



# MICHELI GUIDE TO FUNGAL CONSERVATION CBD EVALUATION FORM



**Name of country:** Suriname  
**Title of report:** National Biodiversity Action Plan (NBAP) 2012-2016  
**Date on report:** February 2013  
**Date of receipt:** 13 March 2013  
**URL of report:** [www.cbd.int/doc/world/sr/sr-nbsap-v2-en.pdf](http://www.cbd.int/doc/world/sr/sr-nbsap-v2-en.pdf)  
**Language of report:** English  
**Date of evaluation:** 26 March 2013

## Key questions

- |   | Yes / no   |
|---|------------|
| 1. Were fungi mentioned? <b>Note.</b> If fungi are mentioned only as an exploitable resource, or as threats to other organisms, for example by reference to fungicides etc. the answer should be “No”.  | <b>Yes</b> |
| 2. Were fungi (including lichen-forming fungi) clearly, consistently and explicitly recognized as different from animals, plants and other biological kingdoms? <b>Note.</b> A check that the basic science is correct.   | <b>Yes</b> |
| 3. Was strategic consideration explicitly given to fungal conservation? <b>Note.</b> An assumption that fungi will be protected if other organisms are conserved is not enough. There must be plans to deal with the issues raised by fungal conservation. Example indicators: separate texts devoted to fungal conservation; lists of important fungus areas / fungal biodiversity hotspots; deficiencies in legal protection for fungi identified and plans present to rectify those deficiencies; threats to fungi identified; fungal red lists mentioned. | <b>No</b>  |
| 4. Were principal fungal habitats and roles taken into account? <b>Note.</b> Fungal habitats are different from animal or plant habitats, and need separate consideration. Example habitats and roles: decomposers, dung fungi, endobionts, freshwater fungi, fungi on man-made products, fungi on naturally occurring inanimate substrata, lichen-forming fungi, marine fungi, mycorrhizal fungi, parasitic fungi.   | <b>No</b>  |
| 5. Was the knowledge gap for fungi recognized with plans to address the problem? <b>Note.</b> Pretending this problem does not exist is no solution. Both parts of the question need to be “yes” to get a positive score. Recognizing a knowledge gap and then failing to deal with it is not enough.   | <b>No</b>  |

**Scoring:** five “Yes” answers = adequate; four “Yes” answers = nearly adequate; three “Yes” answers = poor; two “Yes” answers = deficient; one “Yes” answer = seriously deficient; no “Yes” answers = totally deficient.

## Evaluation. Deficient

### Relative frequency of words relating to different biological kingdoms (from following page)

Animals	61%
Fungi	2%
Plants	37%

### Does this report qualify for gold star rating? No

**Evaluator’s comments** (optional). This national action plan has provided the barest minimum necessary to achieve a “Deficient” rating. The word “fungi” occurs once, but only in a reference to fungicides etc. The word “mushroom” occurs once in the sentence defining biodiversity “the diversity of living beings... particularly plants and animals, but also mushrooms and micro-organisms that are part of communities”. Use of the word “particularly” is a clear indication that this plan explicitly attaches less value to fungi and micro-organisms than to animals and plants. No reasons are given for that stance. The very low number of times fungi are mentioned shows that this prejudice permeates the entire document. Having correctly recognized that fungi are different from animals, micro-organisms and plants, and that they are a separate component of biodiversity, the plan then makes no further mention of them. There is no strategic consideration of fungal conservation, no mention of fungal habitats, no mention of the knowledge gap for fungi and no plans to address the problem. There is no understanding that conservation of the producers (plants) and consumers (animals) cannot be achieved without also conserving the recyclers (fungi).

---

**Guidance notes.** The Rio Convention on Biological Diversity [CBD] requires participating countries to submit national action plans and reports. In these documents, openly available on the Internet [[www.cbd.int/nbsap/search/default.shtml](http://www.cbd.int/nbsap/search/default.shtml)], governments describe their policies and activities to protect biodiversity. In the past they have focused on animals and plants, almost totally overlooking fungi, so we monitor these documents as part of the campaign to conserve fungi. This form, a standardized and objective way to evaluate CBD documents in respect of fungi, can be downloaded from the Internet at [www.fungal-conservation.org/micheli/cbd-report-form.doc](http://www.fungal-conservation.org/micheli/cbd-report-form.doc). Please e-mail completed forms as an attachment to the *Micheli Guide to Fungal Conservation* [[micheli@fungal-conservation.org](mailto:micheli@fungal-conservation.org)]. The evaluator’s name, and postal and e-mail addresses must be supplied, but will not be published. Evaluations are checked and then, if suitable, published on the *Micheli Guide to Fungal Conservation* website [[www.fungal-conservation.org/micheli](http://www.fungal-conservation.org/micheli)]. If you would like to comment on coverage of fungi in an individual national action plan or report, the national focus point for the CBD’s *Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice* is a good place to start. It is possible to find the name and e-mail address of each of these national focus points from the following web page: <http://www.cbd.int/doc/lists/nfp-sbstta.pdf>.

### Frequency of fungus words in document

Word	Frequency
fung (as in “fungal”, “fungi” and “fungus”)	1
lichen (but excluding German words like “wissenschaftlichen”)	0
myc	0
mould	0
mushroom	1
toadstool	0
truffle	0
yeast	0
other (please specify)	
<b>Fungi total</b>	<b>2</b>

### Frequency of animal words in document

There are many possible animals words to check, please as a minimum check those which are in *italics*.

Word	Frequency	Word	Frequency
<i>amphibian</i>	0	<i>insect</i>	1
<i>animal</i>	37	lynx	0
arthropod	0	<i>mammal</i>	0
bat	0	mollusc	0
bear	0	moth	0
bee	0	owl	0
beetle	0	porpoise	0
<i>bird</i>	0	raptor	0
bryozoan	0	<i>reptile</i>	0
butterfly	0	rodent	0
cattle	0	seal	0
coral	0	snail	0
crustacean	0	snake	0
dolphin	0	tortoise	0
dragonfly	0	turtle	1
duck	0	<i>vertebrate</i>	0
falcon	0	wader	0
<i>fauna</i>	4	wasp	0
<i>fish</i>	7	whale	0
frog	0	wolf	0
goose	0	worm	0
other (please specify)			
<b>Animals total</b>			<b>50</b>

### Frequency of plant words in document

Word	Frequency
bryophyte	0
conifer	0
fern	0
flora	4
flower	0
moss	0
plant (excluding phrases like “sewage treatment plant”)	26
other (please specify)	
<b>Plants total</b>	<b>30</b>