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FOREWORD

One of the main factors adversely affecting the conservation, use, monitoring and reporting of information on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (PGRFA) is the lack of access to data and inefficient exchange of information. This is, in large part, due to the different approaches to data management and documentation, which have prevented the creation of a unique language to share data despite the many attempts, so far, to do so.

This lack of standardization had prevented the PGRFA community from exchanging PGRFA data worldwide and had, for years, been one of the main challenges for the effective conservation and sustainable use of plant material. These gaps represent a barrier to the sharing of information in the scientific community and to the development of value-added services for plant breeders, researchers and organizations working on agricultural biodiversity. If crop wild relatives (CWR) in situ resources are to be conserved and sustainably used, it is fundamental to bring their information into an accessible standardized format to secure a consistent data compilation and management.

To meet these challenges, the Secretariat of the FAO International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA) undertook to address the gaps and the lack of coherence in the documentation methods for plant resources, in particular for Crop Wild Relatives (CWR) conserved under in situ conditions, through the development of an international standard. It has developed an international language for CWR in situ data that will enable countries to compile and exchange data held by different national and international organizations, advanced research institutes and other bodies. Compilation and data exchange for on-farm managed cultivated PGRFA is not addressed in this document.

This technical paper is an additional tool by which the Secretariat seeks to strengthen capacities of Contracting Parties and National Programmes on the implementation of the International Treaty. The List of Descriptors will help users to understand how CWR in situ information can be documented and integrated in their institutional workflow, including what data need to be provided and how to do it.

The accomplishment of this undertaking was possible thanks to the work of experts, technical staff and national focal points of the Treaty involved in the consultations and related discussions over this year. Special thanks to the support of the members of the Core Advisory Group who provided scientific guidance to the development process of this List of Descriptors. The financial support provided by the Government of Germany,
which made it possible for us to undertake this project is acknowledged and highly appreciated.

We hope that this material meets the needs of researchers and users of CWR material and the broader plant genetic resources community, and that it will also contribute to the way plant genetic resources for food and agriculture are documented and exchanged at the global level.

Kent Nnadozie
Secretary
International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA)
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This technical paper has been developed and published thanks to the project “Development of a globally agreed list of descriptors for in situ Crop Wild Relatives Documentation”, funded by the Federal Ministry of Food and Agriculture of Germany.

The Secretariat of the International Treaty of FAO acknowledges all the institutions and individuals who have contributed to the accomplishment of this work.

Our very special thanks go to the experts who participated in the various consultations, round tables and training workshops for their valuable inputs and suggestions.

This publication also benefited from the valuable review by members of the Core Advisory Group of the project, specially selected for the validation of the survey results whose names are listed under the List of Contributors below. They are acknowledged for their significant support, guidance and advice.

Finally, we thank all the national focal points of the International Treaty and individuals who provided important inputs in the consultation process and for the improvement of this publication.

We are grateful to the colleagues of the Treaty Secretariat and other technical staff of FAO for their contribution to the development of this document. Thanks to Adriana Alercia, Francisco López, Marco Marsella, Ana Laura Cerutti and Gerardo Francione for their direct inputs and active coordination of the project.

Kent Nnadozie, Secretary of the International Treaty, held the overall responsibility for this publication.
CONTRIBUTORS

Core Advisory Group

Barbieri Rosa Lia, Embrapa- CENARGEN, Brazil

Bernhardt Nadine, Julius-Kühn Institute, Germany

Bounisch Maria, Julius-Kühn Institute, Germany

De Maio Pablo, Universidad Nacional de Catamarca, Argentina

Dulloo Mohammad Ehsan, The Alliance of Bioversity International and CIAT, Mauritius

Endresen Dag, GBIF and University of Oslo, Norway

Germeier, Christoph, Julius-Kühn Institute, Germany

Hassan Neveen, National Gene Bank, Egypt

Iriondo José M., King Rey Juan Carlos University, Spain

Mathur Prem Narain, Alliance of Bioversity International and CIAT; and Kirkhouse Trust, India

Maxted Nigel, University of Birmingham, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Zhang Zongwen, The Alliance of Bioversity International and CIAT, China
### Survey Experts

#### Argentina
- **Bertero Daniel**, Universidad de Buenos Aires  
- **Gonzales Juan Antonio**, Fundación Miguel Lillo

#### Armenia
- **Avagyan Alvina**, Scientific Centre of Vegetables and Industrial Crops

#### Australia
- **Humphries Alan**, SARDI  
- **Norton Sally**, Australian Grains Genebank - Agriculture Victoria

#### Bangladesh
- **Salam Md. Abdus**, Bangladesh Agriculture Research Council

#### Belgium
- **Vandelook Filip**, Meise Botanic Garden

#### Bhutan
- **Dorji Rinchen**, National Biodiversity Centre, Ministry of Agriculture and Forests  
- **Tshering Wang**, National Biodiversity Centre

#### Bolivia
- **Bonifacio Alejandro**, Fundación PROINPA

#### Brazil
- **Clement Charles**, Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas da Amazonia (INPA)  
- **Fragomeni Simon Marcelo**, Embrapa  
- **Gomes Pádua Juliano**, Embrapa  
- **Guiducci Filho Edson**, Embrapa  
- **Heiden Gustavo**, Embrapa Clima Temperado  
- **Pinto de Lemos Eurico Eduardo**, Universidade Federal de Alagoas (Ufal)  
- **Ribeiro de Castro Ana Cecilia**, Embrapa Agroindustria Tropical  
- **Santos Sandra Aparecida**, Embrapa Pantanal  
- **Sosinski Júnior Ênio Egon**, Embrapa

#### Canada
- **Diederichsen Axel**, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada  
- **Smith Tyler**, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada

#### Chile
- **Salazar Suao Erika**, Instituto de Investigaciones Agropecuarias (INIA)

#### Colombia
- **Parra Quijano Mauricio**, Universidad Nacional de Colombia – Agronomía
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>Bonilla Nevio, INTA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechia</td>
<td>Holubec Vojtěch, Crop Research Institute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>Monteros Altamirano Álvaro Ricardo, INIAP</td>
<td>Instituto Nacional de Investigaciones Agropecuarias (INIAP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tapia Bastidas César, INIAP</td>
<td>Instituto Nacional de Investigaciones Agropecuarias (INIAP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>Galán Pablo, Asociación Jardín Botánico La Laguna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morales Herrera Aura Jasmin, CENTA</td>
<td>Centro Nacional de Tecnología Agropecuaria y Forestal (CENTA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>Annamaa Külli, Estonian Crop Research Institute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Holtsmann Külli, Ministry of Rural Affairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eswatini</td>
<td>Mbingo Musa Maxwell, National Plant Genetic Resources Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Fitzgerald Heli, University of Helsinki</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kiviharju Elina, Luke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Bazile Didier, CIRAD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Didier Audrey, Ministère de l’Agriculture et de l’Alimentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Guarino Luigi, Global Crop Diversity Trust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Obreza Matija, Global Crop Diversity Trust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thormann Imke, Federal Office for Agriculture and Food</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weise Stephan, IPK Gatersleben</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>Aboagye Lawrence Misa, CSIR-Plant Genetic Resources Research Institute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Aravanopoulos Filippo, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avramidou Evangelia, Imfe Elgo Demeter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mellidou Ifigeneia, Institute of Plant Breeding Hao-Demeter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Merkouropoulos Georgios, Hellenic Agricultural Organisation-Demeter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mylona Photini, HAO-DEMETER, Institute of Plant Breeding &amp; Genetic Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ralli Parthenopi, Hellenic Agricultural Organization-Demeter, Institute of Plant Breeding and Genetic Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tzatzani Thiresia-Teresa, Hellenic Agricultural Organization-Demeter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Guatemala
Hernández de La Parra, Mauricio, Ministerio de Agricultura, Ganadería y Alimentación (MAGA)

India
Gupta Veena, ICAR-NBPGR
Pandravada SR, NBPG Regional Station, Hyderabad
Pradheep K, ICAR-NBPGR
Sivaraman Nivedhitha, ICAR-NBPGR
Tripathi Kuldeep, ICAR-NBPGR, New Delhi

Israel
Mayzlish Gati, Einav Israel Gene Bank
Singer Alon, Israel Plant Gene Bank, Agricultural Research Organization - The Volcani Center

Italy
Negri Valeria, Università degli Studi di Perugia
Ricardo Dias Sonia, FAO

Jordan
Abulaila Khaled, National Agricultural Research Center (NARC)
Al Sane Khaldoun, National Agricultural Research Center (NARC)

Kenya
Fadda Carlo, Alliance of Bioversity and CIAT
Nyamongo Desterio Ondieki, Genetic Resources Research Institute - Kenya Agricultural and Livestock Research Organization (KALRO)

Lebanon
Chéhadé Ali, Institut de Recherches Agronomiques Libanais (IRAL)

Malawi
Mponya Nolipher, Malawi Plant Genetic Resources Centre

Mali
Sidibé Amadou, Institut d’Economie Rurale

Malta
Fresta Louis, Plant Protection Directorate, Veterinary and Phytosanitary Regulation Department, Ministry for the Environment, Sustainable Development and Climate Change

Mexico
Orjuela Restrepo Maria Andrea, Conabio

Mongolia
Noov Bayarsukh, Institute of Plant and Agricultural Science
Morocco
Amri Ahmed, International Center for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas (ICARDA)
El Bahloul Yasmina, Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique (INRA)
Sahri Ali, INRA

Netherlands
Kik Chris, CGN
van Zonneveld Maarten, World Vegetable Center

Nicaragua
Cajina Acevedo Néstor, Instituto Nicaragüense de Tecnología Agropecuaria

Norway
Rasmussen Morten, NIBIO - Norwegian Genetic Resource Center

Oman
Alsaady Nadiya, Oman Animal and Plant Genetic Resources Center

Pakistan
Ahmad Shakeel, Pakistan Agricultural Research Council
Siddiqui Sadar Uddin, PARC-NARC-BCI

Papua New Guinea
Komolong Birte, PNG National Agricultural Research Institute

Peru
Amasifuen Guerra Carlos Alberto, Instituto Nacional de Innovación Agraria
Ingar Elliott Vanessa, Ministerio del Ambiente

Poland
Dostatny Denise F., Plant Breeding and Acclimatization Institute - National Centre for Plant Genetic Resources
Forycka Anna, Institute of Natural Fibres and Medicinal Plants
Podyma Wieslaw, Plant Breeding and Acclimatization Institute

Serbia
Mikic Sanja, Institute of Field and Vegetable Crops
Terzić Sreten, Institute of field and vegetable crops

Slovakia
Hauptvogel Pavol, National Agricultural and Food Centre - Research Institute of Plant Production

Sweden
Palmé Anna, NordGen
Weibull Jens, Board of Agriculture
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Sylvain Aubry</td>
<td>Federal Office for Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Mulumba John Wasswa</td>
<td>Plant Genetic Resources Centre - National Agricultural Research Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland</td>
<td>Müller Jonas V.</td>
<td>Royal Botanic Gardens Kew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>Gaiero Paola</td>
<td>Universidad de la República</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rivas Latorre Mercedes María</td>
<td>Universidad de la República, Rocha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>Brenner David</td>
<td>USDA ARS Plant Introduction Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ragone Diane</td>
<td>National Tropical Botanical Garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>Kamusaki Womba Peggy</td>
<td>Zambia Agriculture Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ng’uni Dickson</td>
<td>Zambia Agriculture Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sampa Sumini</td>
<td>Zambia Agriculture Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tembo Masiye</td>
<td>National Plant Genetic Resources Centre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This list of passport Descriptors for Crop Wild Relatives conserved in situ (CWRI v.1) has been developed taking the Core Descriptors for in situ conservation of CWR v.1 published by Bioversity International in 2013 as the starting point. It also builds on recent experiences conducted by the Secretariat of FAO’s International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA) in the context of the development of its Global Information System (GLIS), as well as on the inputs of international projects such as the Farmer’s Pride.

The CWRI passport descriptors proposed here constitute the minimum initial list for CWR in situ data exchange. They are the result of consultations conducted with the support of the national focal points of the International Treaty and selected international partners and experts, as reported in the ‘Contributors’ section. A global survey was conducted in early 2020 and the inputs of more than 107 experts from 87 institutions in 48 countries have been analysed and taken into consideration. We are also thankful to all the scientists that have served in the Core Advisory Group (12 members) for their valuable support in setting the direction of the research and taking a prominent role in the validation of the results.

The list is intended to be a user-friendly data exchange tool for which data should be available worldwide. Its wide adoption and use will facilitate and streamline the collection of data needed for documenting in situ CWR in a consistent way.

For each descriptor, this tool provides a brief explanation of content, its coding scheme, and a suggested field name. Nevertheless, on-farm management of plant material is not addressed in this document. It is to be noted that suggested mandatory descriptors are highlighted.

The standard descriptor list for CWR in situ documentation developed and validated at the global level through this project is an evolving document. The future modification or addition of further descriptors should not be precluded when more data would become available. These CWRI descriptors are designed to facilitate the compilation and exchange of CWR in situ passport data. They are also designed to contribute to the further development of the Global Information System (GLIS) and support the conservation and utilization of CWR throughout the world. Furthermore, they aim to be compatible with the ‘Digital Object Identifiers for food crops - Descriptors and guidelines of the Global Information System’ (Alercia et al. 2018).

Core descriptors for in situ conservation of crop wild relatives v.1.
The Secretariat of the International Treaty welcomes any suggestions for the improvement on this first version (v.1) of Descriptors for in situ conservation of CWR and can be sent to the Secretary of the International Treaty pgrfa-Treaty@fao.org.

**MANDATORY DESCRIPTORS**

1. **Genus**
   
   *Genus name for taxon.*

2. **Species**
   
   *Specific epithet portion of the scientific name. If unknown, ‘sp.’ is allowed.*

3. **Species authority**
   
   *Provide the authority for the species name. It is recommended to use the Catalogue of life.*

4. **Subtaxon**
   
   *Subtaxon can be used to store any additional infraspecific epithet. The following abbreviations are allowed: ‘subsp.’ (for subspecies); ‘var.’ (for botanical variety); ‘f.’ (for form). It is recommended to use the Catalogue of life.*

5. **Subtaxon authority**
   
   *Subtaxon authority at the most detailed taxonomic level.*

* Descriptors numbers belonging to the list published in 2013 are included in parentheses (x.x.x) next to the descriptor's name.
6. **Country of occurrence** (2.1.1) (ORIGCTY)
Country where the CWR population was observed or inventoried. Use the Three-letter ISO 3166-1 code of the country where the site is located.

7. **Location of occurrence site** (2.1.2) (OCCURSITE)
Location information below the country level that describes the site where the population sample was observed, inventoried, or collected, preferably in English. This might include the distance in km and direction from the nearest town, village, or map grid reference point, (e.g. 7 km south of Curitiba in the state of Parana).

   7.1 **Name of the location or nearest place**
Name of the site location or nearest place to site (village, town, city or landmark). The name used may also be created to indicate a place that may not have proper names (e.g. the junction of two named roads).

   7.2 **Distance to site** [km]
Distance in km from nearest named place to site.

      7.2.1 **Type of distance**
      1 Road distance
      2 Straight distance

   7.3 **Direction from nearest named place**
Direction of site from nearest named place in degrees relative to North.

8. **Latitude of occurrence site** (Decimal degrees) (2.1.3.1) (DECLATITUDE)
Latitude of the site expressed in decimal degrees. Positive values are North of the Equator; negative values are South of the Equator (e.g. -44.6975).

9. **Longitude of occurrence site** (Decimal degrees) (2.1.3.2) (DECLONGITUDE)
Longitude of the site expressed in decimal degrees. Positive values are East of Greenwich Meridian; negative values are West of the Greenwich Meridian (e.g. -120.9123).

10. **Coordinate datum** (2.1.3.4) (COORDDATUM)
The geodetic datum or spatial reference system in which the coordinates given in decimal latitude and decimal longitude are based (e.g. WGS84, ETRS89, NAD83).

11. **Elevation of site** [masl] (2.1.4) (ELEVATION)
Elevation of site expressed in meters above sea level. Negative values are allowed.

12. **Site protection** (2.4) (SITEPROT)
Indicate whether the site is under any legal or official legislation. Follow IUCN Guidelines available at https://portals.iucn.org/library/node/30018
13. **Observation date** [YYYY-MM-DD] (3.1.1) (OBSDATE)
The most recent date the population was observed.

14. **Population identifier** (3.1.2) (POPID)
The identifier (sequential number or code) that you use to identify your population. Each distinct population should be given a population unique identifier.

15. **Collecting number** (3.2.3) (COLLNUMB)
Original identifier assigned by the collector(s) to the sample/specimen deposited in the genebank.

16. **Status of occurrence site** (3.2.4) (POPSRC)
Status of the occurrence site of the population.

- 10 **Wild** (11 Forest or woodland, 12 Shrubland, 13 Grassland, 14 Desert or tundra, 15 Aquatic habitat)
- 20 **Farm or cultivated area** (21 Field, 22 Orchard, 23 Backyard, kitchen or home garden, 24 Fallow land, 25 Pasture, 28 Park)
- 60 **Weedy, disturbed or ruderal habitat** (61 Roadside, 62 Field margin)
- 99 **Other** (for example coastal habitats, elaborate in REMARKS field)

17. **Biological status of the population** (SAMPSTAT)
The coding scheme proposed can be used at different levels of detail, either by using the general codes (in **boldface**), such as 100 or 200, or by using the more specific codes such as 110, 120 or 130.

- 100 **Wild**
  - 110 Natural
  - 120 Semi-natural/wild
  - 130 Semi-natural/sown
- 200 **Weedy**
- 999 **Other** (elaborate in REMARKS field)

18. **Managing institute, legal entity or individual name** (MNGINSTNAME)
Name and address of the institute, legal entity, herbarium, or individual responsible of the population (e.g. protected area authority, nature reserve manager, national park manager, private landowner, etc.).

18.1 **Managing institute or individual address** (MNGINSTADDRESS)
19. **Name of the institute or individual holding ex situ samples** (INSTNAME)
Name and address or code of the institute, legal entity, herbarium, or individual where collected population samples are deposited (e.g. local or national genebank, or herbarium). If the Managing institute has collected material, the holding institute name and address should be the same as the Managing institute.

19.1 **Address of the holding organization or individual** (INSTADDRESS)

20. **Code of the institute or herbarium holding ex situ samples** (3.2.5.2)
FAO WIEWS institute code or Index Herbariorum code of the institute where the ex situ accession/specimen is maintained.

20.1 **FAO WIEWS institute code** (http://www.fao.org/wiews) (INSTCODE)

20.2 **Index Herbariorum code** (http://sweetgum.nybg.org/science/ih/) (HERBCODE)

21. **Accession/specimen number** (3.2.5.1)
This is the unique identifier for accessions or specimens collected (e.g. genebank, herbarium, etc.) and is assigned when a sample/specimen is entered into the collection.

21.1 **Ex situ accession number** (ACCENUMB)

21.2 **Herbarium specimen number** (SPECNUMB)

22. **Conservation actions in place** (3.5) (CONSACTION)
Indication whether conservation actions related to the population are in place. Use the IUCN classification scheme for conservation actions in place (available from https://nc.iucnredlist.org/redlist/content/attachment_files/dec_2012_guidance_conservation_actions_in_place_classification_scheme.pdf) (adapted).

0 No conservation actions

1 Monitoring and Planning

2 Land/Water Protection and Management

3 Species Management

4 Education and Legislation

99 Other (elaborate in REMARKS field)
23. **MLS status of the material** *(MLSSTAT)*  
The status of the *ex situ* accession of the CWR population with regards to the Multilateral System of Access and Benefit-sharing of the International Treaty, if available.

0 Not available under the MLS  
1 Available under the MLS

24. **Links to associated information** *(URL)* *(LINKS)*  
One or more URLs where further information about the CWR can be found. Multiple values are separated by a semicolon without space.

25. **Remarks** *(REMARKS)*  
The Remarks field is used to add notes or to elaborate on descriptors with value 99 or 999 (= Other). Prefix remarks with the field name they refer to and a colon (:) without space (e.g. SITESTAT:riverside). Distinct remarks referring to different fields are separated by semicolons without space.
OPEN QUESTION

Global Unique Identifier
Various experts indicated that the use of a global unique and persistent identifier (PUID) would be useful to build automatic services to integrate CWR in situ data and to enable the desired linkages between populations and other genotype entities across different information systems.

The Secretariat of the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (PGRFA) facilitates the assignment of a persistent unique identifier (PUID), in the form of a Digital Object Identifier (DOI) to the Global Information System (GLIS) users, free of charge (https://ssl.fao.org/glis). The Secretariat is also available to provide training and support required by stakeholders for the adoption of DOIs.

DOIs go beyond the concatenation of fields and offer advanced services that would, for instance, facilitate the identification of germplasm safety duplicated in ex situ conditions (i.e. genebank or herbarium), or allow a flexible access to information associated to the CWR. Although different PUID technologies exist, DOIs have been selected as the best option by a panel of experts in 2015.

X. Persistent Unique Identifier (PUID)
It is any persistent unique identifier assigned to the population so it can be unambiguously referenced at the global level and the information associated with it harvested through automated means. Report one PUID for each population. For ex situ material DOIs have been adopted since 2017.
FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT:
International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture
pgrfa-treaty@fao.org

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
Rome • Italy