do you have a list of threatened species?

BD: No, it does not exist; it should be elaborated for couples of species.

AT: BiH Rule Book lists some species prohibited to be harvested? Is it only list you have?

BD: Yes it is only list we have. The list needs to be undated.

HS: Do you know anything about ISSP-MAP in BiH? Affecting legislation? Has the part of Fairwild already entered to the legislation?

BD: We have the law related to ISSP-MAP. But, the companies have realized that there is nothing good for them. They will have to pay extra money in terms of enforcement of the new laws for sustainable MAPs collection.

- AT: Rule Book was revised in 2009, with subsequent approval by the Ministry in 2010. I heard that the main affect is focused on motivationfor the foreign countries to apply for permits. 10-15 application for collection permits were sent last year.
- HS: Which level (national or regional) is suitable for the actions to be undertaken for sustainable collection of *Helichrysum Italicum*?
- BD: It can be done regionally. For example, Croatia has quota, but people don't know exactly how much it is allowed to harvest. Quota setting is not clear in terms of figures used.
- HS: It can be great success if it can be implementedat the regional level.
- XH: Can you tell a few words about MAPs harvesting? Compare to last years?
- BD: This year was good for collection.

#### 16.05 **CROATIA** (Igor Borsic)

- DJL: This is more a comment rather than question. There is a general feeling that establishment of quotas is what you want. It is pretty clear from the endangered species management experience that quota is the most inefficient way of control harvest. I am wondering about willingness of the countries concerned to consider some alternatives of quota setting? It is really difficult to know how much is sustainable. What do you think?
- IB: It is much easier for inspectors to go to the field and then control the companies on how much they are allowed to harvest. It would be good to implement some alternatives. But I think, collectors are really interested to collect as much as they can to get more profit.
- XH: Do you know anything about Croatian system of drying herbs? Do you have some machines?
- IB: I am not sure. But I think they dry naturally. I have enquired about the way collected plants are dried. Thus, traditional (small scale drying) is mostly done in barns (dry, dark but airy places) while drying of plantation plants is mostly done in driers (drying chambers).
- XH: Did you have some projects focused on the natural drying of herbs?
- IB: As far as I know, no. I don't know how companies do it.
- ER: Comment: There are some projects in Romania related to natural herbs drying.
- WK: Comment: sometimes companies get material that is not good quality. If the companies get a good quality material, collectors get some premium.It is important that financial incentives are applied for certain quality materials.

### COUNTRIES WORKING GROUP 3: Macedonia

#### 16.20 **MACEDONIA** (Biljana Bauer Petrovska)

### COUNTRIES WORKING GROUP 4: Serbia and Montenegro

#### 16.30 **SERBIA** (Zora Dajic Stefanovic)



## **Discussion**

XH: There are two problems: 1) quality and 2) price. Do you have any projects related to recycling and biomass formation?

ZD: It is a really good idea to make biomass from the MAPs remains. We should keep it in mind in the future. We can develop this technology to make good fertilizers and biomass from the MAPs remains. Also, mulching – is good for organic cultivations. We can think about these projects in the future.

### *16.45 MONTENEGRO (Boris Spalevich)*

DJL: Rule Book is something that needs to be updated. Level of threat is something behind the level of threat clear understanding.

BS: Monitoring is a problem. No feedback information received. No updates exist in the country. The same info is used for a long time. Therefore, it is really difficult to implement updates.

DJL: It would be interesting to engage the different stakeholders in the MAPs activities. Is there money/funding for that?

BS: Money collected from Serbia, Montenegro can be used for the projects to be implemented in the future. It is a big portion of money received. If 10% of this money is used, it can be great.

HS: I didn't find it in the country presentations activities related to the trainings to collectors. There is a need to do something for collectors. Profession of being collector can be in need. Also we need to know the level of people involvement to the MAP sector.

ZD: I disagree. People are poor and not educated. I don't really know who is only involved in collection. Collection is not the main activity. It is seasonal additional activity.

EB: I agree too.

ZD: I think, anybody can be able to harvest MAPs. There is no need to initiate such profession and to make the unified profile of collector.

BS: Trainings for traders, for example.

ZD: It is another story.

HS: I did not mean that somebody will be a full time collector. If you give people a reason to be proud of something, you can achieve then something important. People can get the training certificate. It can be professional work. We can create understanding of improving the situation. It could end up with the best practices of collection. It can be changed to the long-term practices later.

ZD: I cannot imagine it being implemented in our country.

XH: What do you think why EU and US want to buy MAPs in SEE? How can we increase the market potential? Can we organize a regional conference related to MAPs market?

BS: Yes we can do it. Potential for the future cooperation is very important. We need to think about close regional cooperation.

XH: We need to concentrate on our own needs and challenges. We really know to handle with our own problems.

PB: It is a matter of standard. But we need to know the buyers requirements.

PV: Rural women are important element in gathering. I was wondering about women's engagement in the MAPs collection in each country?

EB: Yes, they are.

EB: What do you mean by regional branding?

BS: I mean that there is a need to think about development of brand in Serbia.

**17.15 Resource Assessment Working Group: presentation of discussion results and guidance for next work** (*Wolfgang Kathe*)

*18.00 End of the day*

*18.30 Dinner*

## 5 WORKING GROUPS DISCUSSION ON REGIONAL PROJECT IDEAS

### Day 3

#### 5.1 Working group discussion

07.30 *Breakfast*

09.00 Working Groups: **Guidance for discussion about the regional project ideas**

09.15 Working Groups: Discussion about the regional project ideas/ Preparation to the presentations of the ideas

11.00 *Coffee break*

11.20 Working Groups: Continue discussion about the regional project ideas/preparation to the presentations of the ideas

12.30 *Lunch*

#### 5.2 Working group presentations on resource assessment and regional project ideas

14.10 **Resource Assessment Working Group 1:** “*Resource assessment for Low Risk Species*” (Heiko Schindler, Danna Leaman)

See Annex 3 for Summary discussion of resource assessment working group

- Use of the list of priority species in SEE
- Funding available for the Red List assessments of MAPs in Europe. This funding could cover the assessment of 150 to 300 species. List of priority species for the SEE region (around 94 sp.) could serve as the focus list of species.

#### **Discussion**

ZD: Do you have any ideas about timetable of activities identifying the MAPS priority species in the countries?

DJL: We should be doing it right now. There is funding from EU available (before the end of this year). It would be a nice thing to do.

AT: Comment about funding for implementation of the best guidelines in the region. Updating of the Red List was included to the actions to be implemented for the potential project (Working group 4). It can be a good idea in the future.

WK: Who can have access to this Red Listing funding?

DJL: IUCN doesn't have it yet, but it is fairly secured and number of medicinal plant species is ranging between 150 and 300.

ZR: What are the certification costs for collectors?

- DJL: This question was raised earlier. There is not tightly fixed price. It depends on a number of days needed for inventory, a number of collector centers, how much preparation needs to be done. It is not fixed figure.
- EB: Based on your experience, could you please tell us about the FWC costs in Turkey?
- WK: It directly depends on the information we get from the company interested in certification. We only can calculate the costs estimates based on the info we have. It depends on the size of the operation.
- BS: Do you have some local consultants in the SEE countries for FWC? What are the criteria for certification?
- HS: No, we do not have it. FairWild Indicators Document contains the main principles used as a check list for the companies interested in certification. Any company will be assessed with regard to these FW principles. For example, current status of target species (Principle 1) is one the criteria applied for any company
- BS: Who is doing consulting?
- HS: We can offer workshops and trainings (IMO). But person who does the audit cannot do consultancy. We are not doing consultancy.
- BS: Have you started Red List assessment project in western Balkans?
- DJL: No we have not started yet. There was network of people evaluating the project. We can use the upcoming project to train the network of experts in SEE in Red Listing.

#### **14.35 Working Group 2: Future of MAPs production in the changing economy**

*(Natalija Angelova)*

- ZD: Why did you select the countries as you did?
- ER: We have chosen the priority partners who can significantly contribute to the project implementation.
- WK: Suggestion: To treat these project ideas as the first draft, after that it can further be circulated.
- HS: Why did you name the collectors training as an obstacle?
- NA: Percentage of interest of collectors in training may be very low, depending on the country.
- KJ: Trainings should be more focused on private sector, associations, and NGOs, who can effectively use it.
- AN: It is a good suggestion.
- SS: Who are the collectors?
- NA: The rural people.

#### **15 00 Working Group 3: Wild Plant Resource Management** *(Kristina Rodina)*

- ER: Can you explain the conflict between botanists and private sector?
- KJ: Explanation of the Albanian example.

DJL: I'd like to follow-up on discussion of importance of need for the accurate data on species, conservation status; and so much better information can be received through the cooperation with government.

KJ: Sharing experience of Albania; US Forest Service can help to prepare country methodology for resource assessments, while Albanian botanist's evaluations were not based on rigorous methodology.

ZK: Who can be responsible for the Scoping stage?

FD: A combination of institutions – multistakeholder process (data and experience sharing).

#### 15 20 **Working Group 4: Research** (*Zora Dajic Stefanovic*)

##### **Discussion**

DJL: There is a research network in the Caribbean region. One of the major targets of this network was to understand pharmaceutical safety of commonly used medicine. Faculties of medicine we used as sources of getting data.

ZD: We decided to put this issue to data analysis. We tried to compare the official data and data gathered.

ER: Who is target audience for the second proposal?

ZD: It can be interesting for the industry stakeholders. They can search the new compounds (ABS links)

#### 16.00 **Working Group 5: Regional Branding** (*Aleksandar Nikolovski*)

##### **Discussion**

HS: Who will be the target group for the marketing: industry or final consumers?

AN: Final consumers.

DJL: Have you considered bringing the risks (depopulation of rural areas) in order to design the regional marketing strategy around promotion of rural livelihoods, maintaining the contribution to biodiversity. For example, North American market is quite open to these kinds of things.

AN: We are talking about specific products with limited capacity. We need capacity for this. Also, maybe the market doesn't want to have a final product, maybe we have demand on raw materials.

ZD: Are there necessity of marketing and promotion of these products? There is a need to set a strategy of marketing promotion and convincing the consumers about good MAPs quality. People are not aware about it.

KJ: We can advertise the region as a region with sustainable management. USAID example: Regional Competitiveness Initiative focusing on herbs and spices, agriculture and tourism. Implementation of such initiative can be a good idea for the SEE region.

WK: US market seems to be open towards the products which are exotic. There are lots of Mediterranean products represented on the US market. Have you looked at the situation in the SEE from this perspective? Development of something exotic in the region?

KJ: We are working on this. Balkans are famous with feta cheese, a big portion is being exported to US market. We are targeting Balkans as one whole region. We have been

successful in selling herbs, spices. Now we need to make more efforts. It is not short-term process. The other aspect is that MAPs products usually go through the mediators. We need to initiate the direct export from the SEE region. Also we need to identify niche market (some success with 'fancy shops').

## 16:20 **FINAL DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION**

WK: What need to be happened? How we can proceed to make it happen? How further concept can be developed?

ZD: Use somehow AMAPSEEC. Association is very open in SEE. The core group is SEE representatives. We are happy to have members from other regions. Everybody has opportunity to attend the conferences organized by the Association. We coordinate well. We can use capacity of the association to do some activities focused on the MAP regional development. The association is open for traders. Collectors have never been involved before. Organization of joint meetings is possible in the future through announcements on the website.

AT: The first thing is to have a look at a concept and country action points. We can offer taking the role of the revising of the concepts, develop proposal and help possibly with other organization

XH: I suggest improving the background information. It will be important to invite processors and collectors to the workshops in the future. Increasing the number of private sector people is important.

KJ: I agree partially with Xevit. Business is export oriented thing. But we need all actors who will work towards development of this sector.

WK: Would it be possible to organize the seller-buyer meeting at the regional level?

ZD: Yes it is possible, but would be great to have some support for this.

XH: I mean that now after all these discussions happened, the industry needs to know what is happening now in the MAPs sector, There is a need to organize the regional conference in order to let business sector know more about the MAPs sector.

WK: Not everybody is open for this. Some companies prefer to have bi-lateral conversation. My question was about your experience in the region with buyer-seller meeting.

KJ: I will propose different and more effective mechanism for associations/private sector development. We have good fairs which can serve for further development.

ZD: It depends on the level of the company. High level companies are mostly interested in getting income. Is it possible to improve the atmosphere? It is very important to engage private sector.

KJ: Definitely yes, there are possibilities for improvement. It is a great opportunity to know the right people.

WK: Let's define the deadline for the Workshop Report?

Agreed the following:

- By 15<sup>th</sup> of October 2011 – First Draft Report
- By 22<sup>th</sup> of October 2011 – participants' comments

- By 31<sup>st</sup> of October 2011 – Workshop Report finalization

WK: We also need to have finalized WG presentation results(revised by the participants)? What is the output?

PV: Let's leave it on the voluntary basis: sending the comments later or today, it is up to the participants. We will have the output WG results in Annex and it will be crucial output.

PV: What could FAO suggest? Based on the Workshop Proceedings, we can work together with you. As soon as the final document is prepared, you should get in touch with the FAO focal point (you need to find the person) and lobby the issue and workshop outcomes. You should raise the importance of the work. FAO would be interested in joint development of Technical Cooperation Project, for example, through the Technical Cooperation Facilities (advancement to develop the proposal). These funds can be used for Cooperation Project (on scale of 350-400 thousands USD) which will initiate creation of basis modules for a large-scale project on the regional level and a basis for a multidonor fund – where donors could 'pick favourite' and fund.

WK: Post proceedings include:

- 1) Counties lobbying of relevant ministries
- 2) Regional technical cooperation program
- 3) Develop proposal through consultancy.

#### 17.20 Evaluation of the workshop (*Ralf Grunewald*)

#### 17.30 Feedback round

**Participants were asked to compare their expectations from the beginning of workshop with how those expectations were met, and provide any feedback on the workshop.**

#### Most important output:

HS: Workgroup on management planning;

AN: The workshop helped me to conceptualize the work done in Kosovo;

NK: The workshop met my expectations and help with a proposal development for the MAP sector in Kosovo;

EB: Progress is much bigger compared to the Sarajevo workshop in, 2010;

XH: I got a good opportunity to meet new interesting people;

NA: I wanted to learn about the MAPs management, and this is accomplished. I'll try to take these ideas further;

FD: The event allowed meeting people from the MAP sector; it was the useful workshop for development of intersectoral cooperation;

BB: Such a good opportunity to meet new people;

ZD: Most relevant for me is the results of the working groups;

AM: I came up with some ideas for the future projects to be initiated in the region; working groups were useful;

IB: We had very intense days! I am glad to have an opportunity to be here;

ER: New contacts obtained, an opportunity to get equated with people from different sectors;

KJ: It was the interesting workshop, with good environment and nice people;

SS: Expectations are bigger now than when we came here. Now things made me believe that something will happen;

PV: There was a good company and interesting people; a lot of work done;

BD: I got concrete commitment and work outcomes;

BM: I liked interesting country presentations and opportunities to learn more about SEE; also useful to meet people and invite their future contact and feedback to FairWild Foundation;

CK: There was a good chance to discuss management planning of resources with the experts;

BS: Regional cooperation is possible;

DJL: A lot of fresh information received, in addition to very technical work on document;

LP: I am looking forward to having future cooperation; It would be great to meet again;

KR: It was such a great introduction to the MAP sector for me and an amazing opportunity to get in touch with experts from the SEE region;

WK: Updates from all the countries and getting to know everyone personally are extremely useful.

#### What you missed:

EB: More private companies should be involved in the future and more time for discussion after presentations should be given;

XH: It would be great to invite more business-oriented stakeholders to the workshop (colleagues from the associations around Balkan);

FD: I missed more informal way of learning and sharing info; Presentations were packed with data and information;

ZD: Kafana;

AM: More consideration to biodiversity conservation/protection;

IB: I missed some other Croatians;

ER: British tea;

KJ: Coffee;

SS: Kafana;

PV: The beginning of the workshop;

CK: Bigger sign for parking space;

BS: Organizers must be more involved with private sector business; not too many people from the Ministries;

DJL: Spending more time with more of you;

KR: Really strong coffee;

WK: Fox.



**Follow-up steps:**Meeting proceedings:

- Updates to the Background documents and List of Priority species by October 10, 2011
- *Workshop Report*
  - By 15<sup>th</sup> of October 2011 – First Draft Report
  - By 22<sup>th</sup> of October 2011 – Participants' comments
  - By 31<sup>st</sup> of October 2011 – Workshop Report finalization

Post-proceedings:

- 1) Lobbying at relevant ministries (start immediately after document is available)
- 2) Regional technical cooperation programme FAO (potential for 2 years)
- 3) Start Technical Cooperation Facility (consultancy for proposal development) – from January 2012.

**ANNEX 1 Output 1: Medicinal and Aromatic Plants/Non-Wood Forest Products in South East Europe: Identifying challenges and actions to address them**

<b>Country name</b>  <b>ALBANIA</b>	<b>Critical issues/bottlenecks/needs/ constraints/challenges</b>	<b>Priority actions in the country</b>	<b>Who (institution/ person)</b>	<b>When</b>	<b>Nation al/ region al action (N/R)</b>
<b>Environmental issues</b> *priority species identification *main threats to plants  *geographical priorities *collection in or near protected areas	Red Book Inappropriate harvesting practices, Overexploitation in specific areas add certain species (Gentiana, Oregano, etc), fires, Lack of infrastructure Lack of information on defined protected areas	Update the Red Book Training on appropriate HT  Insfrastructure in place Information dissemination, awareness compaign, trainings	University of Tirana, Dpt. of Biology/Botany Forestry Extension Service, MP-EPCA  Government of Albania MP-EPCA; MEFWA	Every 2 years  Annualy  Continually  ASAP	N R N  N N
<b>Socio-economic issues</b> *Value and trade chain *Trade in MAPs *Income generation for collectors *Business development potential  *Branding/labelling/certification	Value added-products  New markets Lack of contractual agreements  High interest rate credit loans, lack of professional training High cost for SME, too many certifications to be selected	Technology uprage, imporved marketing, promotion Fundraising Preparation and Enforcement of contractual agreemetns Regulations in banking sector, subsidies for the sector by Gov. Subsidies; Donor Support	Exporters, MoAFCP, MEFWA, Donors MP-EPCA, Exporters &relevant associations Associations, Donors, Gov. Ministries, Donors	Continually  Continually Continually  Continually	N  N N  N
<b>Legal and regulatory issues</b> *Access to NWFPs	Low enforcement Legislation improvment	Law Adoption and enforcement	MoAFCP, MEFWA, MP-EPCA	2012-2013	N

*National legislation *Regulations with focus on sustainable use of MAPs *Harmonization to EU legislation	Harmonization with EU legislation				
<b>Institutional issues</b> *Organization of collectors *Regulation of collection, processing, trade *Provision of market access, trainings	Lack of functional association at collectors' level	Further development and strengthening of association	MP-EPCA, Gov.	Continually	N
<b>Other issues</b>	Lack of a national policy document on MAPs	Adoptation and implementation of national strategy	MEFWA, ME, MoAFCP, MP-EPCA	2012	N

<b>Country name</b> <b>BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA</b>	<b>Critical issues/bottlenecks/needs/constraints/challenges</b>	<b>Priority actions in the country</b>	<b>Who (institution/person)</b>	<b>When</b>	<b>National or regional action (N/R)</b>
<b>Environmental issues</b> *priority species identification *main threats to plants *geographical priorities *collection in or near protected areas	Fire threats Endangered species ( <i>Helichrysum italicum</i> )	To do preventive measures; to establish monitoring system Resource assessment; set a quota system; training of collectors; control of export; cultivation	Governmental institution Companies; scientific institutions	Short period  Medium term	R  N
<b>Socio-economic issues</b> *Value and trade chain *Trade in MAPs	Unorganized market  Black market	MAP producers association  Law enforcement	Producers/companies  Governmental institutions	Short/medium period	N

*Income generation for collectors *Business development potential *Branding/labeling/certification					
<b>Legal and regulatory issues</b> *Access to NWFPs *National legislation *Regulations with focus on sustainable use of MAPs *Harmonization to EU legislation	Weak law enforcement in practice	Law enforcement	Governmental institutions	Medium period	N
<b>Institutional issues</b> *Organization of collectors *Regulation of collection, processing, trade *Provision of market access, trainings	Exchanging information and networking	MAP producers/collector network	Producers/companies	Medium period	R
Other issues					

<b>Country name</b> <b>CROATIA</b>	<b>Critical issues/bottlenecks/needs/constraints/challenges</b>	<b>Priority actions in the country</b>	<b>Who (institution/person)</b>	<b>When</b>	<b>National or regional action (N/R)</b>
<b>Environmental issues</b> *priority species identification *main threats to plants	Problems with determining quotas that are sustainable for harvesting on country level ( <i>Helichrysum italicum</i> ) Collecting unsustainably	Research, resource assessment Monitoring of harvesting Training/education of collectors	SINP - partner Inspection	Short-term action Long-term	N N

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*geographical priorities</li> <li>*collection in or near protected areas</li> </ul>	<p>Strictly protected species</p> <p>Collection on a limited area (Helichrysum italicum)</p>	<p>(Brochure, Instructions)</p> <p>Control of collectors</p>		action	
<p><b>Socio-economic issues</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Value and trade chain</li> <li>*Trade in MAPs</li> <li>*Income generation for collectors</li> <li>*Business development potential</li> <li>*Branding/labelling/certification</li> </ul>		Promotion of cultivation	Ministry of Agriculture		
<p><b>Legal and regulatory issues</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Access to NWFPs</li> <li>*National legislation</li> <li>*Regulations with focus on sustainable use of MAPs</li> <li>*Harmonization to EU legislation</li> </ul>	Strictly protected species (Gentiana lutea)	Include amendments to the law regarding cultivation of strictly protected species	Ministry of Culture		N
<p><b>Institutional issues</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Organization of collectors</li> <li>*Regulation of collection, processing, trade</li> <li>*Provision of market access, trainings</li> </ul>	<p>Cooperation between sectors (agriculture, forestry, nature protection)</p> <p>Dialogue between companies</p>	Cross-sectoral meeting	<p>Initiated by Ministry of Culture</p> <p>Croatian Chamber of Economy</p>		<p>N</p> <p>N</p>
<b>Other issues</b>					

Country name <b>KOSOVO</b>	Critical issues/bottlenecks/needs/ constraints/challenges	Priority actions in the country	Who (institution/ person)	When	Nation al or region al action (N/R)
<b>Environmental issues</b> *priority species identification *main threats to plants *geographical priorities *collection in or near protected areas	Lack of Red Book Uncontrolled harvesting , forest fires Lack of knowledge on collection of MAP Undefined protected areas Lack of information on defined protected areas	Preparation the Red Book Training on appropriate HT Association establishment and collectors' training Defining the protected areas Information dissemination, awareness compaign, trainings	MESP, Academy of Sciences of Kosovo Government, Donors MESP, MAFRD Government, Donors	2012 2012 ASAP ASAP	N R N N
<b>Socio-economic issues</b> *Value and trade chain *Trade in MAPs *Income generation for collectors *Business development potential *Branding/labelling/certificat ion	Inormal SME's, Few Ceritifed SME's New markets development Lack of contractual agreements between Enterprises and collectors High interest rates credit loans, lack of professional training Lack of knowledge on certifications	Licensing/registration of SME's Fundraising Preparation and Enforcement of contractual agreemetns Regulations in banking sector, subsidies for the sector by Gov. Subsidies; Donor Support	MTI, MAFRD, MESP, Chamber of Commerce Gov., Donors, Assocts Exporters &relevant associations Assocts, Gov. Ministries, Donors	ASAP ASAP ASAP 2012 ASAP	N N N N N
<b>Legal and regulatory issues</b> *Access to NWFPs *National legislation *Regulations with focus on sustainable use of MAPs	Lack of adequate legislation Lack of enforcement of national policies	Law Adoption and enforcement Implementaion of Action Plan	MESP, MAFRD, Industry stakeholders	2012 2013	N N

*Harmonization to EU legislation	Harmonization with EU legislation				
<b>Institutional issues</b> *Organization of collectors *Regulation of collection, processing, trade *Provision of market access, trainings	Lack of collectors association	Collectors and traders association establishment	MAFRD, Industry stakeholders MTI	2012	N
Other issues	Lack of a national policy document on MAPs	Adoptation and implementation of national strategy	MAFRD, MESP, Association	2012	N

<b>Country name</b>	<b>Critical issues/bottlenecks/needs/constraints/challenges</b>	<b>Priority actions in the country</b>	<b>Who (institution/person)</b>	<b>When</b>	<b>National or regional action (N/R)</b>
<b>MACEDONIA</b>					
<b>Environmental issues</b> *priority species identification *main threats to plants *geographical priorities *collection in or near protected areas	Overcollecting and bad collection practices  Lack of grazing, depopulation of rural areas, decreasing of the number of collectors.  The resource assessment – a big challenge!  Better control for collected amount of MAPs and NWFP	Good collection practices. Trainings and regulation for buy out with quotas Proper pastures management, rural development  Developing cultivation of MAPs on national level (strategy and action plan for pilot test farms) Stimulating support of implementation of standards for good collection practices	Donors, private sector. Ministry of agriculture  Donors, private sector  Government	2015  2015  2015	N/R  N/R  R

	Improving visibility of MAPs in the statistic of responsible ministries	(organic/fairwild) as value adding tool Improving interaction and cooperation between regional ministries for better MAPs and NWFP management		2012	R
<b>Socio-economic issues</b> *Value and trade chain *Trade in MAPs *Income generation for collectors *Business development potential *Branding/labelling/certification	The annual 2008 WFPs/MAPs export comprises US \$ 15 millions.- 2006 19,91 US  MAPs/NWFPs from Macedonia are mostly exported in Italy in 2008, Non Europe countries and regional Europe countries Bulgaria and Greece. Gathering MAPs average income 200-300 Euro per family per June – September season Gathers income from other NWFPs is 10 times more(barriers, mushrooms)	Adding value for gathers MPP  Rural association of women – activity collecting MAPs and berries. Financial support and logistic support on MAPs	Donors	2012	N/R
	Most of the gatherers are unorganized groups. Despite the existence of the Association of Gatherers HERBA M which is result of SIPPO project activity only small percent of all gatherers is registered. Main reason is that gatherers fear registration due to the possible social security lost Only one species is registered as a brand species with geographic name and marked origin	Explore ways to expand a number of brand species with geographic name and marked origin.	Universities, NGO, expert	When the money comes	N



<b>Legal and regulatory issues</b> *Access to NWFPs *National legislation *Regulations with focus on sustainable use of MAPs *Harmonization to EU legislation	Forest Law (Official Gazette 64/09) Law on Nature Protection (Official Gazette 67/04, 14/06, 84/07)	The list of thretened species of MAPs and NWFP shall be issued as a saporate regullation and not to be part of the Custum law (Official Gazette of RM 167/2008)	The Ministry of environment and Physical planning Ministry of environment ant and the other inst.	2012	N
	Law of Environment (Official Gazette 53/05, 81/05, 24/07, 159/08, 83/09, 48/10, 124/10)  The regulations covering these laws are not completed	Provisions in the Law of Environment regarding NWFP are not suficiently defined (double taxasion) Regullation on collection and trade is not adopted		No action until Governmantal permission	N
<b>Institutional issues</b> *Organization of collectors *Regulation of collection, processing, trade *Provision of market access, trainings	„Shumski plod” just started (2009) Most of the gathers and traders are hasitating to join (only 10 out of 30 are members).  No functional association of collectors.  Cheap imports undermine the national production	Support to „Sumski plod” (Donors shall work with private sector in forming collectors network, the Goverment shall support these eforts) Inforcing national legislation for regullation collection of NWFP.  Exploring national legslation for protecting national production	Donors and private sector, Governmant	2012	N
Other issues					

<b>MONTENEGRO</b>	<b>Critical issues/bottlenecks/needs/constraints/challenges</b>	<b>Priority actions in the country</b>	<b>Who (institution/person)</b>	<b>When</b>	<b>National or regional action (N/R)</b>
-------------------	---	--	---------------------------------	-------------	--

<b>Environmental issues</b> *priority species identification *main threats to plants *geographical priorities *collection in or near protected areas	The red list are not update	To update the national red list and to put together regional red list of dangerous species	IFNP	End of 2011	N and R
	Level of threat	To identified the level of threat	IFNP	First half of 2012	
	Lack of professional educations	Training of trainers	International donors, MoA, IFNP, Biotech institute	First half of 2012	N
	Lack of MAP NGO's and MAP's association	To promote importance of NGO and associations	Independent NGO's, professional associations etc NGO's, IFNP, MoA	First half of 2012	N
	Areas of conservation	To update area of conservation and add new area on the list	NGO's, GIZ, USAID, SNV and other donors	2012-2015	N
	GPS Mapping	GPS mapping of MAP and NWFP sector	MoA, IFNP, NGO's, GIZ, USAID, SNV and other donors	First half of 2012	
	Lack of NWFP and MAP strategy	Sub Sector NWFP and MAP strategy	MoA, IFNP, Monstat	End of 2012	N and R
	Lack of data collecting	To update information from governmental officials		a.s.a.p	N and R
<b>Socio-economic issues</b> *Value and trade chain *Trade in MAPs *Income generation for collectors	Very bad sector value and chain analysis	To update value and chain analysis	IFNP, GIZ, SNV, USAID, MoA or other NGO's	a.s.a.p.	N
	Lack of regional sector value and chain analysis	To upgrade existing national value chain analysis and upgrade	MoA and Amapseec, GIZ, USAID, SNV, SIPO or other	During the 2012	

<p>*Business development potential</p> <p>*Branding/labelling/certification</p>	Lack of regional branding, labeling	web site www.amapseec.com with national strategies and different NWFP and MAP reports	NGO's		N and R
	Lack of strategies for adding value to herb products	To promote Montenegro like herbal destination and final product development	Ministry of Tourism, MoA, USAID, GIZ, SIPPO, and other NGO's	During the 2012	N and R
		Strategy for adding value NWFP and MAP products	FAO, MoA, USAID, GIZ, SNV, and other NGO's	During the 2012	N
<p><b>Legal and regulatory issues</b></p> <p>*Access to NWFPs</p> <p>*National legislation</p> <p>*Regulations with focus on sustainable use of MAPs</p> <p>*Harmonization to EU legislation</p>	Lack of understanding organic certification and its implications for international markets	To promote and support organic certification	FAO. MoA, USAID, GIZ, SNV, and other NGO's	During the 2012	N
	Lack of understanding FAIRWILD certification	To promote and support FAIRWILD certification			
	Lack of Globalgap standards	To promote and support Globalgap standard			
<p><b>Institutional issues</b></p> <p>*Organization of collectors</p> <p>*Regulation of collection, processing, trade</p> <p>*Provision of market access, trainings</p>	Lack of good wild crop harvesting practices and market standards	Training of trainers, training of collectors, booklet preparation etc.	FAO. MoA, USAID, GIZ, SNV, and other NGO's	During the 2012	N
	Lack of practices for herb cultivation	Opportunities and practices of cultivated herb crops	FAO. MoA, USAID, GIZ, SNV, and other NGO's	During the 2012	N
	Not only in Montenegro, but other parts of the world, it is the dealers in	It is very important to involve herb dealers in conservation	FAO. MoA, USAID, GIZ, SNV, and other NGO's	During the 2012	N

	<p>bulk botanical raw materials that often have far greater detailed information on plant population dynamics than biologists have.</p> <p>Law adaption and enforcement</p>	<p>measures and regulations</p> <p>Harmonization with EU legislation</p>	<p>MoA, IFNP</p>	<p>Ongoing process</p>	<p>N</p>
Other issues	<p>The unfavorable banking conditions in Montenegro are the single greatest barrier to business development and competitiveness.</p> <p>Lack of procesing equipment</p>	<p>Lobbing for funds</p>	<p>IRF found</p> <p>MIDAS, IPARD, USAID, and other NGO's</p>	<p>a.s.a.p.</p> <p>a.s.a.p.</p>	<p>N</p> <p>N</p>

SERBIA	Critical issues/bottlenecks/needs/constraints/challenges	Priority actions in the country	Who (institution/person)	When	National or regional action (N/R)
<b>Environmental issues</b> *priority species identification *main threats to plants *geographical priorities *collection in or near protected areas	<p>Red list already exists. Nevertheless, Red list should be updated according to the new IUCN methodology of classification. Endangered species of economic importance are not stressed. Red list of SEE countries doesn't exist</p>	<p>To extract endangered MAPs of economic importance. To identify such species at national and regional level to prepare management and action plans for revitalization of their population and sustainable use</p>	<p>Institute for Nature Protection/group of SEE experts</p>	<p>End of 2011/ mid of 2012</p>	<p>N and R</p>
	<p>Main factors affecting genetic variability, population's abundance</p>	<p>To identify key factors that threat MAP populations both at national</p>	<p>Institute for Nature Protection/group of SEE</p>	<p>2012</p>	<p>N and</p>

	and site fitness have not been evaluated due to lack of interest and capacity (mainly funding)	and regional level	experts		R
	Geographical regions of wild collecting in Serbia are identified. Data base on origin of raw material doesn't exist. In addition, wild collecting is limited to certain areas while in others resources are insufficiently utilized or not used	To create data base and ensure permanent monitoring of origin of collected species To perform measures for sustainable wild collecting in areas that are out of use / to expand collecting areas	Institute for nature protection Companies and MAP purchasers and traders, association Serbian Flora, supported by Ministry of Agriculture	End of 2012	N
	Agriculture in protected areas is not diversified	To promote use of MAP in protected areas (ecotourism, traditional and local products, Herbal tours) both at national and regional level	Ministry of agriculture, Government, Min of Environ	Medium and long term action	N and R
	Ethobotanical data are not gathered and compiled	Perform survey on MAP ethnobotany and traditional use including various products	Relevant scientific institutions in country and region	As above	N and R
	Balkan endemic MAP species are not researched (with few exceptions)	Enable funding of research on Balkan endemic MAPs (chemical characterization, molecular mapping, biological effects)	As above As above	As above	N and R
	Monitoring of MAP resources is not performed (more accurate quota proposals are needed)	Conducting of monitoring (methodology adoption, allocation of funds)		Long term, permanent, depend on funds	N and R

					N
<b>Socio-economic issues</b> *Value and trade chain *Trade in MAPs *Income generation for collectors *Business development potential *Branding/labelling/certification	Collectors are not registered Data on trade exists, income of collectors is regulated by the market	To register collectors	Ministry of Environment	2012 2012/2014	N N and R
	Business potential is not as high as could be, export could increase	To increase competitiveness of the sector both national and regional. To establish regional business association	NGOs	Medium term activity/reg assoc till 2014	N and R
	Most of products are not certificated and branded	To introduce certification and perform trainings to increase awareness of its advantages	NGOs international certificate agencies	Medium term	N
	MAP sector in rural development is not fully recognized	Promotion of MAP in rural development, both collecting and cultivation; to train farmers for MAP cultivation	Ministry of Agriculture, faculties and local agr extension services	Medium and long term activity	N
	Many products with MAP are not present at the market / added value products("functional food" for example, cheese, drinks...sweets)	Improvement of product diversification, certification, branding and marketing both at national and regional level	Private sector	Medium and long term action	N and R
<b>Legal and regulatory issues</b> *Access to NWFPs *National legislation *Regulations with focus on sustainable use of MAPs *Harmonization to EU	Access and use of MAP is under official legislation. Some bylaws are not fully harmonized with main Laws	To create, update and improve several bylaws and facilitate administration procedures	Ministry of Environment, Min of Trade	2012/2013	N
	Regulations on sustainable use and adequate wild collecting of MAPs	To develop regulations on sustainable MAP use. To update	Ministry of Environ/Reg group of experts, int org	2012/2013 Medium	N

legislation	don't exist . Strategy on MAP use is not updated . Regional doesn't exist Most of those is already harmonized	the nation Strategy and perform it enforcement. To formulate Regional Strategy and Action Plans (as non official doc)		term	R
<b>Institutional issues</b> *Organization of collectors *Regulation of collection, processing, trade *Provision of market access, trainings	These issues are regulated in Serbia				
Other issues	Potential of underutilized habitats for MAP collecting and especially cultivation is not fully understood  Quality of MAP products of SEE is not sufficiently recognized	Research and training in use of soils of low fertility for MAP farming  Promotion of MAPs and MAP products of SEE	Research institutions  Future regional association, relevant international institutions	Medium and long term action  As above	N and R  R

## **ANNEX 2 Output 2: Regional project proposals provided by country working groups**

**WORKING GROUP 1** (*Aleksandar Nikololovski, Ismail Hetemaj, Xhevit Hysenaj, Zsuzsanna Rathonyi, Aleksandra Mladenovic, Vuk Djukic*)

**FOCUS:** Regional branding, marketing, product development (certification, incl. FairWild obstacles, promotion of MAP products from SEE)

**Rationale** (why? explain the issue)

- regional branding will help companies to position themselves on global marketing

**Scope** (what, where)

- Concept for regional branding for some of products - Balkan Region (SEE Region)

**Objectives and aims**

- MAIN OBJECTIVE - To establish regional brand on MAP and NWFP through strength regional cooperation, increase trust between producers, traders and costumers, at regional level and improvement of competitiveness on the global market.

**Specific objectives:**

- 3.1. To identify production potential per product/country/region
- 3.2. To conduct market research at global level including determination demand per product
- 3.3. To facilitate certification process of products in accordance to international standards recognized as proof of good quality
- 3.4. To strengthen institutional background

<b>Activities</b> (what exactly)	<b>Timeline</b> (when/by when)
4.1. preparation of regional MAP marketing strategy (which will consist of proposals for advertizing, web page design, good design of final product pack, etc.)	1.1. one year and half, March 2013 (for preparation of strategy) 1.2. two years, and of 2013 (for implementation of strategy)
4.2. conduct market research at global level and determine the demand per product and region (EU/USA)	2. one year, end of 2012
4.3. upgrade of processing technology, add value through certification and post harvesting activities (need assessment, provide assistance to local partners to apply for funds)	3. two years, end of 2013
4.4. organization of regular conferences of International Association (AMAPSEEC), organization trainings for harvests, consolidators, processors	4. regularly every two years, next one in May 2012

**Partners** (who)

- Forest, land owners,
- Government,
- Line Ministries,
- International organizations (FAO, USAID, GTZ, SNV, WWF, IUCN, SIPPO),
- Small medium enterprises (SME)



## Income by country

Country	Value: Wood (million \$)	Non-wood (million \$)
Albania	0.54 + 0.26	0.34(not confirmed)
Bosnia H	300 (?)	29
Croatia	208 + 31	2.5
Kosovo		3
Macedonia	10 + 22	14
Montenegro	n.a.	7
Serbia	68+53	37
	692	92

### Funds:

1. 1.450.000,00 EUR for preparation of strategy
1. 2.900.000,00 EUR for implementation
2. 200.000,00 EUR (market research)
3. 100.000,00 EUR (need assessment, provide assistance to local partners to apply for funds)
4. 60.000,00 EUR (strengthening the institutional background)

### Potential donors (who can pay for this)

- Local governments
- International funds
- Foreign governments
- International organizations
- EU funds

### Risks and obstacles (why not)

- change of consumers attitudes
- depopulation of rural areas
- lack of interest of national governments to invest in MAP and NWP
- fragmented stakeholders
- political stability in the region
- non-tariff trade barriers
- unsecured resource apply.

**WORKING GROUP 2** (*Zora Dajic Stefanovic, Biljana Bauer Petrovska, Branko Djuric, Igor Borsic*)

**FOCUS: Research** (Research/training in use of soils of low fertility for MAP cultivation; *Helichrisum italicum* transnational resource assessment and management plan; Update of Red List; Research on Balkan endemic MAPs; Survey on MAP ethnobotany and traditional use; Climate change etc.)

**Project Proposal 1**

**Rationale** (why? explain the issue)

Ethnobotany and MAPs traditional uses in SEE are not well documented and traditional knowledge is going to be lost.

**Scope** (what, where)

Investigation of MAPs and their products which are traditionally used for different purposes (folk medicine, diet, religious, veterinary, spiritual, social etc.) in SEE countries (Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, Serbia, Macedonia, Kosovo, and Albania).

**Objectives and aims**

The main objective of the project is to make a compilation on the information on traditional use of MAPs and conservation of traditional knowledge.

**Activities** (what exactly)

- existing literature survey
- to prepare questionnaires
- to determine target sites (according to geography, nationality etc.)
- to compile folk names of MAPs and to conduct etymological analyses
- data processing
- to create a webpage and database
- to organize workshop and conference
- to publicize a book/monograph
- to raise public awareness

**Timeline** (when/by when)

3 years

**Partners** (who)

Relevant institutes and universities of SEE countries (Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, Serbia, Macedonia, Kosovo, Albania), local community, NGOs

**Funds** (for how much)

700 000 euros

**Potential donors** (who can pay for this)

EU funding, FAO, USAID, national governments, Slow Food Organization, Embassies, herbal industries

**Risks and obstacles** (why not)

Local community skepticism and distrust

Misleading information from local community.

## **Project Proposal 2**

**Rationale** (why? explain the issue)

*Helichrysum* spp. from SEE is considered to be under threat because of overexploitation. Species of this genus are appreciated as valuable MAPs and used because of their antibacterial, anti-inflammatory and hepatoprotective effects and as an insecticide. Essential oils are used in the production of perfumes and cosmetics.

**Scope** (what, where)

Investigation of genus *Helichrysum* in SEE countries (Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, Serbia, Macedonia, Kosovo, Albania)

**Objectives and aims**

Objectives of the project are:

- to make resource assessment
- to set up plan for sustainable management use
- to develop cultivation technologies and promotion of cultivation
- to improve knowledge on biology and drug quality of *Helichrysum* spp.
- to introduce and implement FairWild standard with the main aim to preserve genetic variability of natural populations of *Helichrysum* spp.

**Activities** (what exactly)

- agreement of common methodology
- mapping of natural populations
- setting of experimental cultivation fields
- awareness raising on cultivation
- investigation of biology (morphology, anatomy, ecology)
- pharmacological research
- molecular mapping
- gathering the data on ethnobotanical and traditional use
- socio-economic research
- trainings for collectors
- preparation and publishing of brochure
- analyses of obtained results and development of plan for sustainable management use
- exchange of information with key buyers (business meeting)
- workshop organization

**Timeline** (when/by when)

3 years

**Partners** (who)

Relevant institutes and universities of SEE countries (Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, Serbia, Macedonia, Kosovo, Albania) and France (Corse), companies, extension services, NGOs.

**Potential donors** (who can pay for this)

FAO, USAID, big companies/industry, EU funding.

**Risks and obstacles** (why not)

- Insufficient partner institutional capacities
- Decreased market interest for *Helichysum* sp.

**WORKING GROUP 3** (Elizabeth Radford, Elvira Bazina , Nevenka Dalac, Naser Krasniqi, Natalija Angelova, Paul Vantomme, Laszlo Percze, Zora Dajic Stefanovic)

**FOCUS:** Future of MAP production in changing rural economies (preservation of collection traditions, transition from collection to farming)

**Issues:**

- Preserving the traditional systems, building and preserving Plant-People relationship which is being lost;
- Responding to the current transition from traditional wild collection to cultivating medicinal plants
- Cope with changing rural economy
- Unsustainable harvesting practices (with WG 4 overlapping issue), lack of collectors

Overall theme is the contribution of MAPs in maintaining rural livelihoods and biodiversity

**Rationale**

Improving rural livelihoods and culture, sustainable use, to improve the livelihood in mountain areas and maintain biodiversity

**Scope**

Work undertaken on this theme is relevant throughout the region: SEE countries and mountainous areas

Global scope: Rural development, including rural, ecotourism etc.

**Objectives and aims:**

**Overall objective:**

To conserve and improve income generation and livelihoods of rural households through sustained MAP handling (collection, processing and cultivation)

**Objectives:**

- Improved collection techniques of MAPs
- Promotion of MAP cultivation
- Improve income levels of rural households through MAP handling
- Enhance processing
- Recognition of existing and potential contribution of the sector to the rural society (inc. people and environment)
- Maintain the high (plant) diversity of these regions (associated benefit ..provides ecosystem services etc etc )

**Activities:**\*\*\* = priority.

*a) Improved collection practices (techniques):*

- Consolidate and improve the technical knowledge of all involved in the collection process;
- \*\*\*2. Training collectors (posters, booklets, demonstrations, face-to-face, timing, rules, tools, calendars);
- \*\*\*3. Best practice sites as examples of good existing practises (eg Fairwild)
- \*\*\*4. Building institutional capacities, training of trainers, making MAPs more visible;
- strategically important species, specific education, awareness raising campaign, legislation framework, universities, ministries, extension services,

- Improved cultivation practices, close market links, close relationship between collectors and buyers

*b) Improved cultivation:*

- Share information: Organize study tours to ongoing practices for people from ministries, women associations, to countries like Bulgaria, Turkey (government officials on land, decision makers); for e.g. Explore and implement through land leases;
- \*\*\*2. Pilot test plots for strategic species, cultivation on high lands, on the poorest rural areas (LFA);
- Incentives for cultivation (financed by government, company, farmers), dryers and cooling;
- Land issue;

*c) Improve income:*

- Incentive system for collectors based on quality
- Contract/ Agreement between collectors and consolidators
- Contract for collectors to ensure security/quality/quantity
- Establish collector associations: improve prices, ensure the quantity (e.g. Private Forest Owners in Kosovo, Private forest users in Albania, rural women associations)
- Networking with/exploring collaboration with tour operators

*d) Improved processing*

\*\*\*1. Incentives for adding value (cultivation activities, drying machines etc.)

*e) Recognition of existing and potential contribution of the sector to the rural society (inc. people and environment)*

- Provide information to rural development authorities on the role of MAPs in maintaining rural and landscapes and society
- Development action plan with activities to promote this sector e.g. training farmers to understand potential of wild harvesting and cultivation ( inc. concrete training actions) , bringing buyers to the villages, promoting all local goods MAPs and other products.

*e) Improved biodiversity protection*

No time

**Timeline (when/by when?):**

5 years

**Partners (who?):**

Very general list of partners produced (Ministeries, Agencies, donors, NGOs, Associations) the following are potential appropriate lead organisations for the priority activities (\*\*\*)

1a) For Training collectors:

Leading organization for Albania: EPCA – Herbs and Spices Industry Association

Leading organization for Kosovo: Ministry of Agriculture,

Leading org. for Bosnia: Ministry of Agriculture

Leading org. for Macedonia: NGOs in partnership of associations

Leading org. for Serbia: Serbian Flora (Association of MAP processors and exporters)

1b) For training trainers

External expertise, Short Term Technical Assistance for regional level training of trainers (Ministry of Forest/Environment, Value chain associations, NGOs, Consultancies, Women associations, Chambers of Agriculture/Economy/Industry, Universities, Extension services)

### Best practices site

Albania: the association, EPCA

Kosovo: institutes, universities

Bosnia: Institutes, universities

Macedonia: private company eg Alkaloid

Building institutional capacities

Association in Albania, regional authorities in Kosovo, Ministries in Bosnia, Agencies in Macedonia, FAO with collaboration

Serbia: Association – Serbian Flora

### Pilot test plots – cultivation:

Industry or exporters in Albania, Ministries in collaboration with university, scientific people, Scientific people in Bosnia, NGO in Macedonia, Serbian institute for medicinal plants research

Establishing collector associations:

“Project team”??? in close cooperation with association in Albania, Expert specialist in collaboration with ministries in Kosovo, Chamber of Commerce in Bosnia, Ministry collaboration with NGO in Macedonia

### Incentives for cultivation:

Albania: the association, EPCA

Kosovo, Ministry

Bosnia, regional development agency, implementing agency(RDA, Mostar) and government

Macedonia: ministry

Funds (for how much?)

Serbia: Institute for Medicinal Plant research, Belgrade

### **Potential donors (who can pay?)/Donors active in agriculture sector:**

Bosnia: SIDA, Italian cooperation, USAID, EU, IPARD, IFAD, Czech Republic and Slovenia, World Bank

Kosovo: Finland, Norway, SIDA, EU, USA, World Bank, Denmark, the Netherlands, Luxemburg, FAO

Albania: USAID, Italian cooperation, World Bank, UNDP, SNV the Netherlands

Macedonia: UNDP, Switzerland, EU

Serbia: Ministry for Agriculture, USAID, FAO, SIDA, NL government. (UNDO – nature protection)

### **Risks and obstacles:**

- Lack of trust of amongst collectors, reluctance from collectors side
- Lack of awareness from Ministry side – not important, not priority
- Incentives - Low government priority
- Governments “Talking not doing”
- Regional and political (constraints)/ developments
- Competition among countries
- Lack of human and institutional resources/capacity.

**WORKING GROUP 4** (*Kristina Rodina, Frosina Pandrushka Dramikjanin, Kristaq Jorgji, Boris Spavelic, Sasa Stamatovic*)

**FOCUS:** Sustainable Resource Management

**Rationale:**

- Countries on different level
- Where system exists, lack of enforcement
- Information sharing missing
- Good country experiences are not available
- Eg. AL 1996 maps for 15 priority species - need update
- Low Expertise of local government/forestry data
- Periodic monitoring of populations missing
- Not updated RED BOOK
- Lack of cooperation between government and scientific sectors
- Political priority

**Scope**

- 7 countries – Balkan medicinal plants important species
- Conservation concern and economic importance
- 20 species of regional importance

**Aim**

Promotion/improvement of sustainable management practices of regional level of SEE countries

**Objectives**

- Understand and document the status of (economic/conservation) priority MAP species
- Adoption of unified guidelines/methodology for sustainable management
- Make the guidelines appropriate for every level of users
- Build capacity of different stakeholders to implement this sustainable management practices
- Creation of networking

**Activities**

1) **Scoping** (6 months for analysis):

- Identification of guidelines, best practices, country and international guidelines for sustainable management
- Identification of priority species
- Stakeholder consultation

2) **Evaluation**

- Red List for priority species update
- Resource assessments in all countries

3) **Management**

- Development of management plans for species
- Development of good practice guidelines (or adaptation of already available – GACP, FairWild, etc)
- Trainings to various stakeholders on best practices
- Monitoring

4) **Promotion**

- Regional cooperation, best practices promotion
- Dissemination of good practice guidelines



### **Preliminary content of good practice guidelines**

1. Protection of threatened species
  - Cultivation guidelines (can be included)
2. Collection practices
3. Processing practices

### **Partners**

- Private sector (collectors and companies)
- State (government and ministries)
- NGOs
- Scientific institutions

### **Risks and obstacles**

- Political situation
- Conflict interest between collectors and botanists

### **Funds**

National level:

- Environmental fund (Serbia)

International donors: (EU, IPA etc)

\*Return money from MAP sector -potential

### **ANNEX 3 Summary discussion of resource assessment working group**

**Group participants:** Heiko Schindler (HS), Christina Krug (CK), Danna Leaman (DJL), Bryony Morgan (BM)

**Overview:** The purpose of this working group was to review the draft document “FairWild Resource Assessment – A Guidance Manual for Low Risk Species” written by Heiko Schindler, and to discuss next steps for publication.

#### **Summary**

The group participants reviewed the draft document, and identified the sections that could be cut, modified, and additional information and annexes that could be included. It was discussed that the document as written covered a broader topic than was understood as “resource assessment”, as it covered management planning and monitoring aspects of ecological resource management. It was recommended to change the name of the document to “Species-area Management Plans for Low Risk Species” or similar. Some of the information included will be extracted and incorporated in a general introduction to FairWild implementation, and a separate guidance note on the FairWild risk assessment procedures for species resilience to collection.

Beyond the topic of the working group, the participants also reviewed all of the FairWild Guidance documents published or under production, and identified gaps and revisions that should be made (see attached schematic). It was agreed that as many of these documents as possible should be made available (can be advertised as available in draft, if not posted directly on website), as revision and final publication will take more time and resources than currently available.

Results of the working group session were presented to the workshop by HS. DJL also made a presentation on how the list of priority medicinal plant species for SEE (contributed in advance of the workshop by the participants) might be included in the priorities proposed for an EU-funded IUCN Red List project that will include European medicinal plants, and other IUCN Red List/conservation action opportunities in the region, for which training/capacity building might be included in designing an FAO project proposal.

## ANNEX 4 Workshop agenda

### ENABLING SUSTAINABLE MANAGEMENT OF NON-WOODFOREST PRODUCTS IN SOUTH EAST EUROPE – SPECIAL FOCUS ON MEDICINAL AND AROMATIC PLANTS

#### Wednesday, 21 September – Arrival

18.30 *Dinner*

19.15 Welcome, Introduction to Vilm (*Ralf Grunewald/Gisela Stolpe, BfN*)

#### Thursday, 22 September - Sustainable management of NWFPs in SEE – Day 1

07.30 *Breakfast*

09.00 **Welcome, introduction to the agenda and workshop goals** (*Anastasiya Timoshyna, TRAFFIC and Aleksandar Nikolovski, FAO*)

09.20 **Introduction round** (Participants expectations)

09.40 **Wild plant non-wood forest products in South East Europe** (*Wolfgang Kathe and Anastasiya Timoshyna, TRAFFIC*)

- The use of wild plants in the region
- Trade and sustainability of wild collection; international and national policies, voluntary frameworks
- Summary of the 2010 FAO-TRAFFIC Expert Consultation and outcomes

10.20 **Towards sustainability of wild plants sourcing: FairWild Standard** (*Danna Leaman, IUCN*)

- FairWild Standard and accompanying guidance documents
- Variety of uses of FairWild Standard: regulations, certification, international policy
- Implementation of FairWild Standard

10.50 *Coffee break*

<p><b>Management of wild plant non wood forest products in SEE: Country experiences I</b> (15 min presentation + 10 min for questions each)</p>
---

11.30 ALBANIA (*Elvira Bazina, International MAPs Expert*)

11.50 SERBIA (*Zora Dajic Stefanovic, AMAPSEEC*)

- 12.15 CROATIA (*Igor Borsic, Dept. of Wild and Domesticated Taxa, State Institute for Nature Protection*)
- 12.30 Lunch

**Management of wild plant non wood forest products in SEE:  
Country experiences II** (15 min presentation + 10 min for questions each)

- 14.00 KOSOVO (*Ismail Hetemaj, Ministry of Environment and Spatial Planning*)
- 14.25 MACEDONIA (*Biljana Bauer Petrovska, Skopje University*)
- 14.50 MONTENEGRO (*Boris Spalevic, USAID*)
- 15.15 Coffee break
- 15.25 BOSNIA-HERZEGOVINA (*Branco Djuric, Agriculture Faculty, Banja Luka*)
- 16.10 Non-wood forest products of South East Europe: FAO experiences (*Zsuzsanna Rathonyi/Laszlo Percze, FAO*)

**Opportunities for sustainable management of wild plant non wood forest products in SEE**

(15 min presentation + 10 min for questions):

- 16.30 **FairWild Implementation: An example of Wild Oregano in Turkey** (*Heiko Schindler, IMO*)
- 16:40 **Business perspective – purchasing sustainably** (*Christina Krug, Martin Bauer AG*)
- 17.25 **Conserving plants diversity: Important Plant Areas work** (*Liz Radford, Plantlife International*)
- 17.45 Planning of Day 2:
- Discussion and definition of working group themes
  - Working group set-up
- 18.00 End of the day
- 18.30 Dinner

**Friday, 23 September Sustainable management of NWFPs in SEE – Day 2**

- 07.30 Breakfast
- 09.00 Introduction to goals and expected outcomes for day 2, general guidance for working groups

**Working Groups**

- Country working groups: discussion of priority actions for country  
*For preparation see Background document on MAP/NWFPs sector in selected SEE countries and List of priority species in SEE. Updates of the information are welcome*
- Resource assessment for low-risk plant species working group  
*For preparation see the List of priority species in SEE and Resource Assessment Guidance documents (2008 and 2011)*

09.15 Working groups: discussion

10.50 *Coffee break included*

12.00 Reconvene for brief group work results presentation/discussion

12.05 Resource Assessment Group: preliminary results

12.15 **Country presentations on the result of the discussion about the main challenges in the MAP sector and actions to be undertaken**

**Country Working Group 1: Albania and Kosovo**

12.15 ALBANIA (*Elvira Bazina, International MAPs Expert*)

12.30 *Lunch*

13.30 – 15.00 Tour around the island

15.00 *Coffee break*

15.30 **Country presentations on the result of the discussion about the main challenges in the MAP sector and actions to be undertaken- *continue***

15.40 KOSOVO (*Ismail Hetemaj, Ministry of Environment and Spatial Planning*)

**Country Working Group 2: Bosnia and Herzegovina and Croatia**

15.50 BOSNIA-HERZEGOVINA (*Branco Djuric, Agriculture Faculty, Banja Luka*)

16.05 CROATIA (*Igor Borsic, Dept. of Wild and Domesticated Taxa, State Institute for Nature Protection*)

**Country Working Group 3: Macedonia**

16.20 MACEDONIA (*Biljana Bauer Petrovska, Skopje University*)

**Country Working Group 4: Serbia and Montenegro**

16.30 SERBIA (*Zora Dajic Stefanovic, AMAPSEEC*)

16.45 MONTENEGRO (*Boris Spalevic, USAID*)

17.15 **Resource Assessment Working Group:** Presentation of discussion results and guidance for next work (*Wolfgang Kathe*)

18.00 *End of the day*

18.30 Dinner

### Saturday, 24 September - Sustainable management of NWFPs in SEE – Day 3

07.30 Breakfast

09.00 Working Groups: **Guidance for discussion about the regional project ideas**

09.15 Working Groups: Discussion about the regional project ideas/Preparation of the group presentation

11.00 Coffee break

11.20 Working Groups: Continue discussion about the regional project ideas/preparation of the group presentation

12.30 Lunch

14.00 **Working group presentations on resource assessment/regional project ideas**

14.10 **Working Group 1:** “Resource assessment for Low Risk Species” (Heiko Schindler, IMO and Danna Leaman, IUCN)

14.35 **Working Group 2:** Future of MAPs production in the changing economy (Natalija Angelova, Macedonian Ecological Society)

15.00 **Working Group 3:** Wild Plant Resource Management (Kristina Rodina, TRAFFIC)

15.20 **Working Group 4:** Research (Zora Dajic Stefanovic, AMAPSEEC)

15.30 Coffee break

16.00 **Working Group 5:** Regional Branding (Aleksandar Nikolovski, FAO)

16:20 **Final discussion and conclusion**

17.20 **Evaluation of the workshop** (Ralf Grunewald, BfN)

18.00 End of the day

### Sunday, 25 September – Departure

## ANNEX 5 List of participants

No	Surname	Name	Institution	Address	City	Country	Tel.	Fax	E-mail
1	Natalija	Angelova	Macedonian Ecological Society	Bvld. Kuzman Josifovski Pitu 28-3/7	1000 Skopje	Macedonia	+389 02 2402 773	+389 02 2402 774	natalijaangelova@gmail.com
2	Goran	Angelovski	Association Sumski Plod	Jane Sandanski 76/1	1000 Skopje	Macedonia	+389 78212388	+389 /023217188	dvm.angelovski@gmail.com
3	Biljana	Bauer Petrovska	Pharmacy Faculty, Skopje	Ul. Koce Metalec No 2V-I/34	1000 Skopje	Macedonia	+389/78447 901	+389/231230 54	biljanabauer@yahoo.com biba@ff.ukim.edu.mk
4	Elvira	Bazina	International Consultant	Rr.I.Tomini; P.G&P; Sh.2, Ap. 30	Tirana	Albania			elbazina@gmail.com
5	Igor	Borsic	State Institute for Nature Protection, Department of Wild and Domesticated Taxa and Habitats	Trg Mazuranica 5	10000 Zagreb	Croatia	+385/15502 946	+385/155029 01	igor.borsic@dzzp.hr
6	Zora	Dajic Stevanovic	University of Serbia, Faculty of Agriculture	Nemanjina 6	11080 Belgrade	Serbia			dajic@agrif.bg.ac.rs
7	Nevenka	Dalac	Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Relation of Bosnia and Herzegovina	Musala 9	71000 Sarajevo	Bosnia and Herzegovina	+387/33 95 35 10	+387/33 95 35 01	nevenka.dalac@mvteo.gov.ba
8	Branko	Djuric	Agriculture Faculty Banja Luka	Bulevar Vojvode Petra Bojovica 1A	78000 Banja Luka, Republic of Srpska	Bosnia and Herzegovina	+ 387 51 330 957		djuric_branko@yahoo.com
9	Frosina	Dramikjanin	Macedonian Ecological Society	Bvld. Kuzman Josifovski Pitu 28-3/7	1000 Skopje	Macedonia	+389 02 2402 773	+389 02 2402 774	pandurska@mes.org.mk; ataraksija@yahoo.com
10	Ralf	Grunewald	Federal Agency for Nature Conservation, , InternationalAcademy Isle of	Insel Vilm	18581 Putbus	Germany	+49 /38301/86- 115	+49 /86301/86- 150	ralf.grunewald@bfn-vilm.de

			Vilm						
11	Ismail	Hetemaj	Ministry of Environment and Spatial Planning in Kosovo	Ex "Rilindja" Building	1000 Prishtina	Kosovo	+381/38211 805	+381/382003 2041	Ismail.Hetemaj@ks-gov.net
12	Sophie	Hirschelmann	Greifswald University			Germany			sophie.hirschelmann@stud.uni-greifswald.de
13	Xhevit	Hysenaj	EPCA - Herbs&Spice Industry association in Albania,XHERDO Ltd	Str. Nikolla lena 138	Tirane	Albania			xherdo@yahoo.com
14	Wolfgang	Kathe	Consultant to TRAFFIC - the wildlife trade monitoring network,c/o WWF Germany	Buntentorsteinweg 226	28201 Bremen	Germany			wok@imo.ch, giraglia@arctictern.de
15	Naser	Krasniqi	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Kosovo	Mother Theresa Str. 35, MAFRD room A14	10000 Pristina	Kosovo	+381 38 245 403		Naser.Krasniqi@fao.org
16	Christina	Krug	Martin Bauer GmbH & Co. KG, Strategische Beschaffung / Strategic Procurement	Dutendorfer Str. 5-7	91487 Vestenbergsgreuth	Germany	+49 9163/88-237	+49 9163/888-237	christina.krug@martinbauer.de
17	Danna	Leaman	IUCN Medicinal Plants Specialist Group, Research Associate, Canadian Museum of Nature and Chair, IUCN-SSC Medicinal Plant Specialist Group	98 Russell Avenue	K1N 7X1 Ottawa, Ontario	Canada	+1 613/ 235 7213		djl@green-world.org
18	Aleksandra	Mladenovic	WWF MedPO			Bosnia and Herzegovina			emesanovic@wwfmedpo.org; amladenovic71@yahoo.com
19	Bryony	Morgan	FairWild Foundation, TRAFFIC	c/o TRAFFIC, 219a Huntingdon Road	Cambridge, CB3 0DL	United Kingdom	+44 0 1223 277 427		bryony.morgan@traffic.org
20	Aleksandar	Nikolovski	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Kosovo	Mother Theresa Str. 35, MAFRD room A14	10000 Pristina	Kosovo	+381 38 245 403		Aleksandar.Nikolovski@fao.org
21	Laszlo	Percze	FAO-REUT, FAO Subregional Office for Central and Eastern Europe	Benczur utca 34	1068 Budapest	Hungary	+361/81412 54	+361/351702 9	Laszlo.Percze@fao.org
22	Elizabeth	Radford	Plantlife International,	14 Rolleston	Salisbury,	United	+44 01722/	+44 01722/	Liz.Radford@plantlife.org.



			International Programme Manager	Street	Wiltshire, SP1 1DX	Kingdom	342736	329035	uk
23	Zsuzsanna	Rathonyi	FAO-SEUM, FAO Subregional Office for Central and Eastern Europe	Benczur utca 34	1068 Budapest	Hungary			Zsuzsanna.Rathonyi@fao.org
24	Kristina	Rodina	TRAFFIC International, c/o WWF Hungary	Álmos vezér útja 69/A	1141 Budapest	Hungary			kristina.rodina@wwf.hu
25	Heiko	Schindler	Institute for Marketecology (IMO)	Weststr. 51	CH-8570 Weinfelden	Switzerland			hs@imo.ch
26	Boris	Spalevic	USAID Economic Growth Project	7 omladinske brigade 9	81000 Podgorica	Montenegro	382 20 227 585	382 20 227 585	bspalevic@me.chfinternational.org
27	Sasa	Stamatovic	Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Water Management			Serbia			sasa.stamatovic@minpolj.gov.rs
28	Gisela	Stolpe	Federal Agency for Nature Conservation, InternationalAcademy Isle of Vilm	Insel Vilm	18581 Putbus	Germany			gisela.stolpe@bfn-vilm.de
29	Anastasya	Timoshyna	TRAFFIC International, c/o WWF Hungary	Álmos vezér útja 69/A	1141 Budapest	Hungary	+36 1/214 55 54-132	+36 1/212 93 53	anastasiya.timoshyna@wwf.hu
30	Kristaq	V. Jorgji III	USAID/Albania, US Embassy	Rruga Elbasanit 103	Tirana	Albania	+355 68 403 186		kjorgji@usaid.gov; dhermijorgji@yahoo.com
31	Paul	Vantomme	FAO-FOEI, Senior Forestry Officer, Forest Products and Industries Division. Forestry Department		Roma	Italy	+39 06 570 54730	+39 06 570 55137	paul.vantomme@fao.org
32	Vuk	Djukic	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, Extension service on plant production	Rimski Trg bb	81000 Podgorica	Montenegro	+382/69070 050		djukicvuk97@gmail.com

**TRAFFIC**  
the wildlife trade monitoring network

