

# **Terminal Report**

## **Globally Important Ingenious Agricultural Heritage Systems (GIAHS)**

**Project number: GLO/02/G41/A/1G/**

**Project symbol: UNTS/GLO/001/GEF**

September 2003

**Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the United Nations  
Rome, Italy**

## Table of Contents

I. Project Rationale and Objectives .....	3
II. Project Objectives .....	3
III. The Purpose of PDF-Block A and the Planned Activities.....	4
IV. Summary of Activities Completed and Final Outcomes.....	4
1. Partnership Arrangement.....	4
2. Documentation of the Process and Criteria for Systems and Sites Identification .....	5
V. Total Budgetary Expenditures.....	6
VI. Summary and Recommendation .....	6
Annex 1. Template of Project Proposal.....	7
Annex 2. GIAHS Criteria for system and site selection.....	9
Annex 3. Summary of the Technical Workshop and International Meeting, 5-7 August.....	14

## I. Project Rationale and Objectives

In many countries specific agricultural systems and landscapes have been created, shaped and maintained by generations of farmers and herders based on diverse species and their interactions and using locally adapted, distinctive and often ingenious combinations of management practices and techniques. Building on dynamic local knowledge and experience, these ingenious agri-“cultural” systems reflect the evolution of humanity and its profound harmony with nature. They have resulted not only in outstanding aesthetic beauty, maintenance of globally significant agricultural biodiversity, resilient ecosystems and valuable cultural inheritance but, above all, in the sustained provision of multiple goods and services, food and livelihood security and quality of life. Such **agricultural and agro-silvo-pastoral systems** can be found, in particular, in highly populated regions or in areas where the population has, for various reasons, had to establish complex and innovative land-use/management practices e.g. due to geographic isolation, fragile ecosystems, political marginalisation, limited natural resources, and/or extreme climatic conditions. These systems reflect often rich and sometimes unique **agricultural biodiversity**, within and between species but also at ecosystem and landscape level.

Having been founded on ancient agricultural civilisations, certain of these systems are linked to important **centres of origin and diversity** of domesticated plant and animal species, the conservation of which is of great global value. The commonality among such systems includes: (a) the ecosystem resilience and robustness that has been developed and adapted to cope with change (human and physical) so as to ensure food and livelihood security and alleviate risk and (b) the human management strategies and processes that allow the maintenance of biodiversity and essential ecosystem services (water recharge and quality, nutrient recycling, soil conservation, pest control, etc.).

The wealth and breadth of accumulated **knowledge and experience** in the management and use of resources is globally significant resources that need to be preserved as well as allowed to evolve. These agricultural "landscapes" typically evolve in parallel with their associated “lifescapes”. They are characterised by **continuous technological and cultural innovations, as well as adjustment of management practices and uses** of resources and ecosystems, through their transfer between generations, exchanges with other communities and ecosystems and in response to natural events and to changing social, technological and political context.

## II. Project Objectives

*Objective 1:* Improving understanding of globally important ingenious agricultural heritage systems (GIAHS), of their diverse environmental, socio-economic and cultural attributes, their global importance and knowledge systems with regard to agricultural biodiversity as well as their landscape diversity, cultural and natural heritage, and dynamic evolution;

*Objective 2:* Generating increased recognition by multiple stakeholders of the global significance of these agricultural systems and their harvested and non-harvested biodiversity and thereby to leverage policy, institutional and financial support for their safeguard, sustainable evolution and, as appropriate, the replication of valuable attributes.

*Objective 3:* Building the capacity of national and local institutions and providing support to local communities and populations in selected, global priority sites, for the demonstration and development of strategies and management techniques and the creation of opportunities and

incentives to promote the preservation of such biodiverse land-livelihood systems. Such support efforts to promote their dynamic conservation and sustained viability would include:

- (a) the conservation and sustainable use and, where necessary, rehabilitation of their agricultural biodiversity and genetic patrimony, ecosystem services and landscape heterogeneity;
- (b) the safeguarding and recognition of the dynamism provided by the combination of local knowledge systems, cultural inheritance and social organisation;
- (c) mitigating threats of degradation and root causes of dysfunction and enhancing environmental and socioeconomic benefits at local and global levels and;
- (d) adding economic, environmental and cultural value to products, artefacts and knowledge systems of GIAHS through supportive policies and local area development strategies that provide incentives for their sustainability.

### **III. The Purpose of PDF-Block A and the Planned Activities**

The PDF A (Phase I) is a grant obtained from the Global Environment Facility (GEF) through United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), with co-financing support of FAO and other partners, aimed to facilitate the involvement of a range of stakeholders in the conceptual thinking and project development process, with a view to:

- (a) raising awareness and soliciting interest in GIAHS through mobilisation of global institutional support mechanism; and
- (b) developing a consensus among key partners on the project approach and process and identification of co-funding arrangements. The specific activities conducted include the following:
  - **Supporting the preparation and collection of case studies** for consideration during the First Stakeholders' Meeting and Workshop;
  - **Organisation of a Technical Workshop** with members of the scientific community, NGOs, representatives of indigenous groups/civil society, interested partners/donors and selected resource experts/country representatives familiar with potential sites/systems. The purpose of this workshop was: (i) discussed the criteria for site identification and evaluation and review existing case studies; (ii) definition of a participatory and transparent process for soliciting nominations or applications for candidate systems; (iii) build consensus on the project strategy, actions and time frame and (iv) developed an outline for the PDF B proposal and agreed on the process and schedule for elaboration of the PDF B proposal, including the selection of a PDF B drafting committee.
  - **Preparation of the PDF B proposal**

### **IV. Summary of Activities Completed and Final Outcomes**

The principal outputs of the PDF-A were as follows: (1) partnership arrangement; (2) documentation of the process and criteria for systems and sites' identification; and (3) PDF-B grant proposal.

#### **1. Partnership Arrangement**

*a) The International Steering Committee (ISC) was established, composed of:*

- FAO as Executing Agency
- National Focal Institutions as national counterpart agency and lead institution
- National GEF Operational Focal Points (of the pilot countries)
- Representatives from co-financing bodies
- Representatives from the UN Agencies and Research Academes

*b) Other International Partners Identified, including possible role, are as follows:*

- UNESCO to explore the establishment of a new category of World Heritage for agricultural heritage systems under the WHC, and for sharing methods, case studies and expertise with WHC and MAB
- UNDP as a strategic partner with linkages to governance and sustainable development issues
- IPGRI as co-conveyor of the Oasis Pilot System in Algeria, Tunisia and as technical advisor on *in situ* crop diversity
- The International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM), as technical advisor and to co-ordinate case studies on heritage landscape management;
- UNU/PLEC for providing technical advise, sharing methodologies relevant for conservation and adaptive management of biodiversity and agro-ecosystems , as well as case studies
- IFAD as donor
- The German Federal Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Consumer Protection (BMELV) as a donor
- UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues
- The Government of The Netherlands as a donor
- Wageningen International (WI): providing technical services through co-funding of the Government of the Netherlands on participatory processes in pilot systems
- The Roman Forum as a technical and strategic advisor on sustainable development issues

## **2. Documentation of the Process and Criteria for Systems and Sites Identification**

Information was collected and a preliminary review and assessment was prepared for major agro-ecosystems of the world. Material on candidate systems and sites was collected through a wide distribution of a call for nomination proposal of candidate systems (Annex 1 – template of proposal). And the *criteria for system and site selection* are presented in Annex 2.

A multi-stakeholder workshop was organised to elaborate the project concept and approach, build consensus, establish criteria for the selection of pilot systems and identify co-funding mechanisms. Through this workshop, an international multi-stakeholder Steering Committee was established (pls see Outcome a under Partnership Arrangement), which will be responsible for system selection and other major decisions on project development. Two background papers were prepared for the workshop by independent experts and a number of other papers were submitted by participating stakeholders.

The report of the Stakeholder Workshop can be found, as well as the background documents at: [ftp://ftp.fao.org/sd/SDA/GIAHS/workshopreport\\_final\\_uk.pdf](ftp://ftp.fao.org/sd/SDA/GIAHS/workshopreport_final_uk.pdf) (English) and [ftp://ftp.fao.org/sd/SDA/GIAHS/workshopreport\\_final\\_fr.pdf](ftp://ftp.fao.org/sd/SDA/GIAHS/workshopreport_final_fr.pdf) (French version). The summary of the workshop is attached as Annex 3.

A concept Paper for the PDF-B Project was developed and submitted to GEF through UNDP. GEF Council approved it on 16 May 2003. Additionally the PDF-B document containing the Full Scale Project Concept was developed and submitted to GEF through UNDP.

Information material was developed for various stakeholders. This included a flyer and a web-site and articles on other web-sites as well as presentations in and outside FAO of the project concept and strategy.

## V. Total Budgetary Expenditures

<b>Details of Activities</b>	<b>FAO</b>	<b>GEF</b>
Preparatory work - travel costs and daily subsistence allowances (2 resource speakers) - preparatory documentation and secretariat costs	4 000	
Country case studies - national institutes/consultants - FAO and other partners	2 500 5 000	8 600
Technical workshop (FAO-HQ, 20 participants, 4 days) - travel and DSA (9 resource speakers) - facilitator/resource person - background documentation	3 000 5 000	15 000
Additional "in-kind" costs - organisation of meeting/workshop (salary, communication, etc.) - use of meeting rooms, presentation equipment, refreshments - communication/Duplication of documents	2 500 2 000 1 000	
<b>Project support costs (6%)</b>		1 400
<b>TOTAL Budget</b>	<b>25 000</b>	<b>25 000</b>

## VI. Summary and Recommendation

*All the planned activities were carried out successfully.*

List of Documents:

- Project Concept Note
- PDF-B project document
- 2 background papers on GIAHS
- over 20 case studies
- a flyer
- a web-site

*Proceed to PDF-B implementation and further development of the Full Scale Project.*

## Annex 1. Template of Project Proposal

Format for Proposals of Candidate Systems  
For The  
Globally Important Agricultural Heritage Systems (GIAHS) Programme

### SUMMARY INFORMATION

a.	Country and location
b.	Project title / name of the system
c.	Requesting agency/Institution
d.	Governmental counterparts and other partners
e.	Summary (max. 200 words)

### DESCRIPTION OF THE SYSTEM

#### 1. Description of GIAHS

Describe the characteristics and functioning of the agricultural system. Include information on:

- Biodiversity and functioning of agro-ecosystem
- Landscape and land and water resource management characteristics
- Indigenous and Local knowledge systems
- Cultural and social aspects of agro-ecological management and conservation strategies (including values, practices and regulatory frameworks governing access to natural resources and other customary and/or formal institutions governing the management of the agro-ecosystem and its benefits).
- Overall ingenuity and remarkability of the human management and characteristics of the agro-ecosystem

#### 2. Goods and Services Provided by the System

Describe the important services and products provided by the system at local, national and global levels. Please pay attention to:

##### *Livelihood services*

- Food security
- Housing, fuel/energy, health and related needs provided for
- Other products and economic services
- Social and cultural services (equity, cohesion, security, ethics, identity, art, values, etc.)
- Quality of life (opportunities, leisure, education and arts)

##### *Environmental services*

- Biodiversity and ecosystem services (conservation, functioning and regulation)
- Soil and water conservation and restoration
- Climate regulation (micro and macro) and carbon sequestration

#### 3. Threats and Challenges

Identify and analyse threats and challenges to the continued existence of the systems and/or to its sustainability and viability. Identify and analyse the local, national and/or global nature of these threats, paying particular attention to occurrences and trends of economic, social, environmental or political nature. Illustrate the changes in the human and ecological dynamics of the system and their effects on ecosystem health, resource endowments and human well-being.

#### 4. Policy and Development Relevance

Describe possible lessons to be learned and benchmark management strategies and principle / practices provided by the system, which are relevant for formulating national and international policies for sustainable agricultural development, as well as their (potential) contribution of the to global concerns of food security and poverty alleviation, biodiversity conservation and climate adaptation.

#### 5. Global Importance

Summarise the outstanding features of the system in terms of their relevance to global concerns in agricultural development and ecosystems management and their cultural and heritage value.

#### 6. Outline of Proposed Activities (if and when selected)

One of the the major requirement of the GIAHS Programme would be a “pilot framework” for the conservation and sustainable management of the GIAHS and its enhanced viability and contribution to poverty alleviation and human well-being. These pilot frameworks would include a plan of activities to reach such goals, as well as a participatory framework for community driven, multi-stakeholder decision making and project management.

Please list:

- activities you would foresee to be included in such a pilot framework
- how these activities will respond to the threats as described under **3**.
- co-financing potential (possibility to attract donors)
- a baseline description of activities, policies and experiences, which are already ongoing in the area and that the project could build upon.
- institutional involvement and embeddedness (support and involvement of institutions that carry responsibility or are otherwise involved in the project area, both local, regional and national)
- participatory approach and community drivenness

#### SUGGESTED ANNEXES:

- maps
- lists of biodiversity species (table)
- description ecosystem interactions (human and bio-physical)
- listing of other resource endowments and goods and services provided by the system
- a schematic cross section/catena of the landscape indicating the biophysical elements/process/flows.
- historical and archaeological description of the system or site
- photos

## Annex 2. GIAHS Criteria for system and site selection

The criteria for system and/or site selection represented here are include two sets:

- 1) criteria for recognition of the system as a GIAHS on the basis of the inherent qualities of the system, and
- 2) criteria for inclusion in the GEF-PDF B and Full Scale Project, on the basis of the context of the system, the eligibility of the country and the content of the project proposal. During the GEF project development phase, internationally agreed selection criteria were further developed for the recognition of remarkable agricultural systems as GIAHS.

### Selection Criteria for Pilot Systems or Sites

#### *systems criteria:*

1. systems ingenuity and remarkability
2. outstanding characteristics
3. proved history of sustainability
4. global significance

#### *contextual criteria:*

5. representation
6. external threats
7. policy and development relevance

#### *project implementation criteria:*

8. project integration: country eligibility and country driven-ness
9. co-finance potential
10. project approach

### Indicators for validation of systems in light of the criteria and notes for interpretation and measurement

The indicators were developed at the Stakeholder workshop and International Steering Committee Meeting of August 2002, for the system/sites selection. During the PDF-B and Full Scale Project, these criteria will be furthered refined and additional indicators and targets will be developed for: 1) monitoring and evaluation of systems health, 2) project performance.

The indicators are grouped here under each criterion. Two of them are used under two criteria (**public goods**, under criteria 2 and 3, and **international conventions** under 7 and 9). One was not used (**on trans-boundary systems**, which the stakeholder report clearly indicates is not a criterion, but possibly a useful dimension for establishing a project funding strategy). Some criteria are proposed by the FAO project secretariat (in italics).

#### 1. Systems' ingenuity and remarkability

This criterion strictly applies to the agricultural systemic level. It brings together several indicators: adaptive capacity, resilience, functional complexity and others brought forward in the stakeholder workshop:

**Diversity and Complexity:** Possess *functional (for instance risk mitigating)*<sup>L</sup> biophysical and socio-cultural diversity and complexity.

**Systems Efficiency:** Contribute to systems efficiency, minimising negative and maximising positive externalities concerning ecosystem health in terms of actual or potential fluxes or flows in resources and information or knowledge over space and time

**Adaptive Capacity:** Possess system flexibility and resilience, and adaptive capacity to cope with changing environmental or socio-economic conditions, stresses or opportunities

**Integration:** Integrate of complex relationships and *positive connectivity* and linkages between the systems' parts.

**Ingenuity / Innovation:** Contain ingenious or innovative solutions or adaptations to critical biophysical and socio-cultural constraints

**Economic Viability and Sustainability:** Possess financial and economic viability, and sustainability over the long term

**Human Ecological Sustainability:** *Sustainability of human-environmental relations and trends in the long term, in the ecological and social sense (nutrient cycles, demography etc.).*

## 2. Outstanding characteristics

These characteristics can be used in determination/selection of priority site/s in a pilot system. These include five major groups of key resource endowments, goods and services and other features of the system:

**(1) biodiversity and ecosystem functioning,**

**(2) landscape and land and water resource management characteristics,**

**(3) food and livelihood security,**

**(4) social organisation and culture** (incl. customary institutions for agro-ecological management, normative arrangements for resource access and benefit sharing, value systems, rituals)

**(5) knowledge systems and farmers technologies.** (incl. technologies, associated value systems, knowledge transfer, language and oral traditions, arts, philosophy, cosmologies,)

Optional:

**(6) other goods and services generated by the system** (incl. ecosystems services, climate adaptation and other environmental benefits of global importance or specific features such as archeological/historic value or contribution to political stability)

For each element a range of sub-indicators will be developed. For instance, indicators can be developed for biodiversity on genetic, intra- and inter species, and endemic diversity, for inter-species dynamics, for ecosystem-diversity and integration, as well as for the taxonomic groups: plants, animal, microbial and ecosystem. Also, knowledge and cultural heritage endowments will be spelled out more concretely by creating specific categories, with indicators to match. The future development of detailed indicators is considered necessary on these characteristics. A proposed sixth category of the criterion has been added to allow for the description of specific additional benefits that may be of global importance.

Indicators for this criterion include:

**Food and Livelihood Security:** Contribute to food and livelihood security, especially in terms of risk-minimisation, among local communities on marginal lands, in remote locations and on the verge of poverty.

**Benefits Maximisation:** Maximise economic, social, livelihood and environmental benefits.

**Social Cohesion:** Promote social cohesion, solidarity and sense of belonging *and identity*.

**Resource endowments and knowledge systems:** Possess remarkable natural resource endowments (especially biodiversity) and intrinsic knowledge systems of global benefit.

**Social and Cultural Diversity:** Represent diverse social and cultural, institutional and economic approaches to management.

**Public Goods:** Provide global public goods and heritage which needed economic valuation

**Traditional Knowledge:** Maintain invaluable knowledge and technology about landscapes, genetic resources, human cultures, and social organisation and institutions

**Relation to the land:** *everyday as well as associative values of the landscape and agro-ecosystem for peoples collective and individual survival and livelihood, their identity and spiritual, religious, philosophical life and the artistic expressions thereof.*<sup>2</sup>

### 3. Proved history of sustainability

Criterion on demonstrated value of agricultural livelihood systems for humankind as a heritage handed down through generations.

**Economic Viability and Sustainability:** Possess financial and economic viability, and sustainability over the long term

**Adaptive Capacity:** Possess system flexibility and resilience, and adaptive capacity to cope with changing environmental or socio-economic conditions, stresses or opportunities

**Human Ecological Sustainability:** *Sustainability of human-environmental relations and trends in the long term, in the ecological and social sense (nutrient cycles, demography etc.).*

### 4. Global significance

This criterion is of great importance for eligibility for GEF funding (Incremental Value) and for the possibility of the creation of a separate category of UNESCO World (Outstanding Universal Value)

This criterion brings together the following indicators:

**Public Goods:** Provide global public goods and heritage which deserve economic valuation

**Value-added:** Attribute due value of global benefits through global heritage recognition, such as labelling, and World Heritage and Conservation classification.

### 5. Representation

This criterion includes the following elements:

- (1) ecosystems and eco-regions,
- (2) systemic,
- (3) scalar impacts,
- (4) geography,
- (5) demonstration value

Indicators include:

**Geography:** Be located within easy access in different continents, at least for learning and demonstration effects

**Eco-regions & Ecosystems:** Represent different major eco-regions and ecosystem types (mountains, tropics, dry lands, coastal zones, etc.)

**Systemic:** Represent major agricultural production systems (Livestock, Crops, Fish, Forest-based), ranging from sedentary (e.g. terraces, oases) to highly mobile systems (e.g. mobility of people and resource use in flood recession, transhumance, altitudinal migrations), used in eco-regions by large numbers of people

**Scalar Impacts:** Possess the potential of extensive impacts in terms of surface area and/or beneficiaries, for the replication or dissemination of experience and lessons learnt, the transfer of knowledge or technology, the learning of unique adaptations to specific constraints, and the contribution to diversity (worth preserving, value of uniqueness, global heritage for preservation, potential lessons for future)

**Demonstration Effect:** Demonstrate its conservation and heritage value to society as a whole

**Outstanding Examples:** Be outstanding examples of specific systems across agro-ecological zones (AEZ), biomes, mountain ranges, rangelands and water types, ranging from the sedentary (e.g. terraced farming) to the highly mobile (e.g. transhumance)

## 6. External threats

For the pilot systems it is required that they represent an array of typical threats or general global trends that induce rapid changes such as: environmental change, economic globalization, demographic change, blanket agricultural policies and technologies, legislation for access, use and benefit sharing of natural resources, etc.

Indicators include:

**External Threats:** Exhibit a range of different external threats (e.g. specialization, standardization, globalization, climate change, etc.) posing challenges for the design of viable alternative solutions, potentially transferable from other sites within eco-region

## 7. Policy and development relevance

This criterion encompasses mainly two dimensions: 1. Representativity of the problematics and of common issues of agricultural heritage systems that need a policy, legal or institutional solution, for instance, in the field of access to resources and legal pluralism and the protection of cultural property and local and indigenous knowledge and benefit sharing. 2. Sustainability benchmarks: Can the system provide benchmarks for the integrated and sustainable management of agricultural systems, for rural development and for *in-situ* conservation of agricultural biodiversity? Are they light houses of sustainable agriculture? Indicators to be developed.

## 8. Project integration: country eligibility ownership and country driven-ness (GEF and FAO criterion)

Indicators include:

**Project Integration:** Willingness of local and national institutions to host and integrate project

**Partnerships:** Enable formation of partnership arrangements and networks among multiple social actors, including stakeholders, through participatory processes

**International Conventions:** *Country ratification of the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the Convention to Combat Desertification (CCD) and the Framework Convention on Climate Change (FCCC), and the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources (ITPGR).*

## 9. Co-finance potential (GEF-criterion)

**Co-finance Potential:** Attract potential co-finance from multilateral (e.g. GEF), bilateral and national institutions

## 10. Project approach

This criterion has five main elements:

- (1) Potentially contribute to all project goals (recognition, conservation, and sustainable management),
- (2) eco-systems approach (reflect fully the GIAHS concept),
- (3) contribute to international conventions: CBD, CCD, FCCC, ITPGR,
- (4) build on existing initiatives, policies and experiences,
- (5) participatory management / sensitivity to indigenous and community issues.

Indicators include:

**International Conventions:** Contribute to the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the Convention to Combat Desertification (CCD) and the Framework Convention on Climate Change (FCCC), and the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources (ITPGR).

**Incremental Approach:** Build on existing agricultural policies and programmes in philosophy, especially in terms of participatory and ecosystem approaches

**Community Empowerment:** Empower local people or communities towards participatory involvement

**Respect:** Respect for *and sensitivity to individual and collective* human rights and rights over traditional knowledge of indigenous and local communities.

**Decentralisation:** Represent decentralised systems of functioning, decision-making and management

**Ecosystems Approach:** Promote an ecosystems approach to traditional agricultural systems management at appropriate scales

**Programmatic Approach:** Be developed through a programmatic approach, with Phase I developing and testing methods at a limited number of pilot sites, and Phase II building a world-wide consortium of globally-important ingenious agricultural heritage sites

**Value-added:** Add value for global benefits through global heritage recognition, such as labelling, and World Heritage and Conservation classification.

### **Annex 3. Summary of the Technical Workshop and International Meeting, 5-7 August 2002**

#### *Agenda of the Technical Workshop and Meeting*

- summary of project goals and objectives
- Discussion and agreement on a conceptual framework of GIAHS
- Exploring partnerships and institutional mechanisms for the GIAHS programme
- Identifying criteria for identification and selection of GIAHS
- Discuss aspects of a PDF-B strategy

#### *Highlights of the meeting*

The meeting was then informed about a number of land-use systems that appeared to have GIAHS characteristics, and about several approaches followed by other institutions that contained elements or had had experiences relevant to the present project.

Participants used each presentation as a basis for wide-ranging discussions on the concept of GIAHS, on their potential to survive in a rapidly changing global or local context and the threats to them arising from increasing population pressure or from competing, less diverse or less environmentally sound systems with higher immediate returns. The discussions also touched on various possible criteria that might be relevant to the selection of GIAHS from the multitude of land-use systems in existence.

One discussion period focused specifically on the conceptual aspects of GIAHS subsumed under each of the letters of its acronym: globally important; ingenious; etc.

The parallel working group sessions on the second afternoon focused on the systematic identification of criteria for the identification and selection of GIAHS. These are the subject of separate reports.

It is impossible to do justice to the rich and varied substance of the plenary discussions in the few minutes at our disposal, but it may be useful to present a brief abstract, listing some tentative conclusions drawn or interpreted from the discussions.

The concept of GIAHS is distinct from, and more complex than a heritage site or a protected landscape. As an attempt at description, without any pretence at definition:

A GIAHS is a living, evolving system of human communities in an intricate relationship with their territory, cultural or agricultural landscape or biophysical and wider social environment. The humans and their livelihood activities have continually adapted to the potentials of the environment and also shaped the landscape and the biological environment to different degrees. This has led to an accumulation of experience over generations, an increasing range and depth of their knowledge system and a complex and diverse range of livelihood activities, often closely integrated.

GIAHS have an array of value elements or benefits, both local and national or global, that is much wider than immediate economic return. Promoting knowledge and understanding of GIAHS and wide recognition of their benefits, particularly positive externalities, may be enough to help some of them survive. Other GIAHS may need more specific support, for example in branding and development of niche markets for certain produce, or through the creation of

institutions that enable payment to communities for environmental services that are by-products of their land-use system.

There are concrete, practical reasons for embarking on a GIAHS programme, and hence on the proposed project: the threat of *decline or disappearance of diversity* in flora, fauna, culture, knowledge systems, institutions, ... . Diversity is a survival factor at all scales, from household to global, in the face of uncertainties, economic or environmental changes, hazards, shocks or disasters. The several kinds of diversity cannot be safeguarded or preserved in isolation, as in an archive, gene bank or museum, but only within living, evolving livelihood systems.

While starting with sound concept formulation, characterisation and selection of GIAHS, the project and programme should be oriented toward action plans and concerted action by networks of local community, NGOs, governments and international partners to enhance the economic basis of GIAHS, their facility to adapt to new and rapid changes, and hence their chances of survival.

These are issues which arose more than once during the plenary discussions, and on which there appeared to be substantial consensus or a convergence of views. But the most important conclusion may be that the wealth of information and insights shared during the presentations and discussions of the first two days of this Workshop will be a major support to the building of the PDF-B and will improve and enrich the envisaged GIAHS project and programme.