



Scientific and Steering Committee Meeting
29-30 October 2012, FAO-HQ, Rome, Italy

REPORT

Contents

Abbreviations and acronyms 3

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY..... 4

 Background and objectives of the Meeting..... 4

 Development and Assessment of GIAHS Sustainability 4

 Strengthening GIAHS Partnerships and Alliances..... 5

 Research and Development Priorities 6

THE MEETING 7

PLENARY PRESENTATION SESSIONS 7

STEERING COMMITTEE SESSIONS..... 14

 Session 1. GIAHS Partnership Initiative – The Operational Framework..... 14

 Session 2. GIAHS application procedures, approval and recognition 17

 Session 3. GIAHS links and possible joint work with CBD, ITPGRFA, UNESCO and other international instruments 18

 Session 4. Strengthening the GIAHS Partnership and innovative alliances..... 18

SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE SESSIONS 21

 Session 1. Review of technical and methodological guidelines for assessing and monitoring Agricultural Heritage Systems..... 21

 Session 2. Capacity-building, research and education and sustainability 24

 Session 3. GIAHS branding and labelling 27

 Session 4. GIAHS – payments for environmental services, links to agriculture and culture, tourism and sustainable development 28

PLENARY SYNTHESIS AND CLOSING SESSION..... 30

Annexes are available on the GIAHS website

Abbreviations and acronyms

CAP	Common Agricultural Policy
CBD	Convention of Biological Diversity
CENESTA	Centre for Sustainable Development
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
GEF	The Global Environment Facility
GIAHS	Globally Important Agricultural Heritage Systems
ICCA	Indigenous People and Community Conserved Areas and Territories
ICCROM	International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property
IFAD	International Fund for Agriculture and Development
IGSNRR/CAS	The Institute of Geographic Sciences and Natural Resources Research, Chinese Academy of Sciences
IPOGEA	Traditional Knowledge Research Center (Società Cooperativa di Produzione e Lavoro)
ITPGR	International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture
LADA	Land Degradation Assessment in Drylands
LPFN	Landscapes for People, Food and Nature
MAB	Man and the Biosphere Programme
MAFF	Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (Japan)
MOA	Ministry of Agriculture
NGO	Non-governmental organization
NIAHS	Nationally Important Agricultural Heritage Systems
ODEPA	Oficina de Estudios y Políticas Agrarias (Ministerio de Agricultura de Chile)
PES	Payment for Environmental Services
RIHN	Research Institute for Humanity and Nature
SCBD	Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNU	United Nations University
WHC	World Heritage Council
WHL	World Heritage List
WSSD	World Summit on Sustainable Development
WTO	World Trade Organization

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background and objectives of the Meeting

The United Nations Partnership Initiative on Globally Important Agricultural Heritage Systems (GIAHS), launched during the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD, Johannesburg 2002), has reached its 10-year maturity, operating in some 20 countries with continually increasing partners. The GIAHS Partnership Initiative represents an integrated policy and action framework for the recognition and dynamic conservation of the world's unique agricultural systems with their associated livelihoods, biodiversity, indigenous knowledge systems, cultures and landscapes.

Following a decade of successful awareness-raising and activities at the global, national and local levels within a sustainable livelihood framework, it is time to take stock of its status and impacts and consider possible pathways for further development and sustained efforts. Several new institutions and countries look forward to joining the initiative and have high expectations for GIAHS implementation, technical support, and recognition and monitoring of GIAHS status.

The meeting was convened to promote focussed discussions between and among pioneering countries and Scientific and Steering Committee members, to seek their advice and identify ways and means to further develop and sustain the interest of major stakeholders, as well as to take stock of the lessons learned and achievements of the GIAHS project interventions.

The Meeting was attended by 54 participants, comprising the members of the Steering and Scientific Committees (National Coordinators/Facilitators, Experts from Universities and Research Institutions, Country Representations to FAO), FAO GIAHS Secretariat and staff members and consultants. All partners and member unanimously confirmed that the present GIAHS Global Coordinator, Dr Parviz Koohafkan, remains in this position for at least until the next Steering Committee Meeting.

Development and Assessment of GIAHS Sustainability

The Meeting provided a wealth of insights and experiences arising from development interventions at local, national and global level. At the national level, experts from the pilot countries (China, Japan, Chile and Tunisia) presented their experiences of implementing dynamic conservation of agricultural heritage systems.

A key success factor was the demonstration of the economic importance of agricultural heritage, in the form of both monetary and non-monetary values, confirming GIAHS as a sustainable rural development model. Involvement of a range of stakeholders in knowledge-generation and awareness-raising activities such as multi-disciplinary research on agricultural production landscapes; community development activities; agri-culture exhibitions; scientific publications; news and media campaigns, has led to wider understanding, visibility and acceptance. While building local and national institutional capacity, a fundamental GIAHS objective is to ensure that farmers, communities and governments not only believe in the Initiative but also own it.

In Asia, China from the developing world and Japan from the developed world have been leading the implementation, pursuing steps to internalize the GIAHS concept, and are now on the way to expansion and up-scaling of GIAHS sites. This expansion needs a management protocol to assess and monitor the sustainability of important agricultural heritage sites, both nationally and globally. Another key focus area that is important for sustainability and viability of GIAHS is to pursue the development and diversification of incomes and livelihoods of farmers and communities.

There are several on-going studies of the transformation of conservation and sustainable use activities into marketable products, and new income streams arising from promotion of sustainable tourism, products labelling and improved market access. Although marketing and tourism development appeared to be promising income-generating activities, these need further assessment of site accessibility and impacts on biodiversity, land and water quality and their uses. During these assessment and monitoring activities special emphasis was placed on the empowerment of farmers and communities and linking them to national institutions. Together they can create an enabling government policy, which is crucial for the achievement of GIAHS sustainability.

Strengthening GIAHS Partnerships and Alliances

In the light of the GIAHS impetus, one of the main objectives of the meeting was to analyse the steps and the way forward for strengthening the GIAHS partnership. The meeting provided an opportunity for discussion and interaction among key partners. The multiple elements of GIAHS, and its relevance to several multilateral instruments, provide options for partners and supporters of GIAHS to strengthen alliances and form new ones.

Participants highlighted the fundamental need and importance of harmonizing work among GIAHS, and other international actors with compatible goals such as the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization/World Heritage Council (UNESCO/WHC) and the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA).

Given the partners' diverse objectives and complex activities, a cluster approach was suggested, and the establishment of a coordinating mechanism with a decentralized secretariat. To further strengthen GIAHS visibility and support from governments, it was also suggested that a stronger link be created between GIAHS and Articles 8(j) and 10(c) of the CBD. One feasible option is to work towards a Protocol related to the Aichi Targets under the CBD. This instrument should function as a platform for cooperation between GIAHS and other conventions with compatible goals, and should provide clear leadership and guidance to communities on how to manage their landscapes and natural resources.

The growing number of countries favouring and promoting the GIAHS network was highlighted as an opening for the Initiative to be incorporated into FAO's regular programme. To generate or reinforce the political will of governments, the Initiative should focus on demonstrating to decision-makers the value of biodiversity and ecosystem goods and services provided by GIAHS. Moreover, the Initiative should take greater advantage of public information, which is a powerful instrument for ensuring that counter-productive policies, legislation and international instruments are transformed into those that are more sustainable. An effective way of reaching out to governments is with the assistance of high-level scientists who can provide valuable advocacy for agricultural heritage systems.

Countries should explore the option of a Nationally Important Agricultural Heritage Systems (NIAHS) initiative, committee or other structure at a national level, as pilot tested in China. This would reinforce the strategic development and sustainable livelihood focus of the GIAHS Initiative and reduce the pressure to recognize a multitude of GIAHS sites, as seen on the World Heritage List (UNESCO/WHL).

Instruments such as the CBD, which rely on national implementation, in partnership with indigenous and local communities and stakeholders, together with the focus of the GIAHS Initiative on community empowerment, could be used to ensure that local decisions remain with local people. Ownership of agricultural heritage by the community and for the community is imperative, and remains the foundation for designation and recognition of GIAHS as well as for their sustainability.

Research and Development Priorities

The Meeting provided an arena for participating actors to discuss the research and development needs of the GIAHS Initiative. Four key research areas were identified: i) resilience of the systems; ii) economic valuation and quantitative assessment of GIAHS; iii) mapping of GIAHS sites; and iv) payment for environmental services, sustainable tourism and GIAHS labelling. These complementary activities support GIAHS sustainability and are closely related to building capacities and empowering farmers and local communities.

One of the main challenges identified for the Initiative was analysis and quantification of the systems' resilience, and how to determine the system's key characteristics and practices that have contributed to their survival. As many previous attempts are mainly qualitative observations, quantitative assessment of the impacts would be worthwhile to provide tangible evidence for decision-makers of the benefits of a GIAHS holistic approach. For this, the scientific basis for the conservation and management of GIAHS should be strengthened through economic analysis and valuation of GIAHS goods and services. Mapping of GIAHS sites at landscape level would also be relevant. This would contribute to the assessment and monitoring of the system's historical development, and provide a baseline indicator for the establishment of a sustainable management plan.

The need to explore the development of eco-tourism activities, the GIAHS brand and a GIAHS mechanism for payment for environmental services (PES) was emphasized during the discussions. To promote tourism, first a feasibility study should be conducted to provide a supported analysis of tourism development opportunities for each site. Although on-going market activities involving GIAHS products are lucrative, GIAHS branding and labelling would require guidelines and regulations for the use of the brand as well as mechanisms to ensure the quality of the GIAHS products.

THE MEETING

After a welcome statement and opening remarks by Mr Laurent Thomas, Assistant Director-General for Technical Cooperation, FAO, the meeting started with a half-day plenary session in which eight speakers provided overviews of:

- ✓ current examples of GIAHS, the GIAHS partnership initiative and its resource partners;
- ✓ the incipient transition from farmers' rights to communities' rights;
- ✓ the agricultural landscape in the World Heritage Convention and synergies with GIAHS;
- ✓ China's experience with GIAHS and future perspectives;
- ✓ Japan's experience with *Satoyama* and GIAHS and future perspectives;
- ✓ Indigenous People and Community Conserved Areas and Territories (ICCAs) and their relationship with GIAHS;
- ✓ GIAHS in the context of existing multilateral instruments;
- ✓ an overview of CBD Articles 8j and 10c, Aichi Biodiversity Targets and GIAHS.

The Steering Committee and the Scientific Committee convened in four parallel sessions over two half-days, with further presentations and discussions of different topics.

The Steering Committee considered the operational framework; GIAHS application procedures, approval and recognition; links and possible joint work with CBD, ITPGRFA, UNESCO and others; strengthening the GIAHS Partnership and innovative alliances.

The Scientific Committee considered technical and methodological guidelines for assessing and monitoring GIAHS; capacity-building, research and education and sustainability of GIAHS; branding and labelling (geographic indication); links between agriculture and culture, tourism and sustainable development and payments for environmental services.

Highlights from the Committee sessions were presented in the final plenary session and briefly discussed. The meeting was closed with thanks to all participants and contributors of information and insights.

Rather than simple answers and conclusions for the long term, complex multi-actor and multi-country GIAHS undertaking, the meeting provided a wealth of insights and experiences that will enhance the partnership framework and guidelines; reinforce the synergy among existing partners; and facilitate the forging of effective links with several other groups and institutions with similar goals.

PLENARY PRESENTATION SESSIONS

The Chair, Professor Anne McDonald, welcomed the participants and opened the plenary session on the first morning.

Mr Laurent Thomas, Assistant Director-General Technical Cooperation, welcomed and thanked all present for their participation in the GIAHS meeting. He noted that the GIAHS Partnership Initiative is a FAO flagship for sustainable agriculture and rural development, supported by the Global Environment Facility (GEF), Germany, International Fund for Agriculture and Development (IFAD), Turkey and pioneering countries China and Japan. It is the first global initiative linking agriculture and cultural heritage in view of their historic, current and potential contribution to food security, nutrition and sustainable development.

The partnership recognizes the crucial importance of the well-being of small-scale farmers and local farming communities, and aims to sustain, conserve and protect our Agricultural Heritage and its multiple ecosystem goods and services.

Mr Thomas stated that FAO will continue to promote understanding and awareness of the fact that most biodiverse systems are formed in interaction with humans, and that traditional knowledge and customary sustainable use contribute to and uphold biodiversity.

On behalf of FAO, he acknowledged and thanked China for its support to the GIAHS initiative, for its leading role in promoting dynamic conservation of the Globally Important Agriculture Heritage Systems not only in China, but also providing assistance to other countries around the world through the South-South cooperation programme and through identified funding.

From the developed world, he also acknowledged and thanked Japan for pioneering GIAHS in developed countries, for offering their country to host the GIAHS Forum in 2013, and for offering technical cooperation in the years to come.

Mr Parviz Koohafkan, Director, Land and Water Division and Coordinator of the GIAHS Initiative, presented the background and development objective of the global initiative. He recalled the 2011 FAO publication *The State of Land and Water Resources*, which shows the challenges ahead, such as rapid population growth, particularly in the rural areas of least developed countries; a change in diet includes more meat, requiring far more water and other inputs; the large proportion of food wasted between production and consumption; and the required doubling of food supply in developing countries by 2050.

Mr Koohafkan stressed smallholder and family farms produce most of the world's food, are the stewards of environmental services and biodiversity. He expressed how higher and sustainable productivity, therefore, would have a major impact on their well-being. GIAHS was then introduced, while focusing on their goods and services.

GIAHS are classified and typified based on the ingenuity of their management systems, high levels of agricultural biodiversity and associated biodiversity, local food security, and their biophysical, economic and socio-cultural resources that have evolved under specific ecological and socio-cultural constraints and opportunities. These systems can lead the way to intensification without simplification of the agro-eco-cultural system or loss of biodiversity. Besides local action this requires an enabling environment created by national policies and international instruments.

Recognizing the evolutionary processes, GIAHS holds key potential for building a sustainable future, particularly for ensuring food security and enhancing the livelihoods of smallholders and family farming communities worldwide. This meeting therefore considered policy vision, cooperation among existing and new partners, governance, and development intervention such as capacity-building and empowerment, awareness and education, research and development.

Prof. Jose Esquinas stressed that farmers' rights are also community rights, developed over millennia. He expressed the need to create new mechanisms to safeguard them, locally as well as globally, along the lines of the 2001 treaty.

He emphasized the concept of Agriculture and Culture, and the need to conserve ecological and cultural diversity for future generations. He suggested that a section on GIAHS be included in the 2007 multi-year plan of action for agricultural biodiversity.

Prof. Esquinas called attention to the loss of biodiversity that has occurred over recent years. By example he explained that humans have been using some 8 000 species for food; today this has been reduced to around 150, while only two crops, rice and potato, provide more than 60 percent of the world's food energy. Research on important neglected crops, and promotion of their use, is essential for restoring diversity and nutrient balance in diets.

Conservation of genetic resources has been largely *ex situ*, in gene (seed) banks, mainly in industrialized countries. *In situ* conservation of plant and animal genetic resources in their own environment by rural communities is essential for complementing such static conservation and for restoring, or maintaining, balance between community rights and individual or corporate breeding rights.

Ms Mechtild Rössler (UNESCO) outlined synergies between UNESCO's programmes and GIAHS, including the 1972 World Heritage Convention and its cultural landscapes, the Man and the Biosphere Programme (MAB) with Biosphere Reserves, LINKS and the Geoparks network. She noted the UNESCO-CBD cooperation since 2010 on biocultural diversity with a work programme between CBD, the 1972 World Heritage Convention, the 2003 Convention on the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage and the 2005 Convention on the Promotion of Cultural Expressions. Cultural landscapes inscribed on the World Heritage List, which are also GIAHS sites such as the rice terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras, provided excellent case studies of cooperation on the ground. However, the work with local communities and indigenous peoples needed to be enhanced.

An integrated approach for agricultural landscapes was also required for sustainable, climate-resilient, diversified food production; reduction of rural poverty and food insecurity; sustainable biomass fuel, forest and fisheries production; conservation and restoration of wild biodiversity; protection of critical watershed functions and terrestrial climate mitigation. Ms Rössler highlighted specific issues and problems faced by people dependent on pastoral or agro-pastoral systems, who need to migrate further each season. They traditionally manage and maintain an extensive area, partly overlapping and closely linked with sedentary, arable agriculture systems and often crossing national boundaries.

She indicated three specific points for cooperation between GIAHS and UNESCO:

- 1) Case-by-case cooperation at specific sites and cultural landscapes, where GIAHS could be instrumental in the recognition of the agricultural practices – for example, on-site capacity-building could be carried out jointly;
- 2) Cooperation with GIAHS at Biosphere Reserves or cultural and natural World Heritage sites such as in buffer zones around a number of World Heritage sites, for example at Ngorongoro (Tanzania) or in the Maasai Mara area; and
- 3) Thematic projects, such as for oasis systems or agropastoralism, where the World Heritage Committee may request comparative or thematic studies and scientific inputs from GIAHS will be needed; as well as in the further development of some concepts including

human–nature interaction and cultural diversity. The GIAHS–UNESCO cooperation on the theme of agropastoralism in the Mediterranean 2007–2012 had been excellent.

Prof. Li Wenhua outlined China’s diverse geography, agro-ecological conditions and nationalities, its long and rich history of diverse integrated agricultural systems, and its holistic philosophy. He highlighted several threats to the sustainability of biodiverse and culturally diverse agricultural systems, including population pressure, replacement by ‘modern’ uniform, often large-scale, monoculture technologies; neglect and lack of conservation of indigenous knowledge and traditional technologies; inappropriate policies and lack of incentives.

Internationally China leads the development of GIAHS sites and related national and international initiatives. More than 20 symposia and training courses were organized to strengthen capacity; in 2010 a scientific expert committee was established for selection of candidate sites; the international GIAHS Forum was held in Beijing in 2011. In 2012, Nationally Important Agricultural Heritage Systems (NIAHS) were identified and developed based on the GIAHS concept to avoid excessive numbers of sites at the global level. Scientific research is addressing several issues related to GIAHS, resulting in drastic reduction of rice blast damage.

Prof. Li showed several active and candidate pilot sites and indicated potential for widespread application of some of the successful production systems. GIAHS-brand labelling of produce from the sites has improved people’s livelihoods and increased public knowledge and understanding of these systems and, combined with other publicity, has increased local income from tourism. There is still a long way to go, however, institutional changes and infrastructure are needed as well as incentive mechanisms.

Mr Yutaka Sumita recalled that Japan is blessed with rich and varied natural resources, but is frequently hit by natural disasters. The traditional paddy rice agro-ecosystem in Japan has been forming human-influenced nature with high plant and animal biodiversity, as illustrated by the *Satoyama* landscape in the Sado and Noto GIAHS sites. The Noto site was shown to have two agricultural heritage systems: an unusual type of small-scale inshore marine fishing and traditional partly terraced wetland rice cultivation. The Sado site is known for the recovery of the endangered Japanese crested ibis and for promoting environmentally sound paddy rice farming.

The GIAHS concept is consistent with Japan’s policy in which each country and region should maintain and develop agriculture in a sustainable manner while taking into consideration agricultural diversity, conservation of natural resources and the resilience of agriculture to climate change. GIAHS is part of the 2012 National Tourism Promotion Plan and of Japan’s Biodiversity strategy 2012–2020. Japan’s national policy aims to develop guidelines to recommend GIAHS sites, monitor existing GIAHS sites and promote GIAHS initiatives in Japan. Nationally and internationally, Japan supports the GIAHS initiative, *inter alia* through links with the local government of Ishikawa prefecture and by hosting the GIAHS Forum in Noto in 2013.

Mr Taghi Farvar introduced the Indigenous and Community Conserved Areas and Territories (ICCAs, www.ICCAconsortium.org). ICCAs are successful examples of collective decision-making on nature, the oldest form of conservation, closely related to culture and livelihood. They are the ‘bio-cultural diversity jewels of the world’.

The ICCA concept is closely related to GIAHS, but is not necessarily the same. Some work by the ICCA consortium with GIAHS in Iran indicates that these ICCAs are some of the best potential GIAHS.

On terminology, Mr Farvar recommended replacing specific terms such as ‘small farmers’ by the more general and accurate term ‘indigenous peoples and local communities’.

Prof. Stuart Harrop listed and described the issues relevant to GIAHS in an international and policy context; the several international instruments relevant to each; some problems to be resolved and the range of data required to determine legal priorities and structure of future GIAHS work; and options for an international legal umbrella or a soft-law or *ad-hoc* approach. Articles 8j and 10c of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Aichi Targets are some of the most important international instruments that can be engaged in efforts to mainstream GIAHS. GIAHS could participate in the fulfilment of the Aichi Targets, in a joint venture with key organizations such as CBD, WHC and MAB.

Prof. Harrop cautioned that aiming for a GIAHS convention would require much detailed preparatory work and the negotiation path could be arduous, with compromises along the way. Several other options would appear less complex and time-consuming, and some would lend themselves to a step-by-step or modular approach.

The pages of Prof. Harrop’s clear, systematic and detailed screen presentation can guide the GIAHS partners in their work mainstreaming GIAHS, anchor it in existing international instruments, and develop joint activities among stakeholders and other actors. This summary report cannot do justice to the information, so the reader is referred to the [presentation](#) on the GIAHS website.

During the wide-ranging [discussion](#), it was agreed work should be combined, however merging endeavours was considered difficult; a cluster approach may be preferred, considering the different objectives. The idea of a coordinating mechanism, with a decentralized secretariat, was seen as an option. However, the question was then raised whether this should start with an alliance of friendly countries or through another type of approach.

Some of the important discussion points included:

- The need to reconsider the typologies and definition of biodiversity; these are different, in some cases conflicting, between agro-biodiversity as considered in GIAHS and similar agri-cultural environments, and biodiversity as understood by many ministries of the environment or agencies or non-governmental organizations (NGOs) dealing with protected areas.

- The need to work locally, close to the ground and with local people, given that the nature of threats to GIAHS and similar areas may be very different from one country or region to another. The threat may be conversion to intensive agriculture with neglect of the value of biodiversity, complexity and traditional knowledge and cultural practices of the displaced agricultural system and community; or, for example, abandonment with consequent re-growth of 'natural' vegetation or reforestation, severely reducing agro-biodiversity and in some cases biodiversity and eroding long-established bio-cultural landscapes.
- The need for an effective and targeted communication strategy and public awareness as powerful instruments to change counterproductive policies, legislation and international instruments in a more sustainable direction.
- Biodiversity value and ecosystem services should be demonstrated for decision-makers in order to generate or re-enforce political will. Reaching out to governments may be more effective with the assistance of high-level scientists.
- The need to respect and apply the principles of free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) for indigenous territories. The practical implementation of these principles will help strengthen and empower indigenous peoples and local communities and contribute to effective local action.

In the short plenary session, the morning of 30 October 2012, **Mr John Scott** discussed CBD Articles 10c and 8j and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets in relation to GIAHS.

He highlighted the strong support expressed in Article 10c as 'Each Contracting Party shall ... *Protect and encourage* customary use of biological resources...; and particularly in Article 8j, 'Each Contracting Party shall ... *respect, preserve and maintain* knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities embodying traditional lifestyles Several tasks and components of work derived from the CBD articles are clearly related to GIAHS work, and could be entry points for increasing visibility, recognition and impact of GIAHS.

Referring to the Aichi Targets, in particular those related to traditional knowledge (Target 18) and *in situ* conservation of plant and animal species (Targets 12 and 13), as well as genetic diversity (Target 16) and protected areas (Target 11), participants discussed whether clustering these targets could be the basis for setting up a protocol for culture and nature with the objective of recognizing, supporting and promoting the GIAHS concept and practice. This would focus on *in situ*-conservation; with a view to strengthening the legal enforceability of the CBD's revised strategic plan and its twenty Aichi Targets.

Mr Scott advocated a joint, threefold work programme GIAHS-CBD-UNESCO, that could include joint fundraising, projects and workshops in support of mutual goals. Its aim could be: revisiting and reconciling existing protected areas; envisaging their potential expansion; establishing buffer zones and corridors; reviewing areas of significant *in situ* and on-farm conservation; taking into account biological and cultural areas of resilience and hotspots.

Mr Koohafkan introduced the parallel sessions of the Steering and Scientific Committees, noting that GIAHS efforts had been successful working with local communities, proving feasibility, and that GIAHS had worked well with CBD, Ramsar and others. He

suggested that the best way to proceed might be through continual reminders to the world and through collaboration with existing international instruments and partners. He urged meeting participants to work towards outputs in the next sessions.

STEERING COMMITTEE SESSIONS

Session 1. GIAHS Partnership Initiative – The Operational Framework

Parviz Koohafkan (FAO) recalled the most important features of the GIAHS operational framework – concepts of partnership, vision, mission, strategic objectives, three levels of involvement, and roles of the steering committee, secretariat and partners. The discussion in this session led into the more specific issues discussed in later sessions.

Ms Teresa Agüero (Oficina de Estudios y Políticas Agrarias, Ministerio de Agricultura de Chile, ODEPA Chile) emphasized the importance of cooperation and coordination between all three levels (local, national and global), and of synergy between all stakeholders, including ministries in charge of various components of a GIAHS.

Prof. Ming Luo (Ministry of Agriculture, MOA China) highlighted the importance of GIAHS in China and the value of South-South Cooperation, and emphasized that FAO should play a key role. He raised concerns about the need to refine the standard procedure for selecting GIAHS sites.

Mr Joseph King (ICCRUM) presented the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCRUM), an intergovernmental capacity-building institution for the conservation of cultural heritage. He noted that cultural heritage could teach us how to survive and adapt to disasters, besides promoting diversity and sustainability. He recommended strengthening the capacity-building component of the GIAHS programme. Much research has been done, e.g. as noted in China's presentation, which needs to be brought to a larger audience. Research is needed on individual sites to identify commonalities and differences in issues such as food security, legal administrative management and trade values. The results should serve in the development of an innovative series of learning materials to facilitate national and local GIAHS work in different countries.

Prof. Anne McDonald (Sophia University, Japan) noted that funding is a critical issue. GIAHS partners may need to engage in fundraising, including solicitation with the private sector. She suggested exploring how FAO might wish to go about fundraising. As an example, she cited the case of Japan, which started without funding but became a success as the Japanese partner had a positive approach, working with the communities, managing to convince them that GIAHS could facilitate policies and open the door to new policies – such as those needed to obtain eco-farming certificates. Along this line, the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF) helped create GIAHS in Japan and spearheaded building synergies at the international level.

Prof. McDonald emphasized the importance of interactions between and among national focal point institutions and key stakeholders at the regional level. She cited the GIAHS-Asia workshop sponsored by Japan in December 2011, where participants from India, China, Japan and the Philippines had the opportunity to learn from each other's sites.

Mr Yutaka Sumita (Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, Japan) noted that after ten years of the GIAHS partnership, the GIAHS concept has become widely known; GIAHS

implementation has been successful; and 20 sites have been designated. In Japan efforts have been made to establish standards for new GIAHS sites and their monitoring.

He also expressed that the GIAHS Partnership Framework is timely; leveraging global and national recognition and governance remain important and require attention by partners – *inter alia* through efforts to include GIAHS in priority projects and through FAO's Regular Programme structure, which could entail budget allocation and enhancement of the secretariat.

Mr Taghi Farvar (The Centre for Sustainable Development, CENESTA) cautioned against the risks of bureaucracy when working towards a formal instrument such as a protocol, treaty or conventions. GIAHS should maintain a focus on a community approach; the usual project approach creates risks when governments are involved.

Mr Koohafkan agreed that traditional systems are under threat – including from governments. Sometimes policies have good intentions but disastrous impact. Policy-makers should be cautious, aware that good intentions do not necessarily lead to sustainable results. For example, when policies are set for more food to be produced, because there are one billion hungry, but without concern for natural resources, resulting in policy-makers adding another problem without first solving the one addressed.

Ms Mechtild Rössler (UNESCO) noted that there are already 962 sites of outstanding universal value on the World Heritage List (WHL). It was increasingly difficult to manage the workload. In 2011 the external audit indicated that UNESCO and WHC should re-focus on conservation and not on listing more sites. However, the list cannot be closed – countries have a right to nominate sites. The listing has economic benefits in certain regions, not only for tourism but also for regional development and recognition. WHL nominations are costly and their preparation takes time, sometimes over 20 years. It is a demanding inter-governmental system.

The World Heritage Committee sometimes had difficulty recognizing agricultural systems. Their outstanding universal value was not well understood. If an agricultural heritage site needs to be assessed, it would be good if GIAHS staff could assist in highlighting its outstanding uniqueness and value.

She noted that there were advantages to working with governments, as they had to fulfil their obligations under a legal instrument. However, decisions to be taken in living cultural systems should be by local people and communities, including indigenous peoples. This should be in the next road map.

Mr Sumita recalled that *Satoyama* and *Satoumi* in Japan are very isolated places suffering from de-population. Maintaining the landscape with its rice terraces can give meaning to people living in these areas, and involve them actively. The commitment to conservation in these places was a completely voluntary process.

Prof. Anne McDonald (Sophia University, Japan) described the GIAHS experience in Japan, where the Minister for Agriculture was interested in working with the United Nations

and the communities. The current GIAHS sites, Noto region and Sado, were identified jointly by the United Nations University (UNU) and MAFF, and their designation had a remarkable impact, especially on the communities, restoring their pride.

Prof. Li Wenhua (The Institute of Geographic Sciences and Natural Resources Research, Chinese Academy of Sciences, IGSNRR/CAS) found the example of the UNESCO World Heritage List useful. He suggested that the nomination process for a GIAHS site be placed under the leadership of FAO. Some countries may wish to establish their own Nationally Important Agricultural Heritage Systems (NIAHS) network, as has China. If some of these national sites were nominated for GIAHS, the partnership should create criteria so as to maintain a degree of consistency.

Mr King noted that intergovernmental bodies such as FAO, UNESCO, and ICCROM – though to a lesser extent – work through governments. However, he raised the question of how to work closely with people on the ground and to avoid a top-down process. GIAHS may not need to be quite as evaluative; a country's wish to join the partnership could be one of the main criteria. He suggested a more inclusive approach, starting with the communities and emphasized their ownership.

Prof. Pietro Laureano (Traditional Knowledge Research Center, IPOGEA) noted that the UNESCO convention has evolved over the last 40 years, and GIAHS could take the best of these developments. The UNESCO convention started with monuments and expanded to landscapes. UNESCO has considered a proposal for working on a new convention for landscapes. A proposal for transboundary sites, drawn from UNESCO, could be considered. He suggested extending the GIAHS concept to recognizing more general sites of interest. He stated knowledge is always spread from site-to-site, and this approach could help solve the problem of listing of sites or heritage sites from every designation category.

Prof. Mauro Agnoletti (University of Florence, Italy) shared his knowledge and experiences of Italy's Ministry of Culture, which is handling UNESCO designation and assessment. Sometimes the processes are being penetrated by political bodies and hence result in a more politically inclined selection process; not based on standard criteria.

Mr Farvar noted that the term 'agriculture' was often used in a broad sense, including livestock, fisheries and forestry, as in the case of GIAHS itself, or the FAO. The term 'farmers' is more restrictive, however. He suggested that GIAHS replace it with a more inclusive term, clearly indicating all actors engaged in GIAHS.

Ms Agüero highlighted that in the case of Chile, the GIAHS steering committee, and in a GIAHS site, all stakeholders sit at the same table: public and private sectors, farmers, fishers or forest users, producers, and entrepreneurial representatives. She stressed the importance of exchanging views and ideas from the different stakeholders and working towards a common objective and goal.

Session 2. GIAHS application procedures, approval and recognition

The Committee discussed existing procedures and viewed the management plan as more important than excellence of a site (functionality over aesthetics). It was emphasized that the focus should be on the role of the community in creation and maintenance/conservation of the landscape, securing the integrity of the site, and working to realize concrete benefits. The systems and procedures should be based on clear, transparent rules and remain lean and attractive, avoiding over-bureaucratization.

The Committee agreed that international frameworks are important. GIAHS should rely on an alliance of around 20 proactive nations to provide coverage in inter-governmental contexts. The Secretariat should identify a focal point in governments and maintain communication through them.

It was suggested that GIAHS should make strategic links to existing inter-governmental processes. This will open the way to providing a conceptual framework for moving from sectoral endeavours in conservation, poverty alleviation and equity to providing a coherent, integrative, and comprehensive platform.

The example of UNESCO/World Heritage Conservation was raised. Its World Heritage List is 'overrun by success' as it features nearly 1 000 sites worldwide. Its nomination, evaluation and approval process is intensive, expensive and time-consuming: covering thousands of pages, costing millions of dollars and taking years from application to approval. The system is even more complex for transboundary sites. In spite of these demanding procedures, countries see designation promotes economic benefits; they use it as a development tool, while other countries with many sites are over-nominating, with consequent risk of diminishing the significance of the designation.

The committee agreed that such a complex procedure is not the way for GIAHS, and that the main focus should be on the dynamic conservation of existing sites, rather than on additional designations. The goals of GIAHS designation should be considered, discussed and focussed upon: dynamic conservation of living, globally important agricultural heritage systems. Several questions were raised during the discussion such as: Should GIAHS sites necessarily have 'outstanding universal value'? Could certain everyday livelihood/landscape practices also be globally important? Should nationally important agricultural heritage systems be recognized within countries, as pilot tested in China?

The Committee stressed that the goal of dynamic conservation is served by initiatives or activities that reinforce pride in local communities; increase well-being or bring economic benefit to local communities; or open new pathways to sustainable development.

Session 3. GIAHS links and possible joint work with CBD, ITPGRFA, UNESCO and other international instruments

The meeting commenced with the Chair reviewing the options set out in his original 2005 GIAHS legal report. This led to a discussion of potential ways forward. Key points made by the speakers and the participants included:

- It was emphasised that the GIAHS initiative did not need an expensive instrument requiring large amounts of funding merely to remain in force. GIAHS should be involved in collaboration on traditional knowledge systems within a global framework and database (Laureano).
- GIAHS has a key role in working towards a global Landscape Convention and enhancing collaboration based on the Florence Declaration of September 2012 (Moore). Collaboration – including financing of projects – between CBD, ITPGRFA and GIAHS is not only essential but is demonstrably taking place on the ground, e.g. in Tunisia (Bhatti)
- A potential joint programme could be linked to the existing joint work programme between CBD and UNESCO on the linkages between biological and cultural diversity. It would be entirely feasible for the FAO (GIAHS) to be involved, since the initiative is in its early stages (Scott, Rössler). There is extensive scope for wider, joint ventures between GIAHS and international biodiversity- and cultural diversity-related conventions. As noted in the 2005 Legal Report, there is much scope for better collaboration and recognition on the ground where remits overlap, particularly in relation to the conservation of *in situ* heritage, landscape and bio- and agro-diversity. This was illustrated in relation to sites comprising oasis systems (GIAHS–UNESCO).
- The 2005 GIAHS legal report advocated a protocol under the CBD; this idea was put forward again as a concept ripe for dynamic development (Scott). It was also emphasised that the timing was ripe, given the international discussions concerning the legal enforceability of the CBD revised strategic plan and its 20 Aichi Targets. Such an idea would ultimately need to be driven by supportive Parties (to the CBD). Some of the ideas mentioned dealt in detail with protected areas, corridors, buffer zones; creating a global network of *in situ* protected sites; and securing clear collaboration with all relevant agencies.
- In terms of political will it was indicated that fulfilment of many of the CBD Aichi Targets is facilitated by the GIAHS concept, especially when executed in a joint venture by all relevant agencies. Since the 2010 targets had not been successful there was a strong, global volition to achieve the 2020 targets. Hence the idea of a protocol may have enhanced feasibility (Harrop).

Session 4. Strengthening the GIAHS Partnership and innovative alliances

This Committee session discussed the wide-ranging issues and questions that arise when the partnership is to be strengthened through alliances or links with diverse existing international instruments. The Committee questioned the need for the several conventions in force with their separate meetings and processes. The GIAHS Partnership could work towards an instrument – possibly a protocol – that could function as a platform among GIAHS and the other Conventions with compatible goals.

Mr John Scott raised the idea of a protocol for culture and nature with the objective of supporting GIAHS and the related Aichi Targets. It could revisit and reconcile existing protected areas; cover potential expansion of protected areas; identify and protect areas of significant *in situ* and on-farm conservation; and take into account biological and cultural areas of resilience and hotspots.

The Nagoya Protocol, for example, took six years but at least it has legally binding compliance articles that must be adhered to by Parties and stakeholders. In contrast, the legally binding articles of the CBD are relatively weak. The joint programme of work between the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (SCBD) and UNESCO on the links between biological and cultural diversity has already started and could expand to become a tripartite programme with GIAHS. The first step towards creating a protocol could be to put together a working group to develop a concept note and to bring on board supportive CBD Parties.

The committee discussed several questions raised by the Chair: a protocol for the CBD or several conventions? Is it legally possible? What can we do through a single instrument, implementing parts of different conventions? Could there be an umbrella protocol giving a single cover without entities having to merge?

Mr Scott suggested pushing the limitations of the international system to see if a protocol could come under several organizations. He then questioned why, in these days with modern technologies, the Secretariat would have to be in one place. This could reflect the desires of the member countries through better collaboration. Once 50 parties agree to a protocol it becomes legally binding under international law.

Mr Joseph King noted that protocols are attached to conventions. A stand-alone protocol not attached to any convention would itself be a convention. In reply, Mr Scott clarified that he referred to the need for the Secretariat to be in one place, rather than to severing links with conventions.

Ms Mechtild Rössler found the suggestion of a protocol going under many conventions interesting, and would be happy to give this question to UNESCO's lawyers. She noted that the 1972 Convention did not include protocols but CBD did.

Prof. Kathryn Moore noted that the mentioned conventions are lists; however, the suggested protocol or convention should not list or delineate territories but give leadership and guidance to communities on how to deal with their landscapes.

The Chair indicated the need for legal clarification of this innovative approach. If the terms protocol or convention cannot be used another term can be invented. The question is how to implement part of this convention through a single instrument. Should it be a merger? There may be difficulty in merging, especially in light of the different objectives. The idea of a coordinating mechanism, with a decentralized secretariat is also well liked. Should GIAHS start with an alliance of countries that like this idea or use another approach? Mr Scott raised the possibility of clustering common objectives rather than 'merging' them.

Prof. Kenichi Abe noted the philosophy of his Institute (the Research Institute for Humanity and Nature, RIHN), which holds that the roots of the current environmental problems reside in human culture; the concept of ‘futurability’ combines future with possibility (of survival for the human race). RIHN has already exchanged MOUs with several countries.

Reflecting on how to build partnerships, **Ms Kyra Busch**, working on the global programme of the Christensen foundation, mentioned some examples of projects – not just on one crop or one seed, but a whole culture. She cited some examples that link farmers from Ethiopia to Peru and their learning about the conservation and management of potato. This kind of exchange can help farmers think about how to deal with the threat of climate change – how to take traditional knowledge and disseminate it to new generations. Not only to conserve a specific crop but also to include a cultural approach. This is one way to work together in new alliances to safeguard these systems.

Mr Koohafkan noted that activities could become more systematic by following a global or regional plan of action. However, better coordination or a global framework would be required, which could be a protocol (soft law or hard law), or a binding instrument could be useful. In order to start the paperwork for this instrument, he discussed the need for a concept note with possible options and related pros and cons. He also indicated that one of the aims of the meeting was to look into resource mobilization, and asked the committee for ideas and advice on how to mobilize resources. Noting the excellent work of Prof. Harrop on legal instruments and recently on the Aichi Targets, Mr Koohafkan enquired whether it would it be possible for him to prepare a concept note for an GIAHS instrument.

Regarding the overall coordination of the GIAHS Partnership Initiative, it was decided by Partnership members that Mr Koohafkan will continue his function as GIAHS global coordinator after his retirement from FAO.

SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE SESSIONS

Session 1. Review of technical and methodological guidelines for assessing and monitoring Agricultural Heritage Systems

Prof. Min Qingwen reported on the application of the guidelines, finding that it is important to compare sites, e.g. the GIAHS rice-fish or rice-fish-duck system, with the rice monoculture system. Indexes for diversity and agrobiodiversity were used for ecosystem services, and there were some benefits from the traditional system. Economic measures are needed to explain to others, including scientists, what such benefits are; also the cultural aspects should be recorded. Economic aspects include niche markets, branding of produce, and attraction of local tourists to the agro-eco-cultural system.

Prof. Mauro Agnoletti outlined the institutional structure, strategies and policies for management of the rural, and particularly, historical rural landscapes of Italy. There was a policy of protecting biodiversity by promoting large unbroken areas of forest, often planted pine forest, with some unexpected results: erosion and mudslides increased dramatically under forest on abandoned, steep terraced agricultural land.

In 2012, the Ministry of Agriculture was placed in charge of policies for rural landscapes, and a law was enacted allowing removal of forest on abandoned agricultural land to restore historical landscapes. This was in response to decades of abandonment of agricultural land to neglect and natural re-growth of forest or conversion to planted pine forest at a rate of 100 000 ha/year.

Landscapes are mapped and characterized not only by their current state but also on how they have evolved over centuries, and more intensively, over decades. A historical index is assigned to landscapes: high for fine-grained, diverse landscapes maintained over long periods but that are now under threat and have a strongly reduced area. The main issue is the biodiversity of such landscapes evolved in close relation to people – a complex, small-scale, diverse landscape including forest used and managed by people.

Mr Abdelwahab Belloum expressed that conservation was only possible when a valorisation strategy had been adopted for production and an operational plan developed by local stakeholders. All countries have sites needing such protection and conservation processes. Funding for local GIAHS initiatives is stimulated by strong local interest and activity.

Mr Atef Dhahri illustrated this with the example of the Gafsa oasis, which has a three-tier agricultural system with 15 varieties of date palms in the top layer, more than 200 varieties of fruit trees in the second level and a ground layer of many kinds of vegetables. There are many problems, including with water. He mentioned that the GIAHS implementation in Tunisia is supported by the European Union for the GIAHS activities and to add value to oasis products, thereby helping to improve livelihoods of the oasis communities.

The Chair noted that creation of value was needed at many GIAHS sites. This is one way to motivate stakeholders by diversification of their income sources, and improving or linking

them to markets where they can obtain a good price for their products. As regards funding support to dynamic conservation activities, the recommendation is to use the GIAHS concept to bring catalytic resources for dynamic conservation activities. In the case of Tunisia, for example, the GIAHS concept of dynamic conservation of the Gafsa oasis agricultural heritage system, to save genetic resources for food and agriculture, facilitated access to benefits sharing funds through the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture.

Prof. Kenichi Abe introduced the RIHN and its philosophy, research domains, affiliations and international research sites; and discussed a site in East Timor – the poorest independent nation in the world – with a traditional forest-based coffee production system. He noted the importance of empowering such isolated small farming communities. East Timor is mountainous, deforested, with a strongly seasonal climate and difficult to manage chemically-rich soils. More than 40 percent of the people depend on traditional coffee cultivation with currently low yields and low quality. The coffee bushes grow up to 5 m high, supported by Albizzia shade trees, without fertilizer or pruning, and the forest-like environment is well conserved. With GIAHS support, it would be difficult to double yields but easy to double the produce price with better harvest and post-harvest practices. Producers could then be linked to consumers through branding, and smallholder farmers would gain greater confidence from adequate livelihoods.

The Chair noted that recognition is most important for smallholder farmers; and that contribution of the children to family labour, such as the coffee harvest (not full-time child labour), is important for inter-generation transmission of technical and cultural heritage.

In **the discussion** several questions and issues were raised, ranging well beyond the focus of the session.

In some countries, many bureaucratic layers hinder effective work with farmer communities. Linked bottom-up and top-down approaches are generally needed. Locally the GIAHS process would generally start by informing the community about its nature and possibilities. Once local people are well informed, the community itself should manage and control the process. Independent monitoring of the territory, however, including periodic mapping, should be considered. Involvement of the local authorities may be very important for budget and other support or monitoring.

The roles of the central government depend on the country. It should be involved at least with respect to policies and legislation. For example, in Japan government endorsement is needed for direct links between local authorities and FAO; in Italy, new legislation enabled the restoration of traditional agricultural landscapes from abandoned, currently forested land.

The broader dynamics of the territory should be examined together with the specific dynamics of the GIAHS, as well as the links between the GIAHS and existing national assessment frameworks.

A range of criteria should be developed, including social and economic. First, some of the active and potential GIAHS should be studied to identify and define criteria and metrics for features such as soil health, biodiversity of the agro-ecosystem (at landscape level, not just at species or genetic level), economic and social conditions, age structure, and derived from such findings for sustainability and resilience.

A key strength of GIAHS is that it includes all components of production, crops, pastures, livestock, fishing, forests and agroforests, which sustain rural communities in their landscapes over time. The criteria should be able to capture the range and interactions of the components. Ingenious traditional knowledge is most important, but mostly verbal; it should be recorded and valued – and its transmission to the younger generation may need to be stimulated.

The results of such multidisciplinary research – partly quantitative – will provide a foundation for discussions with policy-makers and their persuasion. Multiple criteria should be weighted on the basis of perceptions of local people: they have not only been the creators of their agricultural heritage systems, they also manage, sustain and depend on them. Other stakeholders or decision-makers may assign different weights to criteria, but will need to understand local community priorities if their actions or policies are to help communities sustain their GIAHS.

GIAHS is not, and probably cannot be, a strictly defined concept. A GIAHS should be compared with the possible or actual alternative systems in the environment to be able to judge its importance and ingenuity. However, reflection and consultation concerning GIAHS principles, their modification if any, and their adoption should have priority over accreditation. A key, defining feature of GIAHS is the systems perspective as opposed to purely historical, cultural, production, or economic approaches to landscapes and agricultural development.

Land use maps are needed as part of the characterization of a GIAHS, but their specifications may need to be as varied as the systems themselves (in the case of transhumant grazing systems, for example, even the boundaries of the system are flexible). Farmers' perceptions and land management often do not fit the 'standard' scales or map units produced by relevant government agencies. It was suggested that FAO develop general criteria (scale, legend, minimum mapping unit, etc.) for producing land use and other maps, to be tested for the relevance and practicality at GIAHS sites and evaluated by the scientific committee. FAO has a good base from which to lead in this area, with projects such as Land Degradation Assessment in Drylands (LADA) and the State of the World reports on land and water resources, agriculture, forests, fisheries, genetic resources, food and nutrition.

The present guidelines were considered too prescriptive; different methods and criteria will be needed in different countries and environments. A framework guideline, created as a work in progress, could guide national and local programmes and activities, with successful approaches and procedures in different cultural, political and agro-ecological environments described and added over time. In addition, it was suggested that the methodological framework should follow a standard process of GIAHS classification, which could entail the following workflow:

- set draft criteria for GIAHS;
- select indicators for the criteria;
- quantify the indicators in so far as feasible and practical;
- identify the ranges of the indicator values across the landscape, including non-GIAHS;
- classify GIAHS according to values;
- map the distribution of resultant GIAHS classifications.

This process may be iterative, with modification of criteria and indicators. The methodological framework should include research and capacity-building requirements as indicated by the meeting.

Session 2. Capacity-building, research and education and sustainability

In opening Session 2, **the Chair** welcomed the presentation of Mr Christopher Hill to give an overview and direction of the GIAHS Initiative as regards capacity-building, research and education and sustainability. For the information of participants, FAO has been in discussions with the University of Southampton about possible collaboration on the assessment and monitoring of the sustainability of GIAHS.

Mr Christopher Hill recalled the progress to date from characterization of GIAHS and criteria to global identification of GIAHS. A next step would be optimization of the role of GIAHS in sustainable agricultural production. This will involve inter-comparison of ‘twinned’ production systems on aspects such as land use and land cover, economy, biodiversity and environmental services between GIAHS and other agricultural systems in the landscape; quantification; and identifying opportunities for transfer of best practices. There is a continuum between fully traditional and modern intensive, often large-scale agricultural systems. Dynamic integrated modelling – taking into account factors such as the existing economic, policy and legislative environment, technical and financial infrastructure, climate change and their uncertainties – will be useful as a basis for scenario building and policy support, effective capacity-building and adaptive management. (Mr Christopher Hill’s Presentation)

Ms Kathryn Moore introduced the Landscapes for People, Food and Nature (LPFN) initiative, its goal, partners and collaborators, working programme and review structure, and the range of its multi-stakeholder landscape programmes and activities. Landscape is the relationship between people and the land and the evolving outcome of natural processes and human action. In the on-going process towards an international landscape convention, 12 countries signed national landscape conventions in Latin America; there are also developments elsewhere. Communities in many environments are rediscovering the nature and qualities of their landscapes, and are working to restore or maintain their landscape.

Mr Luigi Ponti discussed the need to assess GIAHS more quantitatively. To date, GIAHS assessment has been mainly descriptive; a more quantitative assessment is needed, in terms of agronomic, environmental and socio-economic characteristics and impacts of GIAHS, and of their resilience and sustainability in the light of climate change and economic scenarios. Assessing GIAHS is a far greater challenge than assessing conventional intensive farming systems because of the lack of standard definitions and global data. GIAHS are also more

complex and site-specific, and are more vulnerable to diverse threats. Ending his presentation, he suggested that a nested agro-ecosystem model integrated into a geographic information system could be an important tool for this purpose.

Mr Koji Nakamura discussed local human capacity-building for GIAHS, using the example of two sites on the Noto peninsula in Japan. In both GIAHS, population density is low and had declined by half over 50 years. The population is aging, 20- to 30-year-olds are virtually absent; they are moving to urban areas for economic reasons. Villages are becoming marginal or are collapsing. The landscape is constantly evolving and has been GIS mapped; drivers of change and responses to the changes are being studied.

The two heritage systems (agricultural and fishery) are of high historical and cultural value, so the GIAHS programme has been working to improve their sustainability through capacity-building of young leaders, multi-stakeholder meetings, branding of products, the landscape and the culture of the GIAHS. Boys and girls in urban areas and young staff of, *inter alia*, city governments have been trained in the Satoyama Meister Programme 2007–2012, with 62 graduates able to contribute to the two GIAHS in the peninsula. The training programme has been upgraded and is self-financed for the next three years.

During the multi-stakeholder meetings, which included farmers, farmer associations, university staff, ways to add value to the GIAHS system, its landscape and its products were explored. Branded products have found a target market, and publicity for the landscape and the interesting fishery and agricultural heritage systems has increased the influx of tourists into the peninsula. (Mr Koji Nakamura's presentation)

Mr Akira Nagata discussed the United Nations University (UNU)/Tokyo University research project 'Comprehensive Assessment of Agri-Cultural Systems', in which the UNU has cooperated with FAO since the beginning of GIAHS. He showed a comparison of the criteria for comprehensive assessment, applied for proposed Japanese GIAHS sites, with those used in other countries, and described two case study sites with important complex, biodiverse agricultural systems: one tea cultivation tightly linked to semi-natural grassland, the other grassland-based. The latter, is at risk because of a declining and aging farmer population. It is being maintained and is evolving with the considerable support of local volunteers and new ways of processing and marketing products from the Akaushi (red cattle landrace) reared on the grassland.

At the local level, proposed GIAHS are assisted to improve sustainability and resilience by promoting self-reliance and up-scaling without abundant financial support: good practice in developed countries such as Japan, where there is virtually no additional financial support for conservation of GIAHS.

Mr Nagata mentioned the establishment of a national GIAHS committee hosted by an appropriate ministry. The committee will prepare a list of candidate GIAHS sites, based on the systematic assessment of traditional agricultural systems in the country, and select and nominate good candidate sites. FAO will request the GIAHS Scientific Committee to evaluate the proposal after a field visit by a committee member. To add value to GIAHS recognition,

this procedure should be strict; too much flexibility would degrade its value. This concern is shared by China and Japan.

In **the discussion**, which ranged more widely than the session title, several points and suggestions were presented:

- Aging was recognized as an increasing problem for many GIAHS. Their resilience and sustainability will depend on retaining or bringing in young people. Analysis of cases with a dominantly young population, as in Africa and Latin America, is also needed to identify and resolve their very different problems, including funding.
- Globally, as wide a variation of systems as possible should be explored to build a solid base of specific information for on-going improvement of the methodological framework. Systems mentioned ranged from multi-tier oasis horticulture to transhumant grazing, from small-scale inshore marine fishing to terraced traditional rice cultivation, from tea cultivation linked with semi-natural grassland to extensive coffee harvesting in a forest-like environment.
- The evolving framework document should include a part on criteria and quantitative and qualitative indicators for the different aspects of the increasing range of systems studied. This should reveal constants across different GIAHS as well as specific differences across environments (including the social, cultural and biophysical). The diverse experience of monitoring and approaches and methods to support resilience and sustainability ('futurability') of different GIAHS should be similarly recorded. Such a process will enable GIAHS partners to maintain uniformity in estimation, classification and approach where feasible, and allow clear, well-documented differences in criteria, indicators and methods where justified and necessary.
- A holistic approach was considered difficult in practice because of the need to involve different actors and kinds of expertise. Proposed activities, locally or at national level, should be budgeted and linked with persons with the needed expertise; a research plan should include an implementation plan. Collaboration or joint work with other groups, agencies or institutions will open opportunities, for example in areas of interest to both.
- Research, local and at national level, would include items such as:
 - the relationship between the GIAHS and the non-GIAHS land use within the same landscape;
 - the long-term versus short-term tradeoffs between GIAHS and non-GIAHS systems for food security, biodiversity, water resource management, etc.;
 - development of a systems dynamics approach to the modelling of GIAHS;
 - framing GIAHS in the context of scenarios of climate change, economics, demographics, etc.;
 - benefit/cost analysis of adoption of GIAHS principles using approaches based on ecosystem services.
- Capacity-building will need to be based on gap analysis and skills audit of a cross-section of stakeholders, including communities and civil society, government and informal leaders and decision-makers. Capacity-building should be differentiated from training, since capacity-building entails a longer-term and deeper commitment with active participation in the programme. Building a community of users on the GIAHS website will facilitate knowledge exchange. GIAHS communities should be enabled to interact with decision-makers, for example through existing or newly created community-based organization, or an NGO or other representative.

Session 3. GIAHS branding and labelling

The Chair opened with the question of why farmers should join GIAHS; they would need good reasons, including economic.

Ms Teresa Agüero discussed the GIAHS trademark that will be established in Chile for all those products and services derived from the Chiloé Archipelago. The regulation for the use of the GIAHS trademark will establish the conditions and characteristics that should be followed in the production of GIAHS products and services based on a sustainable agriculture framework. This brand will be presented to the National Property Institute of Chile (INAPI) for its official recognition. The GIAHS trademark will improve the livelihood of producers and support rural development. There is much interest from farmers and entrepreneurs; farmers and extensionists are being trained to comply with this regulation. They have recognized the value added to products achieved through branding.

Prof. Min Qingwen summarized and explained the formal and detailed draft regulations prepared for the use of the GIAHS logo for consideration by the partnership. Their goal is to enhance livelihoods and development. Two classes of logo have been conceived: for products from sites fulfilling the criteria; and with less strict conditions, for products from the region of the sites. The question is whether there should be minimum principles for the logo. The label should clearly state what is to be protected, promoted and conserved. If the logo is to encourage a higher price, it should be uniform worldwide.

How far could use of the logo be extended: for example, could a hotel using GIAHS-certified products carry the logo? A product should not be certified in isolation – that might lead to monoculture of the product, reducing the very biodiversity that the logo should be protecting. Requirements for use of the logo should focus on the product as part of the agro-ecosystem and the landscape and function as an element in their protection. The site or landscape should be labelled, so both farmers and non-farmers contributing to its sustainability, such as tourism services, can benefit. A compliance procedure is needed, for example such as that drafted by China.

Mr Makoto Nagasawa noted the GIAHS brand is useful only in so far as the market accepts its value, and that broad certification was needed, at global (United Nations) level, rather than many different national certifications. He described a large (7 000 ha) biodiverse, complex multi-tier agroforestry system created and managed since the early twentieth century by Japanese immigrants in Brazil, in an area deforested well before their arrival. They restored a traditional system with all the physical, biological and landscape characteristics of a GIAHS, but lacking a very long history and with a non-native population. Strictly this could not be labelled as a heritage system – how many generations or years would have to pass before it would be one?

Mr Benoit Horemans outlined concrete GIAHS activities in the Gafsa oasis in Tunisia, which raised income through high-quality products, ripened and marketed just before their main season elsewhere. The strategy and operational plan with partners was financed by the

European Union. A major problem was the transmission of the traditional knowledge from parent to child because youth are not interested in agriculture. This was resolved by linking a youth employment programme with the GIAHS work.

Mr Luohui Liang highlighted the delicate balance between continuing traditional practices and adaptation to socio-economic change. Payment for environmental services, certification and branding of landscapes and their products, and integrating production, processing and marketing locally would all contribute to maintaining that balance and increasing resilience of the system.

General issues and concerns:

- Development of specific trademark certification criteria associated with goods and products in a country (e.g. Chile) should be associated with agro-ecological conditions. This helps foster compliance by farmers and enhances value, reducing migration and poverty. The certification must coincide with capacity-building of the farmers; often NGOs can mediate this process.
- The intellectual property rights should be with the communities or cooperatives (or local government); the benefits of the brand or trademark should flow to the producers, guardians of the heritage system.
- During the session it was agreed that use of logos, branding or labelling should be regulated at the national level, so as to prevent reduction of perceived value. This should be supported by a formalized application process. However, this process must be accessible at the local level, possibly through NGO support. The GIAHS partnership will need to develop international baseline principles of regulation.
- Some questions remained after the discussions: Should a GIAHS label substitute or complement current labels? Should socio-ecological landscape certification be considered, not just GIAHS certification? What is the role of the private sector? At which point can it be involved and to what extent? Should a new system that adopts traditional approaches be included in the GIAHS? Is GIAHS predominantly about heritage, location-, is it people-specific, or does it include transferred, newly applied traditional approaches (is GIAHS concept-specific)? Is the aim to propagate as well as dynamically conserve?
- Possible challenges to be addressed in active GIAHS include: Would enhanced success in GIAHS disadvantage non-GIAHS areas? Could GIAHS become too dominant in some regions through commercial processes? How can counterfeit or degradation of quality be controlled to provide volume? How can equitable distribution of benefits be ensured between farmers and the supply chain, which tends towards the supply chain with success and commercialization?

Session 4. GIAHS – payments for environmental services, links to agriculture and culture, tourism and sustainable development

Prof. Mauro Agnoletti described landscape and rural policies in Italy. The European Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) 2007–2013 recognizes the values of the rural landscape, including cultural identity, rural economy, environmental quality and quality of life. Conservation of landscape values is a strategic objective of the Italian rural policy, which defines strategies and actions to be financed in the framework of CAP. The Ministry of

Agriculture is in charge of policies for rural landscapes. Assessment of the strategies for landscape adopted by the Italian rural plans identified some inappropriate actions, such as promotion of forest plantation or re-growth on abandoned farms in historic agricultural landscapes. The recently enacted law for the restoration of historical rural landscapes has led to a change in the forest law to allow removal of forest re-growth in order to restore historical landscapes. The law has also created new incentives to solicit wider participation at the regional level. Through the law, the National Observatory of Rural Landscapes has been established to promote rural landscape conservation through measures such as definition, inventory and monitoring, and certification of rural landscapes, and formulation of a landscape prize and certification standard. Protection of historical landscape elements such as terraces, hedges, meadows, has been included in the cross-compliance of CAP to support protection of the rural landscape.

Mr Kazem Vafadari discussed opportunities and challenges for conservation of GIAHS landscapes in relation to tourism development. Tourism contributes to the rural economy through creation of new employment and revenue, and addition of value to local products; and can improve the quality of life and environment, e.g. through maintenance and extension of local infrastructure, including little-used rural houses, environmental and rural heritage conservation and education. Sustainable rural tourism requires economic and social advantages, limiting undesirable impacts on the local environment and balancing the needs of tourists with those of local people.

Tourist influx should be managed within the carrying capacity of sites, infrastructure and landscape to ensure sustainability. In the framework of sustainable rural livelihoods, tourism livelihood assets include natural, economic and institutional capital (participation in benefit-sharing and policy-making), human and social capital and attraction capital. Both institutional and attraction capitals are important for rural tourism development.

Mr Daniel Niles shared some thoughts about the values of rural landscapes. Current valuation of rural landscape is often narrow and inadequate. Comprehensive assessment of the rural landscape values, including a long-term perspective, is needed at local, national and global levels to promote widespread appreciation of the values of rural landscapes for humanity. Certification is a useful way to reward maintenance of a rural landscape, but complementary measures and activities are needed to support the full values of the rural landscape. For example, migration of the rural population to urban areas often leads to changes in lifestyle and health problems. The health value of the rural landscape is often ignored. A major challenge remains: how to take into account the full value of rural landscapes and increase the level of recognition, appreciation and respect.

Ms Liana John, focusing on tourism development and marketing, noted that the historic sustainability of a GIAHS does not ensure future sustainability. Tourism is one option for appreciation and support of GIAHS. Some GIAHS sites are remote or poorly accessible and short of facilities. For example, GIAHS sites in Peru are far away from the popular tourism site of Machu Picchu. Besides infrastructure improvement, capacity-building is necessary to enable farmers to operate and benefit from tourism. The potential of GIAHS sites for tourism development should be assessed. The benefits accrued from certification and marketing of GIAHS sites depend on heightened visibility of GIAHS. Lack of appreciation of some of the

GIAHS values, such as their history and unique character, could lead to the inadequate effect of marketing. A campaign to increase the visibility of GIAHS requires a cost-effective strategy – for example by prioritizing sites where there is already some tourism. The cases from China and Japan presented in this meeting demonstrate approaches to increasing GIAHS visibility at the national level through national media.

PLENARY SYNTHESIS AND CLOSING SESSION

Highlights from the Committee Sessions summarized in this report were presented at the final plenary .

In the discussion, the following points were noted:

- Not only farmers but also fisherfolk, forest users, pastoralists should be included in the description, public information and marketing of GIAHS sites. The terms traditional peoples and local communities, or rights holders, may serve in many cases.
- Ecolabels may need to be arranged in compliance with World Trade Organization (WTO) rules. There are many models and cases that can be reviewed and adopted as needed.
- GIAHS would benefit from cooperation not only with intergovernmental partners but also with international NGOs having similar goals.
- Special sites such as GIAHS can encourage national governments to develop policies for protection of larger, similar landscapes as well. A protocol within several related international instruments such as the CBD and Ramsar is a real possibility. A broad platform is needed, but with a light administrative system.

Ms dela Cruz presented the main conclusions from the Scientific Committee Sessions:

- The Initiative needs to enhance the existing guide, which should become the eventual framework for the dynamic conservation of agricultural heritage systems.
- There is a need for more quantitative assessment of GIAHS, valuing of their role and products, valuing the rural landscapes, and emphasizing the role of the landscape in providing ecosystem services.
- Support from the government is essential to enhance the Initiative.
- For GIAHS labelling and branding, five main issues were identified: i) definition of the label, for product or service, ii) use and application of the GIAHS brand, iii) establishment of a monitoring mechanism, iv) establishment of a universal or international trademark, and v) the need for a feasibility study.
- A key aspect to promote tourism at a national and local level is capacity-building of local communities and involved actors at the GIAHS sites.

Before closing the meeting Mr Koohafkan presented an overview of current issues and future activities:

- Both North-South and South-South cooperation are needed; many more countries than the original industrialized ones are now wealthy enough to assist their neighbours. Good examples are China and Japan. The example of China, which has established NIAHS beside a small, select number of International sites, can be emulated by many countries.
- Presentations during the meeting are on the GIAHS website; the conclusions of the scientific and steering committees need to be listed and integrated; the draft report will be circulated.

- In the future, the existing guidelines need to be enhanced to become more of a framework. GIAHS assessment should be more quantitative, including environmental services; monitoring should be systematic. Two major studies are ongoing, on resilience of systems at risk and on economic valuation of GIAHS.

In closing, Mr Koohafkan thanked all participants for their contributions to the meeting, which had proved a good opportunity for renewing partners' commitment after the considerable success of the GIAHS partnership over the last ten years, both nationally, in several countries, and internationally.

Annexes

Available on the GIAHS website

Meeting Agenda

List of Participants

Welcome and opening statement

Presentations screened during plenary and committee sessions

Background documents provided before the meeting