Appendix S2 B Structured Questionnaire

No	Expert Participant	Country	Affiliation Institution	
1	Participant 1	Bosnia and Herzegovina	University of Banja Luka	
2	Participant 2	Bulgaria	PhD Ass. Professor	
3	Participant 3	Bulgaria	PhD Ass. Professor	
4	Participant 4	Bulgaria	WWF Bulgaria	
5	Participant 5	Bulgaria	Sofia University "St. Kliment Ohridski"	
6	Participant 6	Croatia	Croatian Forest Research Institute	
7	Participant 7	Czech Republic	Department of Botany, Charles University	
8	Participant 8	Finland	Finnish environment institute SYKE	
9	Participant 9	France	INRA UMR BioForA	
10	Participant 10	Greece	University of Patras, Department of Biology	
11	Participant 11	Iceland	Icelandic Forest Service	
12	Participant 12	Italy	Consiglio per la ricerca in agricoltura e l'analisi dell'economia agraria, CREA	
13	Participant 13	Italy	ly CREA Research Centre for Forestry and Wood Casale Monferrato, Italy	
14	Participant 14	Poland	The Kostrzyca Forest Gene Bank	
15	Participant 15	Portugal Centro de Estudos Florestais, Instituto Superior de Agronomia, Universidade de Lis		
16	Participant 16	Romania	National Institute for Research and Development in Forestry "Marin Drăcea"	
17	Participant 17	Romania	National Institute for Research and Development in Forestry "Marin Drăcea"	
18	Participant 18	Romania	National Institute for Research and Development in Forestry "Marin Drăcea"	
19	Participant 19	Russia	Voronezh State Universtiy of Forestry and Technologies	
20	Participant 20	Serbia	University of Belgrade, Faculty of Forestry	
21	Participant 21	Serbia	University of Belgrade, Faculty of Forestry	
22	Participant 22	Slovenia	Slovenian Forestry Institute / Ljubljana / Slovenia	
23	Participant 23	Spain	VAERSA-Generalitat Valenciana	
24	Participant 24	Spain	CITA (Centro de Investigación y Tecnología Agroalimentaria) de Aragón.	
25	Participant 25	Spain	Spanish National Institute for Agricultural and Food Research and Technology (INIA) CIFOR	
26	Participant 26	Sweden	Umeå University	
27	Participant 27	Turkey	Karabük Üniversitesi, Orman Fakültesi, Orman Mühendisliği Bölümü	
28	Participant 28	Turkey	Forestry Faculty of Isparta University of Applied Sciences	
29	Participant 29	Turkey	Department of Biology Tekirdağ Namık Kemal University	
30	Participant 30	Italy	Fondazione Edmund Mach	

	In your view, which are the main benefits of conserving riparian genetic resources?					
Responder	Economic benefits	Food security	Freshwater ecosystem conservation	Filtering water polluters	Scientific interests	
Participant 1	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Participant 2	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Participant 3	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Participant 4	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	
Participant 5	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Participant 6	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	
Participant 7	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Participant 8	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Participant 9	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Participant 10	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Participant 11	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Participant 12	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Participant 13	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Participant 14	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	
Participant 15	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Participant 16	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Participant 17	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Participant 18	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	
Participant 19	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Participant 20	No	No	No	No	Yes	
Participant 21	No	No	No	No	Yes	
Participant 22	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	
Participant 23	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	
Participant 24	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Participant 25	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	
Participant 26	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	
Participant 27	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Participant 28	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	
Participant 29	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	
Participant 30	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	

	In your view, which is the most effective approach to conserving riparian genetic resources?				
Responder	In situ	Ex situ	In situ x ex situ	Integrative conservation	
Participant 1	No	No	No	Yes	
Participant 2	Yes	No	No	No	
Participant 3	Yes	No	No	No	
Participant 4	No	No	No	Yes	
Participant 5	Yes	No	No	No	
Participant 6	No	No	Yes	No	
Participant 7	No	No	No	Yes	
Participant 8	Yes	No	No	No	
Participant 9	No	No	Yes	No	
Participant 10	No	No	No	Yes	
Participant 11	Yes	No	No	No	
Participant 12	No	No	Yes	No	
Participant 13	No	No	Yes	No	
Participant 14	No	No	Yes	No	
Participant 15	No	No	Yes	No	
Participant 16	No	No	No	Yes	
Participant 17	No	No	No	Yes	
Participant 18	No	No	No	Yes	
Participant 19	No	No	No	Yes	
Participant 20	No	No	Yes	No	
Participant 21	No	No	Yes	No	
Participant 22	No	No	Yes	No	
Participant 23	No	No	Yes	No	
Participant 24	No	No	Yes	No	
Participant 25	Yes	No	No	No	
Participant 26	Yes	No	No	No	
Participant 27	No	No	No	Yes	
Participant 28	No	No	No	Yes	
Participant 29	No	No	No	Yes	
Participant 30	No	No	Yes	No	

	In your opinion, have there been changes in riparian genetic diversity in your country over the past ten years?				
Kesponder	No significant changes	Improving status	Degrading		
Participant 1	Yes	No	No		
Participant 2	Yes	No	No		
Participant 3	Yes	No	No		
Participant 4	No	No	Yes		
Participant 5	No	No	Yes		
Participant 6	No	No	Yes		
Participant 7	No	Yes	No		
Participant 8	No	No	Yes		
Participant 9	No	Yes	No		
Participant 10	No	No	Yes		
Participant 11	Yes	No	No		
Participant 12	Yes	No	No		
Participant 13	Yes	No	No		
Participant 14	No	No	Yes		
Participant 15	No	No	Yes		
Participant 16	No	No	Yes		
Participant 17	No	No	Yes		
Participant 18	Yes	No	No		
Participant 19	No	No	Yes		
Participant 20	No	No	Yes		
Participant 21	No	No	Yes		
Participant 22	Yes	No	No		
Participant 23	No	No	Yes		
Participant 24	No	No	Yes		
Participant 25	No	No	Yes		
Participant 26	Yes	No	No		
Participant 27	No	No	Yes		
Participant 28	Yes	No	No		
Participant 29	No	No	Yes		
Participant 30	No	No	Yes		

Rospondor	Has the state of diversity of riparian ecosystems in your country been assessed since 2000?			
Kesponder	Yes	No		
Participant 1				
Participant 2				
Participant 3				
Participant 4				
Participant 5				
Participant 6				
Participant 7				
Participant 8				
Participant 9				
Participant 10				
Participant 11				
Participant 12				
Participant 13				
Participant 14				
Participant 15				
Participant 16				
Participant 17				
Participant 18	N/A	N/A		
Participant 19				
Participant 20				
Participant 21				
Participant 22				
Participant 23				
Participant 24				
Participant 25				
Participant 26				
Participant 27				
Participant 28				
Participant 29	N/A	N/A		
Participant 30				

Responder	Does your country have plans/programs to assess the state of genetic diversity of riparian ecosystems?				
Kesponder	Yes	No			
Participant 1					
Participant 2					
Participant 3					
Participant 4					
Participant 5					
Participant 6					
Participant 7					
Participant 8					
Participant 9					
Participant 10					
Participant 11					
Participant 12					
Participant 13					
Participant 14					
Participant 15					
Participant 16					
Participant 17					
Participant 18					
Participant 19					
Participant 20					
Participant 21					
Participant 22					
Participant 23					
Participant 24					
Participant 25					
Participant 26					
Participant 27					
Participant 28					
Participant 29	N/A	N/A			
Participant 30					

Responder	Does your country have procedures in place to monitor or measure genetic erosion in riparian ecosystems?				
	Yes	No	Don't know		
Participant 1					
Participant 2					
Participant 3					
Participant 4					
Participant 5	N/A	N/A			
Participant 6					
Participant 7					
Participant 8					
Participant 9					
Participant 10					
Participant 11					
Participant 12					
Participant 13					
Participant 14					
Participant 15					
Participant 16					
Participant 17					
Participant 18					
Participant 19					
Participant 20					
Participant 21					
Participant 22					
Participant 23					
Participant 24					
Participant 25					
Participant 26					
Participant 27					
Participant 28					
Participant 29	N/A	N/A	N/A		
Participant 30					

	Indicate and rank strengths of riparian genetic resources conservation in your country						
Responder	Diversity status/ inventories of species	Environmental conditions/ accessibility	Scientific knowledge level	Policy priority	Legislation framework		
Participant 1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Participant 2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Participant 3	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Participant 4	No	No	No	No	No		
Participant 5	Yes	No	No	No	No		
Participant 6	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No		
Participant 7	No	No	Yes	No	No		
Participant 8	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Participant 9	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes		
Participant 10	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
Participant 11	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
Participant 12	Yes	No	Yes	No	No		
Participant 13	No	Yes	Yes	No	No		
Participant 14	No	Yes	Yes	No	No		
Participant 15	No	No	Yes	No	No		
Participant 16	Yes	No	Yes	No	No		
Participant 17	Yes	No	Yes	No	No		
Participant 18	No	Yes	No	No	Yes		
Participant 19	Yes	No	Yes	No	No		
Participant 20	Yes	No	Yes	No	No		
Participant 21	Yes	No	Yes	No	No		
Participant 22	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No		
Participant 23	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes		
Participant 24	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Participant 25	No	No	No	No	Yes		
Participant 26	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes		
Participant 27	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Participant 28	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Participant 29	Yes	No	Yes	No	No		
Participant 30	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		

	Indicate and rank strengths of riparian genetic resources conservation in your country					
Responder	Institutional/ organisational framework	Community awareness	Financial support	Others		
Participant 1	Yes	Yes	Yes	No		
Participant 2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Participant 3	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Participant 4	No	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Participant 5	No	No	No	No		
Participant 6	No	Yes	Yes	No		
Participant 7	No	No	No	No		
Participant 8	Yes	Yes	Yes	No		
Participant 9	Yes	No	No	No		
Participant 10	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
Participant 11	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
Participant 12	No	Yes	Yes	No		
Participant 13	Yes	No	No	Yes		
Participant 14	Yes	No	No	No		
Participant 15	No	No	No	Yes		
Participant 16	No	No	No	No		
Participant 17	No	No	No	No		
Participant 18	No	Yes	No	No		
Participant 19	No	No	No	No		
Participant 20	Yes	No	No	No		
Participant 21	Yes	No	No	No		
Participant 22	Yes	Yes	No	No		
Participant 23	No	Yes	No	No		
Participant 24	Yes	Yes	Yes	No		
Participant 25	No	No	Yes	No		
Participant 26	No	No	No	No		
Participant 27	Yes	Yes	Yes	No		
Participant 28	Yes	Yes	Yes	No		
Participant 29	No	No	No	No		
Participant 30	Yes	Yes	Yes	No		

	Indicate and rank weaknesses of riparian genetic resources conservation in your country					
Responder	Diversity status/ inventories of species	Environmental barriers	Scientific knowledge level	Lack of policy priority	Legislation framework	
Participant 1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Participant 2	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Participant 3	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Participant 4	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	
Participant 5	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Participant 6	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	
Participant 7	Yes	No	No	No	No	
Participant 8	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Participant 9	No	No	No	Yes	No	
Participant 10	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Participant 11	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Participant 12	No	No	No	Yes	No	
Participant 13	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Participant 14	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	
Participant 15	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	
Participant 16	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	
Participant 17	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	
Participant 18	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	
Participant 19	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	
Participant 20	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	
Participant 21	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	
Participant 22	No	No	No	No	No	
Participant 23	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	
Participant 24	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Participant 25	No	No	No	No	No	
Participant 26	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	
Participant 27	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Participant 28	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	
Participant 29	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	
Participant 30	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	

	Indicate and rank weaknesses of riparian genetic resources conservation in your country.					
Responder	Institutional/organisational framework	Community awareness	Financial barriers	Others		
Participant 1	Yes	Yes	Yes	No		
Participant 2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Participant 3	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Participant 4	No	No	Yes	No		
Participant 5	No	No	No	No		
Participant 6	No	Yes	No	No		
Participant 7	Yes	No	Yes	No		
Participant 8	No	No	Yes	No		
Participant 9	No	Yes	Yes	No		
Participant 10	No	Yes	Yes	No		
Participant 11	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
Participant 12	No	No	Yes	No		
Participant 13	Yes	Yes	Yes	No		
Participant 14	No	No	Yes	No		
Participant 15	Yes	Yes	Yes	No		
Participant 16	No	No	Yes	No		
Participant 17	No	No	Yes	No		
Participant 18	No	No	No	No		
Participant 19	Yes	No	No	No		
Participant 20	No	Yes	Yes	No		
Participant 21	No	No	Yes	No		
Participant 22	No	No	Yes	No		
Participant 23	Yes	No	Yes	No		
Participant 24	Yes	Yes	Yes	No		
Participant 25	Yes	Yes	No	No		
Participant 26	Yes	No	No	No		
Participant 27	Yes	Yes	Yes	No		
Participant 28	Yes	Yes	Yes	No		
Participant 29	Yes	Yes	Yes	No		
Participant 30	Yes	Yes	Yes			

Responder	Imagine and describe "an ideal" (the most beneficial) project aimed at riparian genetic resources conservation at the national level.
Participant 1	The project of riparian forest genetic inventory and strategy of conservation could be the first step of the project proposal for the start. Data analysis, in order to get information what do we have "on the field" and what we could do should be the first step toward other "operational" projects.
Participant 2	Mapping and creation a register with all saved genetic resources through an "in situ" approach. Collection and storage of the necessary reproductive materials. Saplings and afforestation of appropriate riparian tree species and origins of suitable habitats. Improving the quality of education and awareness of stakeholders.
Participant 3	Mapping and creation a register with all saved genetic resources through an "in situ" approach. Collection and storage of the necessary reproductive materials. Saplings and afforestation of appropriate riparian tree species and origins of suitable habitats. Improving the quality of education and awareness of stakeholders.
Participant 4	Projects related to restoration and conservation of riparian habitats. The majority of these projects are co-financed by the Life Programme of the EU.
Participant 5	N/A
Participant 6	Most beneficial project will have the aim to make inventory of riparian forests, to determine temporarely situations of riparian forest ang afterall, give some directions for future management of riparian forests.
Participant 7	Large scale genetic screening of selected river species with different dispersal strategies and different rank of rarity, estimation how are different river catchments interconnected.
Participant 8	N/A
Participant 9	N/A
Participant 10	VERY GOOD QUESTION. IT'S A CHALLENGE FOR US TO ORGANIZE A RELEVANT PROJECT PROPOSAL!!!!
Participant 11	Lack of knowledge is the weakness. Basic research on genetic diversity of highland riparian plant species would be a start.
Participant 12	N/A
Participant 13	 POPGIS : DYNAMIC CONSERVATION AND USE OF NATIVE POPLARS 1. Create geo-referenced thematic maps representing the distribution area of Populus nigra and Populus alba based on ecological inventories of the natural distribution of the two species. 2. Establish a network of in-situ gene conservation units in order to improve the characterization and the dynamic conservation of the species at the European level and to complement the European Information System on Forest Genetic Resources (EUFGIS) 3. Promote the use of the native poplars genetic material from selected in-situ gene conservation units and gene banks in agriculture (complementing the scope of the Rural Development Council Regulation n. 1257/99), in breeding programs and in restoration projects 4. Promote and disseminate the results of POPGIS regarding the ex-situ and in-situ conservation, characterisation, collection and utilisation of Populus nigra and Populus alba genetic resources to forest managers, poplar breeders, policy makers and the general public for public awareness

Responder	Imagine and describe "an ideal" (the most beneficial) project aimed at riparian genetic resources conservation at the national level.
Participant 14	 Inventory measures. Genetic monitoring. Registration of the most valuable populations (nature conservation areas, seed base objects). In situ measures on selected populations (removing invasive species, active forest management, restoration of proper water conditions). Ex situ measures on selected populations (collection and storage of the reproductive material in gene banks, establishment of the seed orchards, progeny plantations, clonal archives etc.).
Participant 15	Integrative transdisciplinary plan including all actors involved in riparian restoration, from research, legislation and practice, and public engagement/dissemination.
Participant 16	I am key person in a project proposal in the Young Research Teams competition with the title Identification and conservation of riparian forest genetic resources along the big rivers of Romania.
Participant 17	I will propose a project in the Young Research Teams competition with the title Identification and conservation of riparian forest genetic resources along the big rivers of Romania.
Participant 18	At the national level the Danube Delta Biosphere Reserve include most valuable riparian forest genetic resources. http://www.ddbra.ro/en/danube-delta-biosphere-reserve/danube-delta
Participant 19	The ideal project should provide maximum environmental safety of its recovery technologies, which is still quite difficult to implement with the current state of technology.
Participant 20	Development of concrete programs for conservation of certain riparian ecosystems/endangered species in riparian ecosystems.
Participant 21	"Conservation strategy for riparian ecosystems in the territory of the Republic of Serbia".
Participant 22	Upgrading the project REFOCUS.
Participant 23	(See Chapter 3 on the ECOGEN document attached)

Responder	Imagine and describe "an ideal" (the most beneficial) project aimed at riparian genetic resources conservation at the national level.
Participant 24	The project should consider the following items: i) Characterization y description of the riparian areas to be considered in the project. Inventories and detailed GISs would be integrated in this chapter. ii) Evaluation of the existing diversity at three levels (ecosystems, species, populations) by bibliography or sampling when needed iii) Detection of threads at three levels iv) Prioritizing or selection of flagship species for genetic monitoring v) Specific plans at species level or group of species or reserve (territory) for the conservation and sustainable use of the genetic resources including at least: Justification, Objective, State of the art, Actuation lines to get the objective, Activities program, participants, Period of validity of the plan, Monitoring, Funding, Coordination with other plans and Dissemination) vi) Funding scheme for achieving the plans vii) Tracking tools for plans reviewing viii) Dissemination plan for public awareness
Participant 25	This project would go in hand with a more ambitious one embracing the conservation of forest genetic resources as a whole. Particularities of riparian ecosystems need nonetheless to be taken into account given their high biodiversity and fragility. In an ideal project, the main problems of habitat destruction and careless restoration need to be addressed. Habitat destruction cannot be tacked by a project but by law enforcement. Education about good restoration practices regarding genetic resources can and should be encouraged through educational projects for managers and also the society as a whole.
Participant 26	A programme identifying hotspots of species diversity and redlisted species in riparian zones, integrating conservation and restoration to respond to degradation caused by forestry, agriculture and flow regulation. Conservation and restoration are now treated separately, as is impacts from forestry, agriculture and flow regulation.
Participant 27	Firstly, to complete inventory and registered riparian ecosystem, to aware community and policymaker then to monitor and manage riparian ecosystem.
Participant 28	Conservation strategies of riparian area (CONSTRA).
Participant 29	I think I'm not so much experienced to offer a project at national level.
Participant 30	The most urgent conservation project would be to monitor the genetic pollution in Popolus nigra (the far most trees we have as riparian vegetation n Italy) from the quite frequent plantations of Populus x Canadensis (P. x euroamericana).