Globally-important Ingenious Agricultural Heritage Systems
GIAHS Project

Report of the
Second International Workshop and Steering Committee Meeting

Rome, 7–9 June 2004

Table of Contents

Background papers (CD-ROM and WWW only):

Conservation and Sustainable Management of Globally Important Ingenious Agricultural Heritage Systems (GIAHS), GEF Full Project Concept Note

Globally Important, Ingenious Agricultural Heritage Systems (GIAHS), First Stakeholder Workshop and Steering Committee Session, Rome, 5-7 August 2002, Report

UNESCO World Heritage cultural landscapes by Mechtild Roessler, UNESCO link

Human communities and natural environment in the agricultural areas, the International Geographical Union research experience and methodology by Maria Gemma Grillotti Di Giacomo, IGU link

Globally Important Ingenious Agricultural Heritage Systems (GIAHS): extent, significance, and implications for development, background paper to the first international workshop and steering committee meeting by Miguel A. Altieri, University of California, Berkeley link

Le projet GIAHS (Globally Important Ingenious Agricultural Heritage Systems) en 15 questions, par Jean Bedel link

PLEC News and Views, special issue on methodology link

Summary

The second International Workshop and Steering Committee Meeting of the GIAHS programme, 7–9 June 2004, was convened to inform members on the progress of the project since the first meeting and several GIAHS-related issues; and to discuss methodologies, communication and dissemination methods and approaches, procedures for the selection of case studies, and strategic and funding issues. The various presentations and the extensive discussions identified and clarified a number of issues that should be considered or dealt with during the current phase of the work and in later phases of the programme, rather than providing simple answers to complex questions.

The meeting was opened with a welcome address highlighting the evolving understanding of agricultural diversity and its values, and a keynote address highlighting the importance of agro-ecological, biological and cultural diversity for current and future food security. The first day was devoted to an update on progress of the GIAHS project; presentations on several approaches to recognition and conservation of cultural and agricultural heritage landscapes; and presentation and discussion of several GIAHS-related issues, including a methodological and participatory framework and approach for implementing the GIAHS programme.

The rich and diverse presentations brought about discussions circling and converging on a number of important issues, including: people being the core and insurance of an agricultural system or a (cultural) landscape; viewpoints of the local people forming the basis of GIAHS descriptions and promotion; and the viability of safeguarding the future of such agricultural systems through a combination of market processes and a public-goods approach.

The second day the meeting dealt with global assessment and identification of agricultural heritage systems, criteria and procedure for selection of pilot systems, and an overview and preliminary review of current GIAHS proposals. In a side session, case proponents presented a series of pilot system proposals. On the third day, the functions and composition of the steering committee and the international technical advisory committee the next project phase was discussed, communication and strategic issues were discussed, and planning discussions covered selection criteria and process, priority activities and next steps.

Report

The second International Workshop and Steering Committee Meeting, 7–9 June 2004, was convened to inform members on the progress of the project since the first meeting and several GIAHS-related issues; and to discuss methodologies, communication and dissemination methods and approaches, procedures for the selection of case studies, and strategic and funding issues. The various presentations and the extensive discussions identified and clarified a number of issues that should be considered or dealt with during the current phase of the work and in later phases of the programme, rather than providing simple answers to complex questions.

Session 1: Introduction of partners and project

The meeting was opened with a **welcome address** by Ms Louise O. Fresco, Assistant Director-General, Agriculture Department, FAO. Ms Fresco focused attention on the often millennia-old agricultural landscapes that are among humanity's treasures, such as the cultural landscape in Tuscany, or the rice terraces of Bali or the northern Philippines, and on the responsibility of their current populations, and their governments, for such landscapes and their continual evolution. FAO's primary tasks include policy advice to member governments and capacity building in management of land, water and biological resources, including crops, livestock, forest, freshwater and marine fisheries. In the past, FAO concentrated on yields and on production and safety of food; its current awareness that agriculture, and FAO's tasks, have wider dimensions can be seen in this year's subject of World Food Day, 16 October: agricultural biodiversity.

The GIAHS programme is not an academic exercise but a joint effort with governments, national and international scientific, technical and other partners as well as local communities and authorities to promote greater recognition of the importance of traditional, biologically diverse farming systems that have been maintained and developed over generations for the management of diverse and often fragile and remote ecosystems and provision of a range of benefits. A clear understanding of their history and current trends, including through technological change with its positive and negative effects, is essential to identify pathways of evolution that will maintain their resilience and options for the future. There is a need to increase production, but without succumbing to naive optimism – in the past this was attempted in too narrow a technological way. The GIAHS programme should help to spread a diverse view of agriculture: cropping, grazing, forestry, fisheries, with their interactions within and among communities as well as at national and global scales. There are no easy answers, for example to the question whether countries can afford to consider biological and agricultural diversity while so many people are still hungry – or whether they can afford *not* to do so. The creative efforts of the wide variety of participants in this meeting, and in the GIAHS programme, will be needed to identify how agricultural heritage systems and their evolution can be safeguarded in support of the populations of the world's countries.

Marcel Mazoyer's **keynote speech** addressed the importance of the world's biological diversity and its cultural and agricultural heritage systems for current and future food security. During the second half of the twentieth century, the population grew 2.4 times, and world agricultural production 2.6 times. However, in 2000 there were still two billion people with micronutrient and vitamin deficiencies (iron, iodine, vitamin A, …) and about 0.8 billion people still hungry. About one-tenth of the production growth was due to an increase of agricultural land (from a world total of 1.35 to 1.6 billion ha); irrigation expanded from

0.07 to 0.24 billion ha, accounting for a similar amount; but most of the production growth was due to technological progress (green revolution – seeds, fertilizers, pesticides, tractors).

There are about 28 million tractors in the world, which are owned by only 2.1 percent of the 1.3 billion people engaged in agriculture, so most farms in the world use animal traction or human power only. There are some 250 million draught animals, owned by some 20 percent of the number of people in agriculture. So there are roughly one billion farmers who work without tractors or animals. And half of these farmers do not have improved seeds, fertilizers or pesticides either. This illustrates the very partial, severely uneven social impact of technological progress.

To deal with world micronutrient deficiency and hunger, food production should be about 25 percent higher than at present; and considering the need to feed some 9 – 10 billion people a few decades from now, food production should grow to double the current volume. Conventional agriculture cannot do this, nor can the volume of world trade in agricultural products (currently less than a quarter of annual production) grow to satisfy the expected enormous local and subregional deficits. Worse still would be structural food aid on a global scale –itself unsustainable–, since this would destroy half the world's less 'modern' agricultural systems and societies.

This is not a criticism of modern conventional agriculture, but a demonstration of its limits and of the necessity to consider and use all of the world's agricultural systems: all of the world's agricultural heritage, so diverse, and of such a range of complexity and history. A brief outline of just a few such systems would include:

- natural forest-based systems such as slash-and-mulch; pastoral systems such as in Siberia or Latin America (llamas);
- the irrigated systems of dry areas with a millennial history such as in Mesopotamia or the Nile valley;
- the coastal swamp rice systems of humid West Africa or Southeast Asia;
- the animal-draught systems of Western Europe and the cereal-pulses arable systems, which have been starting points for the agricultural revolution initiated by industrial production of tractors, fertilizers and biocides.

Such systems constitute broad families of specific systems; GIAHS partners and decision-makers need to be aware of their variety. The project will need to choose some of the most important systems to study and to promote their survival and continued evolution. The battle for such systems has a very important cultural dimension for the world: it highlights the inappropriateness and impracticality of a unificatory, reductive vision. At the same time it supports FAO's vision and efforts to ensure local food security (self-reliance) for all mankind.

To achieve this, expansion of the cultivated area will be needed, as well as improving the resilience and productivity of the variety of agricultural systems in the world. But there is no real scope for this as long as produce prices remain as low as they are at present: 4 to 5 times lower than about 50 years ago.

At the Chair's request, after introductions by each **meeting participant** (list in Annex 2), **the agenda** (Annex 1) was introduced and adopted and **chairpersons** for the several sessions were identified.

Parviz Koohafkan reviewed the **goals and objectives and conceptual progress** to date of the GIAHS project (Annex 3), and referred to the agreements and decisions of the first Steering Committee meeting. He recalled the overall project goal: to identify and safeguard Globally Important Ingenious Agricultural Heritage Systems and their associated landscapes, agricultural biodiversity and knowledge systems through mobilising global recognition and

support for such systems, and to enhance global, national and local benefits through their dynamic conservation, sustainable management and enhanced viability. Ultimately the project will be catalytic in establishing a long-term programme building on the experiences and lessons learnt in a number of pilot systems. The three objectives of the project are enhanced global understanding and recognition of GIAHS; demonstration of dynamic conservation in selected, globally important but threatened priority systems; and promotion of conducive legal and policy environments and incentive structures. The purposes of the current PDF-B phase are to produce the full project executive summary and document and to establish stakeholder mechanisms and develop pilot frameworks in pilot systems. Pilot frameworks include commonly agreed objectives, planned activities, methods, and participatory decision-making mechanisms. The full PDF-B document is presented in Annex 4.

Some 200 agricultural heritage systems have been identified by the project so far; only a small sample of the full range in the world. In spite of their riches through co-evolution, co-adaptation of ecological, economic, social and cultural aspects and their contribution to the food security, health and nutrition of many –often poor and isolated– people, many of these systems are under threat. Their sustainability has at least three dimensions: social, economic and ecological. “Biodiversity can be seen as life insurance for life itself” (Nitin Desai). The GIAHS programme is not about the historic or recent past but about the future and the continuing evolution of the diversity of life sustaining agricultural heritage systems. The holistic sustainable livelihoods approach will be used through its concept of five interconnected capitals: natural, physical, financial-economic, human and socio-cultural. Positive and negative externalities will be taken into account in the analysis of such systems in order to work towards sustainability through agriculture and rural development.

Peter Kenmore addressed the meeting on **biodiversity and poverty reduction**. FAO’s agro-biodiversity programme, based on UN-CBD/CPO decision V/5, Nairobi 2000, broadly addresses the issues of managing genetic resources, species and ecosystems in agriculture, fisheries and forestry. The programme focuses on the assessment of production and ecosystem services; adaptive management and best practices; local capacity building and best management practices; and the incorporation of biodiversity considerations in government policies. Policies focusing solely on urban food security are analysed, highlighting ecologically sustainable intensification of traditional systems to improve local, rural as well as national food security and poverty alleviation.

An example of resilient, productive systems is the cooperation between Fulani herders and Hausa farmers based on contractual relationships in Nigeria. These linked livelihood systems are presently under threat because of the increasing population density, loss of migration options through land-use intensification and sedentarization policies, and the trend toward closure of national borders to transhumant herders and their flocks.

The widespread poverty in sub-Saharan Africa has been documented for over four centuries, particularly in records from Ethiopia and Nigeria; in many cases it has been due to labour shortage rather than land shortage. Many farmers have to rely on the natural capital and their human capital; and households may be disrupted by problems such as conflict, disease or migratory labour. Such families need to maximize production per labour-day, not per ha. This determines the kinds of crops and varieties grown and management practices of crops and livestock, including the use of draught or mechanical power.

Worldwide there are now some 100 000 farmers’ field schools in communities, using discovery learning methods based on analysis of ecosystems at different levels. In these field schools, farmers obtain an understanding of functional relationships among species, habitats and human management and their effects on goods and services, for example considering

types of activities and produce, plant nutrient cycles, pest–predator interactions, and other aspects of the production system. Farmers' field schools are being promoted for a range of reasons. In Mali, where there are some 70 000 ha of –at first sight– rice monoculture under the aegis of the Office du Niger, these are in fact the host of ricefield 'fisheries' and complex food webs, producing important daily quantities of fish and crustaceans, containing protein and fatty acids – essential particularly for the nutrition of children–, and other products. And in Iran, the Global Environment Facility, wishing to protect the habitat of the endangered Siberian crane, has been promoting farmers' field schools to help eliminate pesticide use in wetland rice.

In **discussion on the presentations**, it was noted that while there are still large extents of land with soils that would be suitable for food production, these are very unevenly distributed, with some regions and many countries having very little or no "potentially usable" land; and that large parts of such lands are being used for other purposes such as grazing, or are under natural or production forest, and could not be taken into arable cultivation without high investment or high ecological cost. There are some 4 billion ha of protected area that should not be used for cultivation. Global figures such as these should not mask the great differences among countries, or the need to focus on local food security. A specific GIAHS may provide local solutions to food security as well as resilience and risk aversion through the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and local knowledge systems. Moreover, the GIAHS programme is not just a collection of local projects, but also has a global focus to maintain these dynamic living systems and their heritage values. FAO is making efforts to bring community-level concerns to global attention, advocating a move to policies that promote local food security through sustainable and productive systems.

Managed or secondary forest was generally seen as included in the concept of agro-biodiversity. Many farmers have been using wildlife not only to supplement their farm-livelihood systems but also as indicators and timers for their land and crop management activities (the presence of migratory osprey, for example). While taking an agro-ecosystems approach, the GIAHS programme is closely linked with the Plant and Domestic Animal Genetic Resources agendas. It was also found important to recognize how global or regional issues may be influenced or disrupted by local events, and how strongly local agricultural systems may be influenced or even destroyed by global or regional political developments or national policies.

Session 2: Implementing the PDF-B phase and the design of the full project

David Boerma addressed the **GEF project development process**, illustrating main aspects of the PDF-B document (document in Annex 4; presentation materials in Annex 5). In the current transition from the initial global concept to the GIAHS project, the PDF-B phase of project development will be catalytic in developing the strategy and process for the expansion to a truly global initiative.

In the PDF-B phase the project will

1. select, through a consultative process, up to 10 pilot systems and up to 10 partner OP 13 projects (potential GIAHS sites) for networking;
2. develop a methodological framework and a step-by-step approach for participatory development and implementation of dynamic conservation in pilot systems (process and technical aspects);

3. establish participatory mechanisms and processes in each pilot system and country and design frameworks for each pilot system through a fully participatory process in the community and at national institutional level;
4. leverage global and national support and co-funding arrangements for the full-scale project;
5. develop a communication strategy and plan; and
6. develop the full project executive summary and project document.

The present meeting was convened to first, review pilot systems and identify those that can be selected on the basis of clearly established criteria and partners ready to start work; and second, to improve the methodological and technical basis of the project. This includes the participatory methodology and process, and agreement on criteria for identification, selection, (preliminary) assessment and monitoring and evaluation. The meeting provided the opportunity to also discuss the further development of the programme and partnerships (including governing bodies and international instruments, and developing GIAHS for industrialized countries). Towards the end of the PDF-B phase another international workshop and steering committee meeting will be held to revisit these issues in the light of the outcomes of the national and local activities.

Ms Mechtild Rössler, UNESCO discussed the road to **global recognition of the world's agricultural heritage** – the World Heritage as well as the Man and the Biosphere approach (presentation materials in Annex 6; background paper on the CD-ROM). Cultural landscapes were recognized in 1992 under the World Heritage Convention (1972) –an international legal instrument to identify and protect cultural and natural properties of outstanding universal value. The landscape categories (designed landscapes, living or relict cultural landscapes and associative landscapes) also allow agricultural heritage systems to be recognized. This concept was illustrated through World Heritage sites such as the rice terraces of the northern Philippines, the terraced production system of Cinque Terre (Italy), pastoralism in the Hortobagy National Park (Hungary), the tobacco landscape of Vinales Valley (Cuba), or the Quaddisha Valley (Lebanon) –already mentioned in the bible with the sacred cedars of Lebanon. Such sites can be included on the prestigious UNESCO World Heritage list if the interaction between people and their environment is considered to be of outstanding universal value.

Capacity building and awareness raising will be crucial for the recognition of agricultural heritage systems, by governmental agencies and institutions in particular. Two World Heritage papers, available from the UNESCO website (http://whc.unesco.org), may be of interest to participants: Nr 6, World Heritage cultural landscapes, 1992–2002, at http://whc.unesco.org/series/papers_06.pdf , and Nr 7, Cultural landscapes: the challenge of conservation, at http://whc.unesco.org/series/papers_07.pdf .

Concerning the Man and the Biosphere programme (MAB) and its worldwide network of biosphere reserves, agricultural diversity has been recognized and forms part of many sites. Local communities and indigenous peoples have long been involved in agricultural activities –important in their livelihood strategies– as part of the long-term management of the environment. These communities recognize, manage, value and use cultivated crops and domestic animals as well as non-planned (associated) diversity. At the level of the biosphere reserve and landscape or environment, the presence of endangered or threatened useful diversity (such as useful species, crop wild relatives) is important; many sites are also located in centres of crop diversity. Agricultural production occurs mainly in the buffer and transition zones of the biosphere reserve. The reserve management is interested in addressing the agricultural biodiversity agenda; however, appropriate disciplines and skills are required to support investigations.

The representation of different biomes, ecosystems or production systems by the worldwide network of UNESCO biosphere reserves will be of interest for the GIAHS project. Ms Rössler expressed UNESCO's interest to collaborate with FAO and UNDP/GEF in the GIAHS project, in particular from the MAB and World Heritage perspectives. She expressed UNESCO's willingness to explore the creation of a new (sub-) category of World Heritage for agricultural heritage systems.

Herb Stovel, ICCROM, introduced **dynamic conservation of heritage landscapes** – the ITUC approach. The visual presentation materials are reproduced in Annex 7. One of the programmes of ICCROM –an intergovernmental organization set up by UNESCO in 1956– is ITUC, Integrated Territorial Urban Conservation. This programme aims to achieve a better understanding of application of conservation to the management of continuing (agricultural) landscapes; support for continuing relevant dynamic processes; recognition of origins of threats (e.g., misguided agricultural policies), rather than misguided development; and the recognition that adaptation to changing circumstances will be a necessary part of appropriate conservation responses.

There is an emerging convergence of interests between ITUC and GIAHS, since ITUC has been evolving from conservation of buildings to whole landscapes, and has been assuming gradually wider functions, including training in conservation, research, technical assistance and documentation. ITUC is serving people who can influence policies and programmes in their countries, and have the appropriate knowledge so that national sites may be established. Its strategy involves partners with their own networks and training partners. One example of a site and a key issue is Cinque Terre, Italy, with 3000 km of dry-stone walls in its generally steep territory: 8 km per inhabitant. The population is ageing through migration of the young generation, and 90 percent of the formerly fully used terraces have been abandoned in the last four decades. The question how to conserve this very special landscape, requiring regular maintenance, has social, cultural and economic aspects.

In discussion it was noted that such agricultural production systems were being lost because of a range of driving forces and pressures, inter alia, labour shortage, out-migration, policies of globalization and lack of recognition; and that the question of how to maintain these landscapes and facilitate the further evolution of their agricultural systems in a sustainable way was so far unanswered.

Session 3: Implementation issues

The Chair exhorted participants not to become diverted by criticism or scepticism, but to concentrate on the programme and project at hand, including its global, national and local aspects, keeping in mind the relations between mega-biodiversity and diversity of cultural groups and knowledge systems, as well as the co-evolution of ecological processes and socio-cultural patterns.

Miguel Altieri introduced a **methodological framework and step-by-step approach** for implementing GIAHS (full paper in Annex 8). One of the methodological core issues is the scale at which collective action should be organized – that is, where the geographical (physical) or socio-economic boundaries for collective action should be drawn.

In mountain areas of Latin America, for example, genetic diversity is being safeguarded through farmer-managed local seed banks and seed fairs; and agricultural biodiversity is part of the school curricula. Some 10 000 farmers are resisting political and cultural globalization, with traditional seeds as a symbol and tool. Some of the traditional agricultural systems have a very strong resilience against hurricanes because of their

permanent, complete soil cover of different crops and vegetation. In some areas, farmers use livestock manure on their arable fields and use crop associations against pests and diseases rather than chemical biocides. There are examples of important associations between farmers and consumers, inter alia through fairs, and strong local policies on food safety.

A preliminary set of sustainability indicators is needed, covering biophysical, social, economic, infrastructural and policy aspects in so far as these affect the agricultural systems.

Tony Putter presented an internet-based approach to **community-controlled knowledge management** (Annex 9). He contrasted knowledge, which multiplies and grows the more it is shared, with material goods, which are divided up among people. The Ecoport system (www.ecoport.org) was discussed as an example of a multi-dimensional representation doing justice to the multi-dimensional reality of ecological elements (e.g. a plant species, an insect, a fungus) and their intricate web of multiple relationships. Since a GIAHS is dialectic between the dynamics of (agro-)ecosystems, resilience and human ingenuity, it would be useful to explore whether an information base along the lines of Ecoport could effectively serve the needs of the GIAHS programme in both its national and international aspects.

Several questions and issues came up in **discussion**, including how local communities could be enabled to tell their story and insights to the world. This could be started by asking local communities to write their story and insights, encouraged by having available to them the Ecoport system, including the contents of its central information warehouse. This would require a computer and a few CD-ROMs. Knowledge, including voice recordings and images, was seen as a powerful tool to bring about a common understanding between local and national actors. It was noted that an information management structure, a knowledge centre, should be designed and built at the same time as the GIAHS methodology.

On the question who would be involved in collective decision-making in a GIAHS, it was noted that local communities are not homogeneous groups, and that there may be diverse local responses to incentives, which might or might not be conducive to conservation of the agricultural system, its biodiversity and knowledge systems. Local communities should be involved in local–regional–national–global links. Many local communities are interdependent; where there are long traditions of management, normally there are strong local institutions, on which the GIAHS project should rely.

The most important problem of recent decades was seen in the belief of policy-makers that modern conventional agriculture would be able to provide the answers to food security and livelihood problems. Decision-makers should understand that in many cases the long and collective experience of traditional systems is more important and relevant than external knowledge. A multi-stakeholder dialogue will be needed since globalization, with its positive and negative effects, is today's reality. The local authorities and national governments in developing countries will need to understand and be convinced of the specific benefits that would accrue from GIAHS if they were allowed to continue their evolution; and allow societies to draw on a broad wealth of accumulated knowledge in future as well as present generations.

Ms Sally Bunning briefly discussed **natural resource management and traditional ecological knowledge** of GIAHS in relation to the biophysical, socio-economic and political environment (Annex 10). She highlighted the need to show to Ministries of Finance and other decision-makers the national benefits (to budget and infrastructure) of traditional agricultural systems, as well as ways to safeguard and reinforce them through local by-laws and formal recognition of traditional rules and arrangements. It should become generally understood how a wide range of traditional agricultural systems, using planned and wild species and habitats, and adapting to different agro-ecologies rather than compensating for them, are continually

evolving and adapting to new knowledge and the changing socio-economic conditions. Attention to different temporal and spatial scales will show how adaptive management and support for such systems will generate benefits and services at local, catchment, agro-ecosystem, national and global levels.

Luohui Liang briefly introduced the United Nations University project on **People, Land management and Environmental Change** (presentation materials in Annex 11; background paper on the CD-ROM). The PLEC project has been working with multidisciplinary teams to identify land-use stages and innovative systems; select expert farmers and innovative systems; and train and extend such systems through those expert farmers. Agriculture can enhance biodiversity in the ways that improve local livelihoods. Scientists can collaborate with farmers to increase the land under the ways of management. Agrodiversity can be a solution to farmers' problems. It is efficient in total production as well as dynamic and adaptable to economic, social, and environmental changes. Learning from expert farmers is not only effective but also accessible to farmers.

In a brief **discussion** on criteria, it was noted that the aesthetic aspect of diversity had been considered in the GIAHS programme, but would be of doubtful value as a criterion because it would necessarily be based on a culture-determined viewpoint. In the past there was much emphasis on the genetic aspects of biodiversity (for example, work on plant and animal genetic resources). Recently, and through the ecosystem approach adopted by the Convention on Biodiversity, emphasis has been shifting towards whole ecosystems. In considering whether the degree of local control should be a criterion, it was noted that the degree of participation, a criterion being developed over the last few years, was closely related to local control.

Frederic Dévé introduced **socio-economic issues and the policy context** of GIAHS (presentation materials in Annex 12). Three main pressures were identified: trade liberalization, poverty and multilateral environmental agreements. Positive externalities and public goods are recognized in all agriculture, but are particularly rich in heritage systems. However, major issues endangering such systems include an economic crisis in traditional, small-scale agriculture and out-migration, leading to erosion of rural cultural capital and diversity.

The willingness to pay for non-market benefits of agriculture is highest in high-income, urbanized countries with small proportions of the population engaged in agriculture, and lowest in the largely rural, poorest countries. In developing countries where agriculture is the main engine for growth, agriculture and agricultural work tend to have negative connotations. In industrialized countries, retail-driven, supply-chain-managed agriculture is gaining influence and gradually supplanting other paradigms.

In **discussion** on the public-goods approach (which may need budget) versus the market-based approach (which takes time and entails threats), a hybrid approach was considered most viable. It was questioned whether long-term optimization of agricultural systems would be feasible in countries without adequate capacity of valuation of such systems. Local values were seen to be gradually lost when values from globalization were imported. Education is an important tool to maintain local values where it is helping young people realize their relevance, but a threat where school curricula alienate the students from agriculture. Local values, and GIAHS, will need to pay for themselves, but local communities generally cannot do this on their own. Several non-agricultural land uses and secondary benefits from traditional agricultural systems could help pay, however.

The approach developed by the international **Slow Food** association to promote and support traditional, high-quality agricultural products threatened with decline or

disappearance was presented by Ms Cinzia Scaffidi (full text in Annex 13). The products should be locally highly valued, regional, with at least one producer wanting to continue or restart production and marketing. With very limited start-up funding such products were re-positioned in local or larger markets, with positive effects on the local economy, while other aspects of the local community also became more widely known and appreciated. Some of the lessons learned by the Slow Food movement would be directly applicable to the GIAHS programme. It was found that people's preferences were not determined by price alone but rather by their awareness of a range of values – not only in high-income countries, but in a number of developing countries as well.

Pablo Eyzaguirre, IPGRI, discussed the **long-term relationships between cultures and landscapes,** using his and Ms Adriana Woods-Páez's visual materials (Annex 14). IPGRI, in its Livelihoods and Institutions approach, investigates and supports the social, cultural, institutional and economic factors that communities use in constructing landscapes with high biodiversity and livelihood value. It works with partners to strengthen local institutions that define and manage biodiversity resources and niches useful and culturally significant to communities, and that defend and enhance their value. The GIAHS programme should consider the local conceptions and uses of the landscape including allocation of rights and uses of resources within the agricultural systems selected. The GIAHS programme was cautioned against assuming a priori the parameters to define the ecosystem boundaries, the management units or the scope of landscape. A GIAHS should be recognized as an open system within the larger open system (e.g., the country), changing with time. The visions of landscape should be shaped by people who shaped the land, and who are themselves the core of landscapes.

Rolland Pangowish, IITC, shared with participants **the views of indigenous peoples**, such as the Ottawa Nation, traditionally hunters and farmers, now mainly engaged in agriculture on reservations. Indigenous peoples (the Fourth World), separate but impacted by later arrivals in their area, see the earth as a sacred entity, and aim to leave the land as they have found it. The Bruntland report mentioned that indigenous peoples were the first to have and use sustainable values and technologies, but were also the first to be impacted by environmental degradation and pollution through other peoples' activities such as deforestation. They have a strong spirituality and think along holistic and intuitive lines, in contrast to the western, rationalistic, 'scientific' thinking. The West lives in a temporal reality, in a one-dimensional flow of time; indigenous people in a spatial reality, a place in the landscape.

Intellectual property rights generally have not recognized collective knowledge, and constitute a danger to it. Similarly, private property rights may constitute a danger not only to collective property rights but also to the very basis of indigenous culture. Privatization of water, for example, is anathema to indigenous people: water is sacred, like air.

Indigenous peoples have shown adaptability to the changing environment, maintaining their values and a close relationship to their environment. Globalization should not entail an inevitable de-culturalization of humanity.

In **discussion**, the term First Nations was preferred over Fourth World. Participants noted a gradual paradigm shift towards a better understanding of indigenous systems by scientists and policy-makers. Several legal instruments were identified that could serve people, rather than interpret or judge them from the outside: the UNESCO World Heritage Convention and the Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity; the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; and the Draft Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Every

available partner should be approached to invite cooperation in the GIAHS programme, such as the UN-Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues.

On the issue of human rights, it was noted that often, urban power could be overriding rural interests. Access to resources was seen as an element of human rights, as was the right not to be deprived of means of subsistence. It was mentioned that (collective) rights, including rights to natural resources and territories and cultural rights, are necessary to ensure the continued relations of people with their environment that are at the heart of GIAHS. The approach in GIAHS should be people-oriented and community-driven, as already in the project document; that same awareness should be stimulated in international and national decision-making institutions.

Session 4: Preparation for the selection of pilot systems

Ms Maria Gemma Grillotti introduced the research experience and methodology of the IGU work on **human communities and natural environment in agricultural areas**. The International Geographical Union, headquartered in Rome, comprises 89 national committees and 32 research commissions. Its research methodology (presentation materials in Annex 15; background paper on CD-ROM) is integrated, diachronic (not static), and trans-scalar, from local to global; it goes through description and interpretation steps to evaluation. The description identifies the agricultural systems through the prevailing farm type and the total and cultivated agricultural areas, and indicates who organizes the territory. In the interpretation phase, the working of the agricultural system is clarified through analysis of its economic and social characteristics. Interpretation covers the identification of a typical agricultural system through a wide range of elements of its cultural character.

IGU aims to study emblematic and 'urgent' examples and to identify typical agricultural systems worldwide with a standard methodology, and eventually to contribute to building international codes for classification of agricultural system types; for protection of agricultural systems; and for the certification of typical products. It also aspires to compile a thematic atlas of world agriculture, and to create an international school for experts in agricultural heritage systems. The geographical methodology and ideas developed in this IGU research would appear to be useful and applicable in the GIAHS programme as well.

The **discussion** touched on the new interest in agriculture in Europe, and the understanding that agriculture has more roles than production alone. There is also emphasis on set-aside. The European Commission has realized that support should be focused on small farmers, not tied to production – which has mainly benefited large farming enterprises. It was noted that the bundle of rights of the land users should be included in the description of agricultural systems. The annual international IGU conference, in Italy in 2005, was welcomed as one of the ways towards collaboration between IGU and the GIAHS programme.

José Remedios Furtado introduced and summarized the **proposed review and selection process of candidate systems** for the current phase of the GIAHS project. It was noted that the link between local and national interests was extremely important, with endorsement and interest of NGOs, communities and national government institutions. The process would follow a series of steps:

1. Technical review on the basis of the information provided in the questionnaire format
2. Identification of any missing information
3. Identification of those proposals that have complete information and are in a good state

4. Request to proponents for any missing or additional information, including written evidence of commitment at the national level
5. Field confirmation of an adequately varied set of the most promising proposals and check at national level
6. Start of work in pilot systems of the PDF-B phase
7. Final selection of a wider, well distributed and varied group of proposals for the full GEF project.

The **discussion** covered a wide range of issues. An active search would be needed to identify systems of major importance for the programme as a whole but not yet identified or represented. Stakeholders and local governments should be involved in this as well, because many heritage systems are in isolated, marginal areas, on which the attention of central government institutions would not necessarily be focused. NGOs and local or national groups could help build a national network, which would help raise interest, and promote agreement and commitment from national government agencies. Local or national champions for the GIAHS programme, with political influence or high visibility, should be found and requested to promote national commitment and expansion of the national programme, inter alia, through development of enabling policies. A coordinated approach within the country should involve several ministries, including Agriculture and Environment, and if World Heritage sites would be included, also Foreign Affairs or Education as appropriate. Locally, Man and Biosphere and World Heritage National Committees could be invited to collaborate wherever practical. It was noted that the identification and establishment of a World Heritage site is a very long and complex process.

The first pilot sites should act as lighthouses, with people visiting them, or reading about their nature and evolution, becoming enthusiastic and willing to join the programme or develop enabling policies. Most biodiversity is outside protected areas; GIAHS locations can show that land users are stewards of the local biodiversity. Initially the number of cases should be small, but repeated across countries, so that governments recognize the international dimension of agricultural systems.

One of the goals of the GIAHS programme is that national policies should evolve to facilitate biodiversity conservation and sustainable use and recognize multiple roles of agricultural systems. Often changes in viewpoint and insight begin at a local scale, preceding and influencing national policy changes. Policy problems are generally national and cannot be handled locally; in the initial stage, a GIAHS location probably would not yet exert much national leverage.

Initially, GIAHS should concentrate on technical problems that can generally be resolved locally, and on local government; the initial focus should be on examples of local communities and local governments that will actively support the GIAHS objectives and where a national government agency has at least a positive view of the proceedings.

At a later stage, the programme will continue to evolve on a global scale, so that candidate systems and cases not included in the pilot phase may be included at any stage of the long-term process, with a range of possible funding sources.

It was noted that land tenure would be an important factor: the access to resources of local communities. The possible influence on the agricultural system of changes in tenure policies should be considered from the start.

The discussion on the tentative **criteria for system and site selection** (checklist in Annex 16) aimed to answer the questions whether the proposed complex set of criteria could be reduced to a minimum critical set or an optimum set, and whether any other criteria might

be needed. The draft set was found too open and complex, and some items would be very difficult to measure. Terms such as resource efficiency or energy flow are difficult to grasp as criteria. Initially there were few major criteria, derived from the five capitals or from the programme title (globally important; ingenious; heritage). The **format for description of pilot system proposals** was generally considered to be a sound basis for the selection process. Several suggestions for improvement have been included in the revised version (Annex 17).

A major criterion could be the passion and commitment and the continuity of the local community. Well-maintained social cohesion in communities is one of the important success factors. For certain donors –and for the communities themselves– the potential for poverty alleviation is an important criterion. The use of biodiversity as a livelihood strategy would be important, and livelihood should be among the central criteria. A livelihood (five-capitals) approach has been in use for diverse purposes, including a world poverty map. GEF wishes to see a solution to the threats to these systems, inter alia through local capacities and markets. In selection, centres of domestication should be considered; presently several of these are among the poorest or marginal areas.

Yes/no criteria were considered important in the selection, and the total number of criteria should be small. They could include biodiversity, culturally or socio-economically highly valuable, local prior informed consent and government agreement. Cases should be representative for major areas in the world. Certain minimum assets should be available (related to the five capitals); their interactions can provide desired outcomes such as agro-biodiversity conservation, cultural (inter-generational) sustainability, food security. Ingenuity is an important criterion, and is unique for the GIAHS programme, but would be very difficult to judge by objective criteria. It is a meta-criterion that emerges from how different elements and processes of the system are combined through human management and it represents a large diversity of manifestations in different environments. An underlying criterion is the strategic role of a system: cases should be suitable for learning lessons about sustainable systems for the future, able to face and adjust to ecological, economic and political changes.

In this first phase of the programme utilitarian choices should be made: which systems are most important for the future? Systems in marginal areas under threat from modern agriculture, possibly including recently abandoned systems; systems in certain densely populated areas that are very productive per ha but not necessarily economic in the narrow sense, but that are conserving the environment; or very extensive systems (such as hunter-gatherer systems in Amazonia), each of which could provide crucial lessons and broaden the choices for agriculture in the future.

One of the objectives of the current phase is to learn how to operate the GIAHS programme with maximum effect, so flexibility is needed in the first phase. Some spare cases should be identified (waitlisted) in case chosen cases fail to materialize, or in case more funding becomes available. It was suggested that a group of very competent people –not identified during the discussion– should choose the first ten cases, without strict adherence to an a priori set of criteria, but with a focus on their use as examples to attract interest and broader support for the programme.

As one **example of a candidate system**, Mario Tapia summarized the Machu Picchu–Lake Titicaca transect in Peru, proposed by CONAM, the national institute for environment. The transect covers six communities in two watersheds, with two main indigenous groups, engaged in a maize-based agricultural system at elevations around 2000 m and a potato–other tubers–livestock (alpaca) system above 3000 m. Eight of the 18 ecological zones of the Andes are represented in the transect area, with a rich variation of crops, varieties with different

niches, and agro-ecological management methods. The area is also representative of Ecuador and parts of Argentina and Chile. The Altiplano area is strongly affected by climate change, and communities have experience with drought-tolerant forage crops. Varieties of quinua (an amaranth), indigenous in the Andes, are foodgrains for the future; they have a niche market, for example in Europe, and have been planted on 300 ha in Tibet. Since their use was not known there, Peruvians informed and trained the Tibetan farmers.

In discussion, questions were asked on local institutions, historical tendencies and threats to the agricultural systems – such as the land tenure problem of indigenous Andean peoples. The general history is known; the ministry is aware that land tenure problems are most serious in these areas. The 500-odd communities of the Altiplano have been living, producing food and evolving for centuries; now they have services such as electricity and drinking water supply. On questions of livelihood, and what activities besides agriculture might be needed for system sustainability, governments came together to promote a project on the Inca road, and proposed that several sections of it should form a cluster site in the UNESCO World Heritage list –with positive impact on incomes from tourism. It was noted that national policies included import of food and subsidized distribution, with consequent negative effects on the marketing of local produce. In the Uruguay Round of WTO, countries had the opportunity to opt out of liberalization of their food imports, but did not in fact do so.

A **scorecard for information on GIAHS pilot cases** (Annex 18) was briefly introduced by José Remedios Furtado and discussed. The aspect of ingenuity was found missing, but difficult to quantify. It could be characterized in terms of the efficiency and integrated manner of resources use –land, water, biodiversity and seasonality– and where relevant, effective integration between different groups, such as sedentary farmers and transhumant herders, with in addition, resilience to shocks and changes as an emergent property of the system.

The potential of the proposed interventions for poverty alleviation in the agricultural system was considered to be one of the items under co-financing potential. The potential for scaling up or replication from the first cases was seen as one of the key aspects of the GIAHS programme. Tenure conditions were seen as both an internal and an external characteristic of agricultural systems: in the form of customary rules on access to resources as well as national legislation, rules and regulations. Tenure and resource rights and their evolution should be included in the information framework.

Session 5: Selection of pilot cases

On the basis of his review of the proposals, José Furtado highlighted the **main items of complete or missing information** for a number of candidate systems, using the scorecards with a ranking of quality and completeness of each information item and each group of items. Current versions of all proposals received can be found at: http://www.fao.org/landandwater/agll/giahs/cands-e.stm. It was clear that more information is needed for most proposals before they can be evaluated in the selection process for the first set of pilot cases. Most candidate proposals should be focused more sharply in terms of activities as well as various other aspects. The Steering Committee found that it was not in a position to conduct the selection with the information available to date, though suggestions were made that helped rank and agree on priority systems among those available in regard to level of preparedness.

However, the meeting recognized the urgency of completing the selection of pilot systems for the project development and formulation process, so that the project could still be

included in the current GEF funding cycle. Nicholas Remple of UNDP-GEF proposed that systems would be selected one by one, as and when ready. This "rolling system" of selecting pilots for the PDF-B could overlap partly with the Full GEF-Project. The Full project can be developed on the basis of the work in the first systems. While the Full Project is approved and initiated, some system may still be in the PDF-B stage and can join the Full Project later. This flexible approach has many advantages as the development process of each pilot system has its own rationale and planning must be realistic under different circumstances. Nick Remple explained that the GEF rules are no obstacle to such an approach. The secretariat was requested to urgently send to proposers specific queries on any missing or incomplete information as well as a request for some additional information on the scope for livelihood improvement if livelihoods were inadequate or under threat, on what general benefits to the environment would be expected, and on the wild biodiversity in the area if present.

The secretariat was requested to analyse how many people would be directly and potentially benefiting from implementation of each case, as well as the likely impact of the implementation on food security, livelihoods, biodiversity, environmental management, and the potential of the system to face threats, including from climate change. With the results of such an analysis and more complete information as listed in the scorecard, a review team has a better basis for judgment. This should include consideration of any other projects or activities at each location that could make a difference in the expected impact, for example through cooperation or twinning. A search will also be needed for important systems that may be missing from the list of potential GIAHS identified to date.

With the example of linked proposals of three oasis systems in three adjacent countries, it was suggested that possible links between other kinds of systems be explored as well. The meeting expressed caution against giving priority to relic (abandoned) systems, in view of the likelihood that their revival would entail much greater difficulties than the evolution of a living system towards greater sustainability. Participants were encouraged to focus on the system itself in the first phase. The local practice and results can then inform and perhaps help shape national policies: in the later part of the project process a focus on policy aspects may be more effective.

It was suggested that a wide group of people be invited to write occasional papers describing important heritage agricultural systems. Their publication could lead to a wider range of GIAHS proposals. A similar effect could be achieved by requesting, for example, LEISA Magazine to publish case studies and a brief description of the GIAHS programme. The potential for valuable GIAHS projects could be broadened by including the third-world conditions of indigenous peoples in industrialized countries, such as the North American Indian peoples; this would require funding from other sources, without GEF involvement. The UNDP Equator Awards, in recognition of outstanding community efforts for poverty reduction and biodiversity conservation, could also be a good example of a method to make the GIAHS programme more widely known. Recognition systems for agricultural heritage systems should include the whole world, not only the set of countries covered by GEF.

Nicholas Remple, UNDP, briefly introduced a list of GEF–OP13 **liaison projects** (Annex 19), but indicated that many projects involved in agricultural biodiversity were not represented in the list. It would be useful to link with some of these projects, in order to increase the impact of both GIAHS and OP 13, but limiting the extra time devoted to this in view of time and resource constraints.

The session split into three **parallel groups** that briefly discussed cases in three broad regions: Asia, Pacific and Central and Eastern Europe; Africa and the Near East; Latin America and the Caribbean. A selection of the following questions was considered: which

projects would have enough information and which would still need to provide information on specific items; which kinds of systems were still missing; what difference would funding make for specific candidate systems; and what would be the consequences if a given system would collapse or be abandoned. The session then resumed with brief reports from the groups.

For Asia, Pacific and central and eastern Europe, five candidate systems seemed ready for the next steps, and two more after receipt of some supplementary information. It was recommended that the secretariat send the comments on the information to the proponent of each case with the request to send any missing information as soon as possible, and then to go ahead with good, representative cases in a rolling process, deciding on the basis of the available proposals with complete information – acknowledging that the chosen cases might not be the absolutely best ones. Potential systems mentioned for possible future consideration included upland rice and homegarden systems in Southeast Asia; wetland rice–fish and legume-based systems in South Asia; colocasia and breadfruit-based systems in Polynesia; fruit-based and grazing systems in Central Asia; a transhumant grazing system in the Caucasus.

For Africa and the Near East, several important systems were already represented but needed some additional information. Potential systems meriting consideration in future included banana, cassava and yam-based systems in the humid zone; the linked pastoral and sedentary agriculture systems of the Guinea savanna; pastoral systems of the East African grasslands (a case summary available); drought-tolerant grain-based systems in the dry zone such as in Ethiopia or Chad; the coastal mangrove and wetland rice systems of West Africa. The group suggested that people be invited to write chapters about important systems to enable publication of a book for information and advocacy purposes. In discussion, reference was made to earlier books of a similar nature – the Census of agricultural systems, published by FAO/De Agostini in the nineteen-fifties; and books by Grigg and by Allen on agricultural systems of the world. A bibliography on agricultural systems would be very useful for the GIAHS programme; it could form part of a universally accessible web-based database along the lines of Ecoport.

For Latin America and the Caribbean, five proposals were available, but many systems were not represented, including fisheries and fish culture systems and homegarden systems in C America and the Caribbean; cattle grazing in Patagonia; coffee–cacao–shade tree systems in Amazonia, and flood recession agriculture in the Amazon floodplain. A database on the world's ingenious agriculture systems would be needed, even with initially limited and incomplete information.

In **discussion** it was suggested that revival of the Easter Island agricultural system, even if now fossil after a human-made ecological tragedy, would help sustain its culture, which is still alive. While many other indigenous groups would learn from such action, the question remains how many people would potentially benefit, in view of the very small populations on most Polynesian islands.

The meeting noted that the management of the project should be clearly distinguished from the vision, strategy and policy of the wider and more long-term GIAHS programme. While avoiding false expectations, the project should continue to make contact with more systems and cases in an open-ended process; start soon with a selected number of cases that inspired confidence of success; follow up with similar cases where most of the information is already available, while keeping a strategic balance among different kinds of systems and regions; and in due course identify and invite action on several important systems not yet represented in the proposals already submitted.

Side event: Pilot system proposals

Proposers of pilot cases participating in the meeting, including RAIPON (Russia), CENESTA (Iran), Slovak Agricultural University Nitra (Slovakia), IPGRI (oases in Morocco, Tunisia and Algeria), UNU-PLEC (Guinea, Mexico and China) presented information on the agricultural systems covered by the proposals. All proposals received, whether presented or not, are available at http://www.fao.org/landandwater/agll/giahs/cands-e.stm.

Session 6: Project development strategy and Steering Committee decisions

Michel Prieur took participants through the preamble and the main articles of the **European Landscape Convention**, negotiated among all Council of Europe countries, which came into force in 2004 and to date was signed by 26 countries and ratified by 10 (presentation materials in Annex 20). The convention applies to all landscapes, and thus goes beyond action theme 4 of the European strategy (Conservation of landscapes) and the UNESCO Convention of 1975, which refers to outstanding landscapes of universal value.

The European Landscape Convention had its origin in the initiative of local authorities. It is a legal tool with the objectives of well-being for all, and democracy in land management decisions. Management of landscapes is a social and economic activity, and needs participation; the scope, arrangements and effects of participation need to be worked out. National landscape policies should be established, and need coordination and institutional arrangements. Any landscape policy must deal with protection, management and planning. Landscape awards to local authorities for effective and good landscape management have an example function.

In discussion, it was explained that the convention did not define specific landscape units; this was left to the states. The EU is not part of the convention so far. It has subsumed the landscape habitat issue under biodiversity, and its policy is based on an aesthetic conception of landscape; this is evolving, however. On the questions whether a supplement to the UNESCO convention would not have been preferable, and why the concept of beauty was not made explicit, the two conventions were shown to be complementary, based on different conceptions, and have different goals. In fact, around 1995 UNESCO advised on the draft European convention, and the World Heritage Committee welcomed it. The Council of Europe did not wish to have a list of specific landscapes, but a convention covering all landscapes to ensure protection against degradation, evolution and sustainable use, and the building of new landscapes. Beauty is implicit in the European convention.

Incentives for compliance with the convention include the naming of good examples, but regulation is in the hands of the states. The convention encourages recognition of landscapes in law and integration of laws impinging on landscapes. Agricultural policies and ministries are mentioned twice as an important element in the convention. The convention does not have a financial mechanism; that is left to the states.

The questions arose whether the **policy processes in GIAHS** should be close to the World Heritage concept or to the European landscape convention, and with whom partnerships should be built: national governments or civil society organizations. The European landscape convention emphasizes local people as defining landscapes and landscape policies.

GIAHS would be operating at three levels: global (policy and recognition), national (policy) and local. In this regard, while being driven by analysis of local systems, national governments should have an important role. The strategic discussions should be broad,

including the concept that agriculture, related productive sectors and poverty alleviation as well as the environment are elements of GIAHS. The project should raise awareness and should be embedded in national institutions in an intersectoral context. It may not be easy to fit in GIAHS, since many countries have 'convention fatigue', and a strongly centralized government structure. GIAHS strategies should be coordinated with national ministries including Agriculture and Environment, as well as with CBD and CCD. UNESCO would be ready to work together on a broad front: World Heritage, Man and Biosphere and the Intangible Heritage Convention are all relevant to GIAHS.

One of the oldest examples of an international policy framework is the International Plant Protection Convention of 1952. FAO could possibly become the secretariat for a future GIAHS convention; the strengths, benefits and shortcomings of such a process should be explored. Links with existing conventions and instruments might be a wise course, rather than aiming for a new convention – which could take several decades.

The process leading to the International Treaty for the conservation and sustainable use of plant genetic resources, for example, took decades of technical panels before the process became political with the start of an intergovernmental commission, followed by another two decades of development and negotiations before the treaty came into force. The permanent intergovernmental Commission on genetic resources for food and agriculture (CGRFA), in existence since 1983, now has 165 member countries. It has been promoting in-situ conservation of genetic resources in synergy with gene banks, recognizing that genetic resources are a heritage of mankind. Negotiation has led from an international undertaking to a binding international treaty for the protection of plant genetic resources (entry into force 29 June 2004). Of particular note in the treaty text is the article on farmers' rights, which is of great importance as it is the first international agreement to recognize the rights of farmers.

Many local authorities and national governments are aiming for modernization, focusing on economic contributions. Since most contributions and benefits from GIAHS are of a non-market nature, it will be essential to promote a broad, integral view of *agri-culture* and to show how ingenious agricultural systems can contribute to the future. Many governments view this broad heritage as a luxury, to be considered only once primary needs are satisfied – but by then the heritage may have been abandoned or lost –and its importance recognized too late. Also, locally driven priorities may not always correspond with national ones, in part because of the often short-term perspective of governments driven by the periodicity of national elections.

A priority for ensuring success of the GIAHS programme would be to identify and develop a number of working, effective and attractive examples of GIAHS in several countries. These can be used to raise interest and encourage countries' commitment to recognizing and protecting such systems, and to empowering the local communities that created and maintained them. Legislation will be needed in many countries to safeguard traditional knowledge and formalize the rights of farmers and communities to influence relevant government policies and legislation. GIAHS can only be conserved through sustainable use and continuing evolution; systems that are merely protected would rapidly become fossils or costly museums.

A small seminar with stakeholders from the first several working sites and representatives from different international instruments was suggested; this should focus on the concrete sites involved (areas or transects across landscapes), and aim to make a range of potential stakeholders and network members aware of the local and wider benefits from viable agricultural heritage systems. The GIAHS programme is broader than can be contained in one institution: the programme itself will need to be institutionalized. It is multi-

stakeholder, not just governmental and local, but also involving several intergovernmental institutions and instruments and international and national NGOs and community-based organizations.

The GEF part of the programme is restricted to developing countries, but GEF requested that ways be explored to develop parallel activities in industrialized countries and countries in transition. For example, links should be explored with a European network on traditional agricultural systems. It was recommended that links be developed as well with indigenous peoples that live in industrialized or transition countries but have a distinct culture and livelihood strategy. Meeting participants were invited to send specific suggestions for potential partners, supporting institutions, indigenous networks and other potential network members to the secretariat.

Two areas of linkages were envisaged: with other institutions and programmes, and between similar or related systems across national boundaries. Such linkages would promote trans-boundary cooperation, stimulate the interest and activities of local people, and work towards harmonization of enabling policies. Other related existing or starting projects or activities could be encouraged to broaden their scope and take on aspects of GIAHS as well.

So far, **communication** has not been a focus of GIAHS activities. A communication and information strategy should, inter alia, inform and seek contact with a wide range of likely systems, partners and governments. Since different stakeholder groups need different means and kinds of information because of their specific interests and goals, the several objectives and functions to be served by communication activities should be identified first. Then, activities should be chosen and designed – such as a website, newsletter, side event at a meeting. Information and communication mechanisms such as an Ecoport-type database should be developed to enable local people to take initiatives, with limited effort and time to be invested by the secretariat.

An **international Board or Panel of eminent experts** was proposed as a tool for permanence and a legitimizing force. This should have an odd number of members, for example nine, of whom a majority should have a direct link with GIAHS activities. The panel should have regional, multi-disciplinary and gender balance, and include real farmers. The Steering Committee agreed that an open **Scientific and Technical Advisory Group** should be constituted as a source of information and technical support for GIAHS. Terms of reference for the Steering Committee and the Technical Advisory Group will be sent to meeting participants.

In his **closing remarks**, Mr Koohafkan expressed his thanks to all participants for their support and contributions to the meeting and invited their continuing support to the GIAHS programme, also on behalf of Ms Fresco and Mr Yoshinaga.

Annex 1. Agenda

GIAHS Project
Second Steering Committee Meeting
Rome, 7-9 June 2004

7 June a.m. Session 1: Introduction of partners and project

Chair: Kenji Yoshinaga

- **Opening address** by Ms Louise O. Fresco, Assistant Director-General, Agriculture Department, FAO
- **Keynote address** by Prof. Marcel Mazoyer, Directeur de la Chaire d'Agriculture Comparée et du Développement Agricole, France
- Adoption of agenda
- **Progress of the GIAHS project** since the first Steering Committee meeting: new developments, new partners and new challenges - Parviz Koohafkan, Chief AGLL, FAO
- **Biodiversity and poverty reduction**, global issues - Peter Kenmore, Chair, Interdepartmental Working Group on Biodiversity in Food and Agriculture (IDWG-BD), FAO
- Discussion

Session 2: Implementing the PDF-B phase and the design of the full project

Chair: Parviz Koohafkan

Project cycle

- **The GEF project development process from PDF-B to full project** – David Boerma, Project Manager GIAHS, FAO

Global recognition and conservation of agricultural heritage

- **Agricultural Heritage: the road to global recognition** - Mechtild Roessler, UNESCO World Heritage Centre
- **Dynamic conservation of heritage landscapes**: Experiences from ICCROM, the ITUC Programme - Herb Stovel, ICCROM
- Discussion

7 June p.m. Session 3: Methodology and implementation issues

Chair: Maharaj Muthoo

- **Methodological and participatory framework and step-by-step approach for implementing GIAHS** - Prof. Miguel Altieri, University of Berkeley, California
- **Community-controlled knowledge management** – Tony Putter, Ecoport Foundation
- Discussion

- **Strengthening natural resource management and traditional ecological knowledge of GIAHS, the conservation and sustainable management of biodiversity and other biophysical resources, and processes of GIAHS** (incl. appropriate technologies and innovation and adaptation). Short presentations by Sally Bunning, FAO and Luohui Liang, United Nations University, followed by a short discussion

- **Socio-economic issues and the policy context of GIAHS (**viability, sustainability: what policy process is needed, what legal and incentive frameworks are there and which need to be developed? What alternatives are there?) Short presentations by Frederic Devé, Economic and Social Department, FAO and Cinzia Scaffidi, Slow Food Movement, followed by a short discussion

- **Socio-cultural issues and empowerment** (social organisation, culture in relation to the land, customary law, gender, human rights, democracy, traditional knowledge, language, rituals/ceremonies, sacred places, traditional food). Short presentations by Pablo Eyzaguirre, IPGRI: "Long-term relationships between cultures and landscapes" and Rolland Pangowish, IITC: "culture, access to natural resources and human rights", followed by a short discussion

- **Wrap-up facilitated by Prof. Miguel Altieri.** Discussion to integrate the findings of each topical session into the methodological framework and modalities of implementation of the GIAHS Project: assessment, monitoring and participatory processes at local to national levels

7 June evening. Cocktail party

8 June a.m. Session 4: Preparation for selection of pilot systems

Chair: Pablo Eyzaguirre

GIAHS, global assessment and identification of GIAHS

- Human communities and natural environment in the agricultural areas. The International Geographical Union research experience and methodology – Prof. Maria Gemma Grillotti
- Discussion

Criteria and procedure for selection of pilot systems

- Criteria development for site selection – Prof. José Remedios Furtado and David Boerma, FAO
- Draft proposal for a procedure of site selection – FAO
- Discussion
- An example from Peru – Dr. Mario Tapia

Session 5: Selection of pilot cases

Chair: Miguel Altieri

Overview of information on candidate systems

- An overview and preliminary review of information on current GIAHS proposals – Prof. Jose Remedios Furtado and David Boerma
- A list of Liaison OP 13 projects – Nicholas Remple, UNDP

Discussions in parallel groups

Asia, Pacific and Central and Eastern Europe	Africa and the Middle East	Latin America and the Caribbean

Selection of pilot cases (plenary session continued)

- Reports from parallel groups and brief discussion
- Towards a global shortlist of pilot systems
- Next steps in the global assessment of pilot systems and selection process development

8 June evening. Side event

- Presentations by case proponents of their pilot system proposals

9 June a.m. Session 6: Project development strategy and Steering Committee decisions

Chair: Nicholas Remple

Strategic issues, methodology and communication

- Development of GIAHS for industrialized countries. Introduction to the European Landscape Convention – Mr. Michel Prieur
- Strategic issues:policy processes, priorities and linkages
- Communication
- Panel of eminent experts and Scientific and Technical Advisory Group

Closure of the meeting

Annex 2. List of participants

Miguel Altieri, University of California
Dept of Environmental Science, Policy and Management, 201 Wellman Hall, #3112
Berkeley, CA 94720-3112, USA
E-mail agroeco3@nature.berkeley.edu

Giuliano Bellezza, Director of the Home of Geography, IGU – International Geographical Union Research Experience and Methodology
Rome, Italy

Arend van Bodegom, IAC – International Agricultural Centre, Department of Sustainable Management of Natural Resources, P.O. Box 88, Wageningen 6700 AA, Netherlands
E-mail arendjan.vanbodegom@wur.nl

Jan Brindza, Slovak Agricultural University of Nitra. Tr. A. Hlinku 2, Slovakia 94976
Slovak Republic. E-mail jan.brindza@uniag.sk

Robert Brinkman, Breehoven 34,
6721SN Bennekom, Netherlands
E-mail: brinkman.r@worldonline.nl

Ms Maria Adele Cicconetti, IGU – International Geographical Union
Research Experience and Methodology
Rome, Italy

Ms Yana Dordina Nyurguyana, RAIPON
Russian Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North, P.O. Box 110, Moscow 119415, Russia. E-mail raipon@online.ru

Pablo Eyzaguirre, IPGRI, Via dei Tre Denari 472/a, 00057 Maccarese, Rome, Italy
E-mail p.eyzaguirre@cgiar.org

A. De Fernandez
Assistant Permanent Representative of the Federative Republic of Brazil to FAO
Via di Santa Maria dell' Anima 32
00186 Rome
E-mail: rebrafao@tin.it

Jose Furtado, 19 Langford Green, Champion Hill, London SE5 8BX, United Kingdom
E-mail jose.furtado@imperial.ac.uk

Ms Ilaria Giannarini, IGU – International Geographical Union Research Experience and Methodology. Rome, Italy

Ms Maria Grillotti, IGU – International Geographical Union Research Experience and Methodology. Rome, Italy
E-mail grillott@uniroma3.it

Manuel Roberto Guido
Responsabile Segreteria tecnico-scientifica del Gruppo di lavoro permanente per la lista del Patrimonio Mondiale dell'UNESCO
Ministero per i beni e le attività culturali
Via di San Michele 22, 00153 Rome, Italy
E-mail mguido@darc.beniculturali.it

Ms Coosje Hoogendoorn
IPGRI, Via dei Tre Denari 472/a
00057 Maccarese, Rome, Italy
E-mail c.hoogendoorn@cgiar.org

Luohui Liang, United Nations University
Environment and Sustainable Development
53-70 Jingumae 5-chome
Shibuya-ku, Tokyo 150 8925, Japan
E-mail liang@hq.unu.edu

Marcel Mazoyer
Professeur à l'Institut National Agronomique Paris-Grignon, INAP-G, France
E-mail marmaz@free.fr

Maharaj Muthoo, President, Roman Forum
Via Teosebio 44, 00124 Rome, Italy
E-mail muthoo@rforum.org

Mohammad Noori-Naeini
Permanent Representation of the Islamic Republic of Iran to FAO
Via Aventina 8, Rome 00153, Italy
E-mail pm.ir.iranfao@flashnet.it

Rolland Pangowish, International Indian Treaty Council. 1436 Cheverny Crescent
Orleans, Ontario K4A 3C8, Canada
E-mail rdp6416@rogers.com

Ms Cathrien de Pater, EC-LNV, National Reference Centre for Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality, P.O. Box 482, Horapark, Bennekomseweg 41, Ede 6710 BL, Netherlands. E-mail c.h.de.pater@minlnv.nl

Ms Heidi Pihlatie, Permanent Representative of the Embassy of the Republic of Finland to FAO. Via Lisbona 3, Rome 00198, Italy
E-mail eija.napoli@formin.fi

Michel Prieur, Doyen Honoraire,
Faculté de Droit et des Sciences Economiques
de Limoges. 32, rue Turgot, Limoges 87000,
France. E-mail prieur@unilim.fr

Tonie Putter, Ecoport Foundation
E-mail t.putter@ecoport.org

Ms Catherine Razavi Farvar, CENESTA
Centre for Sustainable Development, W 10
Juybar St, Fatemi Square. Teheran 14157, Iran
E-mail khadija@cenesta.org

Nicholas Remple, Project Coordinator, UNDP
35 Grosslingova Street
Bratislava 811 09, Slovak Republic
E-mail nick.remple@undp.org

Ms Mechtild Rössler, UNESCO
7, Place de Fontenoy, Paris 07 SP 75352,
France. E-mail m.rossler@unesco.org

Ms Cinzia Scaffidi, Slowfood
E-mail c.scaffidi@slowfood.it

Herb Stovel, ICCROM, International Centre
for the Study of the Preservation and
Restoration of Cultural Property
Via di San Michele 13, Rome 00153, Italy
E-mail hs@iccrom.org

Mario Tapia
Calle Reni 205, San Boria 41, Lima, Peru
E-mail mariotapia@amauta.rcp.net.pe

Okwen Tenjoh-Okwen, Consultant
Rappenberghalde, 88/1
Tübingen, 72070, Germany
E-mail okwen@excite.com

Dezider Toth, Slovak Agricultural University
of Nitra. Tr. A. Hlinku 2, Slovakia 94976
Slovak Republic.
E-mail Dezider.Toth@uniag.sk

Adalberto Vallega, IGU Vice–President
IGU – International Geographical Union
Research Experience and Methodology
Rome, Italy

Ms Adriana Woods-Paez, IPGRI, Via dei Tre
Denari 472/a, 00057 Maccarese, Rome, Italy
E-mail a.woods@cgiar.org

FAO (E-mail firstname.lastname@fao.org)

Ms Caterina Batello, AGPC

Ms Frederica Battista, SDAR

David Boerma, AGLL

Ms Sally Bunning, AGLL

Ms Romina Cavatassi, ESAE

Gerard Ciparisse, SDAA

Ms Linda Collette, AGPS

Ms Barbara Cooney, TCAP

Frederic Deve, ESA

Jose Esquinas, AGD

Ms. Sara Fernandez, AGLW-IPTRID

Ms Catia-Isabel Santonico Ferrer, SDAA

Ms Louise O Fresco
Assistant Director General, AG

Paolo Groppo, SDAA

Thomas Hofer, FORC

Peter Kenmore, AGPP

Parviz Koohafkan, Chief, AGLL

Jean Verdier, AGLW-IPTRID

Ms Margret Vidar, LEG

Kenji Yoshinaga, Director, AGL