UNEP

CBD

CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/RW-SU-Afr/1/2
22 January 2007

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

AFRICAN REGIONAL WORKSHOP ON SUSTAINABLE USE OF BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY
Nairobi, 12–15 December 2006

REPORT OF THE AFRICAN REGIONAL WORKSHOP ON SUSTAINABLE USE OF BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY, (FOCUS ON AGRICULTURAL BIODIVERSITY)

I. INTRODUCTION

1. In paragraph 5 of decision VII/12, on sustainable use, the Conference of the Parties (COP) to the Convention on Biological Diversity invited Parties, Governments, and relevant organizations to initiate a process for the implementation of the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines for the Sustainable Use of Biodiversity, and requested the Executive Secretary, *inter alia*, "to convene a series of technical experts workshops on ecosystem services assessment, financial costs and benefits associated with conservation of biodiversity, and sustainable use of biological resources".

2. In response to this request, the Executive Secretary organized a series of technical expert regional workshops with financial assistance from the Government of the Netherlands. The African Regional Workshop on Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity was the third such regional workshop, and was held in Nairobi, Kenya, from 12 to 15 December 2006. The African Regional Workshop is the third in a series following: the Latin American and Caribbean Workshop, held in Buenos Aires from 13 to 16 September 2005, and the Eastern European Workshop, held in Moscow from 30 May to 2 June 2005. Information on these two meetings can be accessed through the following links of the Secretariat's website:

http://www.biodiv.org/doc/meeting.aspx?mtg=RWSUCEE-01

http://www.biodiv.org/doc/meeting.aspx?mtg=RWSULAC-01

3. The African Regional Workshop placed a special focus on the applicability of the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines for the Sustainable Use of Biodiversity to agricultural biodiversity. Participants in the Workshop presented 19 case-studies on the sustainable use of biological resources in their countries. Case studies focused on: (i) best practices and lessons learned from the use of components of biological diversity; (ii) implementation of the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines for the Sustainable Use of Biodiversity; and (iii) in accordance with paragraph 5 of decision VII/12, lessons learned as regards ecosystem services assessment and the financial costs and benefits associated with the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity.

4. All presentations are posted on the Secretariat's website: http://www.biodiv.org/programmes/socio-eco/use/workshops.shtml

/…

5. Participants in the Workshop were selected from government-designated experts, based on their expertise and taking into account gender balance and geographical distribution. Experts from selected international and regional organizations were invited to participate in the Workshop as observers. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) was invited as a partner in the organisation of the Workshop in view of its key role on and support in the development and implementation of the programme of work on agricultural biodiversity. Bioversity International, the World Agroforestry Centre, the Tropical Soil Biology and Fertility Institute of the International Center for Tropical Agriculture (ICAT), and the International Federation of Agricultural Producers (IFAP) were invited to assist in the conduct of the workshop in view of their expertise on agricultural biodiversity.

6. The International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD) through its Reporting Services attended the Workshop and reported daily on its progress. The full IISD report, updates and pictures of the event can be found at: http://www.iisd.ca/africa/biodiv/arwsu/.

B. Attendance

7. The meeting was attended by:

(a) Thirteen government-nominated technical experts from the following African countries: Cameroon, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Ethiopia, Mali, Morocco, Niger, Seychelles, South Africa, Togo, Uganda, Zimbabwe;

(b) An additional twenty representatives of governments, United Nations specialized agencies, inter-governmental organizations, non-governmental organizations, indigenous and local community organizations, international research institutions, farmers' federations and pastoralist peoples' organizations acted as observers.

8. A full list of participants is attached as annex I.

ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

9. At the opening session, Mr. Oliver Hillel, welcomed participants on behalf of Mr. Ahmed Djoghlaf, Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity, and explained that the African Regional Workshop on Sustainable Use emanated from a decision of the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention, held in Kuala Lumpur in February 2004. Recalling that delegates at that meeting had adopted the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines for the Sustainable Use of Biodiversity (hereinafter the Addis Ababa Principles), he underscored the importance, for the purpose of this Workshop, of examining their applicability to agricultural biodiversity.

10. Mr. Castro Camarada, representative of the FAO in Kenya, highlighted the interest of FAO in sharing experiences with participants and developing guidance for the application of the Addis Ababa Principles to agricultural biodiversity. He noted the lead role played by FAO in the area of agricultural biodiversity, through its intergovernmental forums and technical support to member countries, in particular, through its Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture that came into force on 29 June 2004, and the Plant Protection Convention, whose secretariats were hosted by FAO. He highlighted the importance of biodiversity for ensuring food security, as reconfirmed in commitment No. 3 of the Rome Declaration on Food Security made at the World Food Summit held in Rome in 1996. FAO efforts included integrating agricultural biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into wider natural resources management, promoting assessment, adaptive management and capacity-building initiatives including effective community planning, and strategies for ecosystem management. More specifically, FAO provided technical and policy support for implementation and monitoring of the Global Plan of Action on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture and the Global Strategy on the Management of Farm Animal Genetic Resources. Those country driven intergovernmental processes were based on national assessments of the status and trends of plant and domestic animal diversity respectively and the resulting strategies and actions focus on conservation and sustainable use with a view to enhancing local, national and global food security and sustainable livelihoods. FAO also promoted the adoption of good

management practices through non-binding voluntary legal agreements such as codes of conduct and work in promoting Good Agriculture Practices, which addressed the full chain from producers to consumers. FAO promotes synergy with the desertification (UNCCD) and climate change conventions (UNFCCC) by integrating biodiversity and climate change mitigation issues into its projects and activities, *inter alia*, on land degradation assessment and sustainable land management. In Kenya, the FAO-Netherlands partnership programme was supporting mainstreaming of biodiversity in agricultural strategies and actions from local to national level.

11. Dr. Toby Hodgkin, Principal Scientist of Bioversity International, formerly the International Plant Genetic Resources Institute (IPGRI), noted that the organization had focused for some ten years on plant genetic resources conservation and hosted the system-wide genetic resources programme (SGRP) of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR). He informed participants of the Platform for Agrobiodiversity Research hosted by Bioversity International to identify and facilitate new and innovative research partnerships, improve the knowledge base and contribute to addressing current global challenges. The processes under the Convention on Biological Diversity were increasingly important to the work of the Consultative Group system. Moreover, the name change of the organization reflected the fact that activities on conservation of genetic resources were embedded in programmes that address the wider production systems and interactions. Highlighting the importance of applying the ecosystem approach and of exploring ways for using the Addis Ababa Principles in the agricultural field, he underscored the focus of the agricultural sector agenda on increasing productivity and realizing the needs of individuals towards achieving the Millennium Development Goals. He stressed the importance of ensuring the sustainable use of agricultural biodiversity through reaching out to both conservation and agricultural forums and incorporating poor farmers' and local communities' voices in international policy.

12. Dr. Brent Swallow, Principal Scientist of the World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF), emphasized that agricultural development and biodiversity conservation lay at a juncture between the three Rio conventions and required synergy in their implementation. ICRAF work on sustainable use was integrated in its programmes on trees and markets, land and people, and environmental services. There was a close relationship between agroforestry and biodiversity, including the potential of tree planting to reduce the pressure on areas of high conservation value while providing habitats for various components of biodiversity. Other aspects of the work of ICRAF included research on: how policy can shape farmers' incentives; appropriate policies that foster the sustainable use of agroforestry; and development of hard and soft law instruments, including co-management agreements and rewards for ecosystem services.

13. In introducing the representative of the International Federation of Agricultural Producers (IFAP) and highlighting its necessary role in the sustainable use of agricultural biodiversity, Mr. Hillel noted the imminent signature of a memorandum of cooperation between the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity and IFAP to facilitate collaboration with the main producers and users of biodiversity with a view to its sustainable use.

14. Mr. Leonard Nduati Kariuki, representative of the Kenyan branch of IFAP, noted that the organization represented farmers from over 100 countries. He stressed the challenge of reconciling conservation needs with agricultural biodiversity for livelihoods, food security and income and the constraints farmers face. Mr. Kariuki underlined that the cooperative arrangement between the Convention on Biological Diversity and IFAP would encourage political commitment to involve farmers in implementing policies relating to agricultural biodiversity through the development of incentive mechanisms and investments for sustainable agricultural practices. He said that biodiversity conservation efforts should be implemented "hand in hand" with farmers through poverty alleviation strategies and incentives, not through punitive actions. On biotechnology, he urged identification of appropriate technologies in partnership with farmers, government, scientists and technicians.

ITEM 2. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

2.1. Election of Chairperson

15. Participants elected Mr. Modibo Cissé, Ministry of Environment, Livestock and Fisheries of Mali, as Chair of the 1st plenary session of the workshop and subsequently elected Mr. Saidi Seddik, National Institute for Agricultural Research of Morocco, as Chair of the closing plenary session. Rapporteurs and chairs were designated for each Working Group as required.

2.2. Adoption of the agenda

16. Participants adopted the provisional Agenda (UNEP/CBD/RW-SU-Afr/1/1), as prepared by the Executive Secretary in line with paragraph 5 of decision VII/12 of the Conference of the Parties.

2.3. Organization of work

17. The Secretariat outlined the suggested objectives, expected outcomes and methodology for the workshop, and following the plenary presentations, proposed convening in informal working groups to review specific case study presentations and consider the application of the Addis Ababa Principles to the sustainable use of agricultural biodiversity. The proposed programme of work for the Workshop schedule annexed to the annotated agenda (UNEP/CBD/RW-SU-Afr/1/1/Add.1) was adopted.

ITEM 3. REVIEW OF THE ADDIS ABABA PRINCIPLES AND GUIDELINES FOR THE SUSTAINABLE USE OF BIODIVERSITY

and

ITEM 4. REVIEW OF KEY TERMS AND CONCEPTS USED IN THE ADDIS ABABA PRINCIPLES AND GUIDELINES FOR THE SUSTAINABLE USE OF BIODIVERSITY IN RELATION TO OTHER RELEVANT TOOLS AND INSTRUMENTS OF THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

18. Mr. Modibo Cissé chaired the plenary session presentations with support of the Convention Secretariat and considering the results of the Latin American and Caribbean Workshop. Welcoming the presence, as observer in the Workshop, of the liaison officer for the United Nations Environment Programme Division of Global Environment Facility Coordination (DGEF). The Chair noted that the Latin American and Caribbean Workshop had highlighted the need for guidance to facilitate the consideration of agricultural biodiversity by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and other donors.

19. The Secretariat then introduced several key concepts for consideration over the course of the Workshop, including, *inter alia*, “agricultural biodiversity”, “sustainable use”, “ecosystem services”, and “ecosystem approach”. The Secretariat noted they were based on definitions stemming from the Convention’s process and described the 14 Addis Ababa Principles, suggesting that participants base their reflections on the spirit and not only on the language of those definitions.

20. Mr. Seth Shames and Mr. David Kuria from Ecoagriculture Partners introduced the work of the organization on sustainable land management and agricultural biodiversity emphasizing links between agriculture and ecosystem services in promoting food security, and the need to minimize land degradation. Discussing the correlation between human population density and IUCN biodiversity hotspots, it was pointed out that farming also occurs in areas devoted to conservation. Ecoagriculture, as a conservation and rural development strategy, highlighted how agricultural landscapes could be managed to enhance rural livelihoods and sustainable agricultural production while conserving or restoring ecosystem services and biodiversity. The ecoagriculture approach was community-based and participatory, and integrated the management of protected areas, watersheds, degraded forests, and farms and plantations to accommodate livelihood options, species and habitat conservation needs and ecological processes.

21. Mr. Kuria outlined community activities carried out in the Kikuyu Escarpment Forest (Kenya), and highlighted the importance of forests regarding: supplying medicinal and wild fruit for communities; research and tourism activities; protection of catchment sites; and contribution to national economies. Noting the achievements made, he pointed to challenges still faced in the full accomplishment of the project, including the area's inaccessibility, inadequate community knowledge of conservation and farming techniques, limited technical capacity, and cultural barriers.

22. The presentation of Dr. Toby Hodgkin, Bioversity International, on on-farm crop biodiversity conservation, emphasized the need for biodiversity conservation to focus on agriculture as, in most parts of the world, biodiversity occurred on or near managed agricultural systems. Bioversity International's initiatives were funded through GEF projects and bilateral support. United Nations agencies, international development organizations, universities and private companies also provided targeted funding for specific projects. The organization collaborated with over 100 national partner institutions on research concerning home gardens, date palm, and the use of diversity for pest and disease management, amongst others. Bioversity International had identified a number of key issues to be addressed in considering agricultural biodiversity, including: the quantity and distribution of genetic diversity maintained by farmers over time and space; processes used to maintain on-farm genetic diversity; identifying the decision makers in relation to the maintenance of genetic diversity; and factors determining the maintenance of diversity by farmers. Research related to on-farm crop biodiversity conservation had highlighted: the relationship between production systems, the environment, and the maintenance of diversity; the need for participatory approaches to adequately describe the diversity existing in a system; the relevance of distinguishing between rare and common varieties in assessing diversity and arriving at value statements; the role of home gardens as repositories of genetic diversity; and the highly dynamic nature of traditional production systems. Those research findings should be used to provide options for mainstreaming and upscaling interventions while operationalizing the Addis Ababa Principles, emphasizing the importance of addressing country/global demands for dramatic production increases in a sustainable way.

23. In ensuing discussions, Mr. Terefe Belehu Mekonnen, Institute of Biological Conservation and Research of Ethiopia, urged the incorporation of ecosystems rehabilitation in the definition of sustainable use. He also noted the importance of proper incentives for farmers to cultivate wild species. He also highlighted the potential for developing synergies within landscape planning.

24. In the presentation by Mr. Jaco Venter, Western Cape Nature Conservation, South Africa, on a conservation partnership in the Greater Cederberg Biodiversity Corridor with a focus on the agro-industry for Rooibos tea (indigenous), Irish potatoes and wine, he noted the use of industry-based practices and land stewardship, and the need to streamline the advice provided to farmers by agricultural officers and conservation regulators to avoid inconsistencies. Through the initiative, a draft corridor map had been first designed for integrated management of the area for both conservation and agriculture activities, and next steps included: completing the planning phase with best practice guidelines; ensuring immediate and smooth transition from planning to implementation; addressing climate change and associated impacts; and using the retail industry and associated processes to inform consumer behaviour.

25. Mrs. Mermedah Moustache, Ministry of Agriculture and Marine Resources of the Seychelles, outlined the status of genetic resources and food crops introduced over the last 200 years and the challenges of maintaining *ex situ* field gene banks of orchard crops and root crops in the Seychelles. The *in situ* gene banks tended to be situated on the flatter coastal plateau characterized by sandy soil and risk of salinization. Moreover, in view of intensive competition for land and conversion of fields to residential areas, the Government of the Seychelles was promoting conservation by motivating home owners to establish gardens and vegetable patches using the slogan "every home a garden".

26. Ms. Sally Bunning, representing the FAO Interdepartmental Working Group on Biological Diversity in Food and Agriculture, referred to the FAO biodiversity website and made a number of key FAO documents available resulting from various intergovernmental processes including progress on the ongoing State of the World assessment of status and trends of domestic animal diversity, work of the

intergovernmental technical working group on plant genetic resources for food and agriculture, notably the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture that entered into force on 29 June 2004, on the implementation of the Global Plan of Action, as well as a fact sheet and poster on managing mountain biodiversity for better lives, noting that the previous day was the International Day of Mountains.

27. It was noted that agricultural biodiversity is cross-cutting in regard to the CBD programmes of work on Dry and sub-humid lands, Inland Waters' Biodiversity, Marine and Coastal Biodiversity and Forest Biodiversity. Attention was drawn to the range of case studies in the 2003 publication "Biodiversity and the ecosystem approach in agriculture, forestry and fisheries," that were presented at the Ninth Regular Session of the FAO Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (12-13 October 2002). Collaborative work of FAO, IPGRI, International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics (ICRISAT) and partner countries on crop-associated biodiversity was highlighted and two relevant publications were distributed to country delegations notably, the 2002 workshop proceedings "Beyond the gene horizon: Sustaining agricultural productivity and enhancing livelihoods through optimization of crop and crop-associated biodiversity with emphasis on semi-arid tropical agroecosystems" and a publication, edited by Melinda Smale, entitled "Valuing crop biodiversity: on-farm genetic resources and economic change".

28. The agreed CBD definition on the scope of agricultural biodiversity was recalled as including "all components of biodiversity relevant to food and agriculture, including the variety and variability of plants, animals and micro-organisms at genetic, species and ecosystem level, which are necessary to sustain key functions in the agro-ecosystem, its structures and processes in accordance with annex I of decision III/11." A wide range of local, national and international factors driving human management practices and decisions in the agricultural sector were also noted.

ITEM 5. APPLICATION OF THE ADDIS ABABA PRINCIPLES AND GUIDELINES FOR THE SUSTAINABLE USE OF BIODIVERSITY, IN PARTICULAR TO AGRICULTURAL BIODIVERSITY

and

ITEM 8. RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE APPLICATION OF THE ADDIS ABABA PRINCIPLES AND GUIDELINES FOR THE SUSTAINABLE USE OF BIODIVERSITY TO AGRICULTURAL BIODIVERSITY

29. Ms. Sally Bunning familiarized participants with the programme of work on agricultural biodiversity under the Convention on Biological Diversity and its four components on assessment, adaptive management, capacity building and mainstreaming, as adopted in decision V/5 of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention, and as a basis for the development of guidelines for the sustainable use of agricultural biodiversity. The support of the FAO-Netherlands Partnership Programme for mainstreaming agricultural biodiversity in Kenya was outlined as a model on how to achieve policy impact through interventions with stakeholders at all levels, from local communities to higher level training institutions. Awareness and capacities of local communities can be strengthened through farmer field school and community planning approaches, but requires improved understanding of, *inter alia*, market dynamics, cultural dimensions and the impacts of policies. Agricultural policies and strategies may be provoking loss of crop and livestock diversity through preferential support for commodity specialisation. For example, maize production replacing local varieties of millets, sorghums and other drought resistant crops in the semi-arid region of Mwingi has exacerbated crop failure during drought periods. In this regard, neglect and undervaluing of extensive pastoral systems, compared to Government favoured intensive livestock systems, was further discussed by participants.

30. Participants then met in three parallel working groups over one and a half days to review the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines and their application to agricultural biodiversity.

31. Working Group 1 was chaired by Mr. Francis Ogwal, National Environment Management Authority of Uganda and included participants from Kenya, Sudan, Ethiopia and Nigeria. Ms. Evelyn Mathias, observer, and Ms. Susan Odhuho, Indigenous Information Network, Kenya, acted as Rapporteurs.

32. Working Group 2 was chaired by Mr. Rueben Oyoo Mosi, University of Nairobi, Kenya, and included participants from Kenya, Egypt, Zimbabwe, South Africa and the Seychelles. Dr. Dagmar Mithöfer, African Insect Science for Food and Health of Kenya/ICIPE and Mr. Kudzai Kusena, National Gene Bank of Zimbabwe, acted as Rapporteurs.

33. Working Group 3 was chaired by Mr. Modibo Cissé, Ministry of the Environment of Mali, and included participants from Togo, Niger, Morocco, Cameroon, Mali and Niger. Ms. Hadyatou Dantesy-Barry, Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries of Togo, acted as rapporteur.

34. The working groups reported to the plenary, which raised further suggestions and inputs on the review of the Addis Ababa Principles for their application to agricultural biodiversity. Based on the background document prepared by the Secretariat on ecosystem services assessment and adaptive management (UNEP/CBD/RW-SU-Afr/1/INF/3), selected experts agreed to liaise in their countries and submit further comments and inputs on the application of the Addis Ababa Principles to agricultural biodiversity and to request the Secretariat to produce a final consolidated document for validation and adoption via e-mail in collaboration with the FAO, if possible, within two months.

ITEM 6. ECOSYSTEM SERVICES ASSESSMENT AND ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT

35. During the next plenary session three presentations were made on ecosystem services assessments.

36. The Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity briefly outlined the range of methodologies for carrying out ecosystem evaluation, including a review of the following concepts: market price, productivity, hedonic pricing and travel cost methods. The dangerous consequences of market failure and negative externalities were noted, highlighting the need to internalize costs that assess the values of ecosystem services. Also noted were the concepts of damage cost avoidance, contingent valuation, contingent choice, and benefit transfer methods. Attention was drawn to key references on ecosystem evaluation, such as the IUCN Guidelines for Protected Area Managers on the Economic Values of Protected Areas and the Ramsar Convention's Guide for Policy Makers and Planners on Economic Valuation.

37. Dr. Jeroen Huising, Tropical Soil and Fertility Institute of CIAT, presented the global GEF project on below-ground biodiversity and related ecosystem services, noting similarities between above ground agricultural biodiversity and below-ground biodiversity. Several issues were outlined relevant to ecosystem services assessment, including the relationship between below-ground organisms and the processes they drive within the ecosystem and the vulnerability of ecosystem goods and services to processes of change, referring to research on the influence of climatic changes, for example, on biotic and abiotic processes and their effects on food production. On adaptive management, he highlighted issues including: identifying the entry points for intervention, use of various tools and techniques; identifying indicators of performance across scales; developing mechanisms to address the specific geographical and socioeconomic context; enhancing food production in Africa through intensification utilizing appropriate pathways; using different scale levels and platforms for negotiating trade-offs; establishing guiding principles for adaptive management; and managing capacity building at the scientific, technical and political level.

38. Dr. Brent Swallow, ICRAF, stressed the importance of considering agroforestry as part of agricultural biodiversity in terms of the processes under the Convention on Biological Diversity. He said that agroforestry was defined as the deliberate management of trees on farms and agricultural landscapes, which was vital for carbon sequestration, watershed functioning, increasing yields, reducing soil erosion and run-off, and enhancing infiltration.

39. The example of the benefits of nitrogen fixing trees used as part of agricultural forestry systems in Zambia was discussed as being a positive case-study of soil fertility restoration and enhancement of below ground biodiversity. Several attributes of agricultural biodiversity were mentioned: reduction of native land pressure and improved fallows; intrinsic value of agricultural forestry systems and the economic potential of commercialization; and deliberate management of invasive tree species.

40. Dr. Swallow noted that despite its importance and value, agroforestry risked falling between—and hence being neglected by—both the agricultural biodiversity and forest biodiversity programmes.

ITEM 7. FINANCIAL COSTS AND BENEFITS ASSOCIATED WITH THE CONSERVATION AND SUSTAINABLE USE OF BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

41. In the closing plenary, Dr. Dagmar Mithöfer presented her work with the International Centre of Insect Physiology and Ecology (ICIPE) on financial costs and benefits associated with agricultural biodiversity through a case-study on the use of indigenous fruits in Zimbabwe and Malawi. She highlighted the importance of indigenous fruits in poor rural areas for income generation and complementing nutritional values. However, indigenous fruit resources were shifting from public open-access towards private ownership and use, and increasing competition over such fruit was resulting in unsustainable harvesting techniques. The market value of indigenous fruit had been increasing and consumers were willing to pay more than the current prices for obtaining such fruit. Summarizing a simulation model on fruit income distribution, she stressed that the lower the income, the greater was community dependence on indigenous fruit. Conclusions of the substantial research on this issue showed that: vulnerability to poverty was seasonal; poverty-reduction measures needed to target critical periods rather than annual income; indigenous fruit could reduce poverty vulnerability during critical periods; conservation of indigenous fruit and trees was useful to ensure food security; and elaborating market-based incentives for fruit and tree conservation was crucial.

42. In the ensuing discussion, the possibility of restoring the balance towards environmentally sustainable practices which have been lost by collapsing traditional systems was noted; the importance of creating markets for agricultural biodiversity was also highlighted by participants as well as the value of comparative case-study research. It was recommended that the Workshop should request the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity and FAO to develop an outline and make a call for a compilation of comparative case studies structured on a regional perspective and that both Secretariats compile a bibliography on the use of and reliance on agricultural biodiversity for food security and nutrition to make this information readily available.

43. Mr. Alfred Ilenre, Ethnic Minority and Indigenous Rights Organization of Africa, reflected on the communal nature of many trees and fruits in African communities, and Dr. Dagmar Mithöfer noted that, with the increasing commercialization of the fruit sector, it is often people outside the community that harvest these communal fruits. The Chair and others noted that the presentation had highlighted the seasonal nature and storage challenges of the fruit sector.

ITEM 9. ASSESSMENT OF THE WORKSHOP

44. At the end the final plenary, several representatives expressed satisfaction on the content, form and outcomes of the Workshop, while noting that four days was a limited time to address both the training objective of the Workshop as well as the production of suggestions on the application of the Addis Ababa Principles to agricultural biodiversity. Participants expressed their belief that, with due follow up by FAO and the Convention Secretariat on the review of recommendations made on the Addis Ababa Principles in their relation to agricultural biodiversity, major objectives of the workshop will have been accomplished.

ITEM 10. OTHER MATTERS

45. There were no other matters.

ITEM 11. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

46. Participants in the Workshop agreed to consider and approve the present report as well as its annexed elements following the closure of the meeting. The final report of the Workshop will serve as a contribution to the in-depth review of the agricultural biodiversity programme of work by SBSTTA at its thirteenth meeting, in February 2008.

47. Participants discussed and approved the Nairobi Statement and agreed to present and further summarise the workshop's output in the form of two distinct documents:

(a) Nairobi Statement on Sustainable Use of Agricultural Biodiversity, based on the presentations, discussions and statements from all participants (annex II);

(b) A consolidated document on the "Application of the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines for the Sustainable Use of Agricultural Biodiversity" to be prepared by the FAO and the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, based on inputs and issues raised from the presentations, plenary discussions and the working groups outputs. It was agreed that a first draft would be disseminated to all participants for feedback, inputs and validation approximately two months following the workshop, as a basis for a process of consultation for further development with all regions and a wider array of partners.

48. Participants recommended the organization, in 2007, of a global ad-hoc technical expert meeting, with due representation from all regions, partner organizations, and indigenous and local communities, to refine and develop further specification on the application of the Addis Ababa Principles to agricultural biodiversity and to develop a set of biodiversity targets specifically aimed at integrating associated specifications to agricultural biodiversity, preferably in the framework of the 2010 Biodiversity Target.

49. Participants thanked the IISD Reporting Services team for their assistance in disseminating the results of this workshop.

50. Ms. Susan Odhuho, Indigenous Information Network, on behalf of the indigenous people's and non-governmental organisations, presented observations and recommendations in a statement to be included in the workshop outputs that the participants requested the Secretariat to make available through its website. It was suggested that further development of guidance in the application of the Addis Ababa Principles should involve indigenous people and local communities and all key stakeholders. It was noted that indigenous peoples often do not have the skills and resources to follow the international processes and adequately implement the principles and need support to do so.

51. Jeroen Huising, Tropical Soil Biology and Fertility Institute/CIAT, on behalf of the participating international research organisations, CIAT, Bioversity International, ICRAF and ICIPE, welcomed the opportunity to be involved in implementation of the programmes of work on agricultural biodiversity and sustainable use since they have a strong presence in Africa and experience in other regions and could particularly contribute to assessment activities and monitoring and evaluation. The FAO and CBD Secretariats were requested to jointly clarify the next steps and to establish processes and seek financial support for follow up work programme activities.

52. Finally, the draft version of the "Nairobi Statement on Sustainable Use of Agriculture Biodiversity," summarizing the workshop's recommendations, and prepared as a draft by the representatives of the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity and FAO, was presented and discussed in depth. The Nairobi Statement was revised and completed with suggestions by participants and then adopted with the request that it be also made available in French.

ITEM 12. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

53. In the closing plenary, following the customary exchange of courtesies and expression of appreciation for the support provided by the United Nations Office in Nairobi (UNON) where the Workshop was held, the representative of the Convention Secretariat thanked participants for their contribution to a successful meeting. The Chair invited participants to apply the agreed Workshop

recommendations within their own spheres of influence and in the context of their projects and closed the meeting at 2.20 p.m. on Friday, 15 December 2006.

– – –

Annex I

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Government nominated technical experts

Country	Expert
Cameroon	Ms. Colette Edith Ekobo née Diengue Otti
Côte d'Ivoire	Mr. Koffi Edmond
Democratic Republic of the Congo	Mr. Mike Ipanga Mwaku
Egypt	Mr. Mohamed Mahmoud Essawy
Ethiopia	Dr. Terefe Belehu Mekonnen
Mali	Mr. Modibo Cissé
Morocco	Mr. Saidi Seddik
Niger	Mr. Hassane Saley
Seychelles	Mrs. Mermedah Moustache
South-Africa	Mr. Jaco Venter
Togo	Ms. Hadyatou Dantsey-Barry
Uganda	Mr. Francis Ogwal
Zimbabwe	Mr. Kudzai Kusena

Observers

Organization	Expert
African Science for Food and Health	Dr. Dagmar Mithoefer
Bioversity International	Mr. Toby Hodgkin
Ecoagriculture Partners	Mr. Seth Shames
Kenya Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) - Netherlands Partnership Programme	Mr. Michael Makokha Odera
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). Interdepartmental Working Group on Agricultural Biodiversity	Ms. Sally Bunning
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) Representative in Kenya	Mr. Castro Camarada
Indigenous Information Network	Ms. Susan Odhuho
Indigenous Information Network	Mr. John Parsitau
International Federation of Agricultural Producers, Kenyan Branch (IFAP)	Mr. Leonard Nduati Kariuki
International Alliance of Indigenous and Tribal Peoples of the Tropical Forests	Mr. Alfred Abora Ilenre

Organization	Expert
Kijabe Environment Volunteers (EcoAgriculture Partners)	Mr. David Kuria
National Genebank of Kenya	Mr. Zachary Muthamia
League for Pastoral Peoples and Endogenous Livestock Development (LPP)	Dr. Evelyn Mathias
Kenya Ministry of Environment and agrobiodiversity focal point	Mr. Patrick Okaka Ochieng
Tropical Soil and Fertility Institute (TSFI)	Mr. Jeroen Huising
United Nations Environment Programme, Global Environment Facility (UNEP/GEF)	Dr. Marieta Sakalian
University of Nairobi, Kenya	Mr. Rueben Oyoo Mosi
Western Cape Nature Conservation Board	Mr. Jaco Venter
World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF)	Mr. Jean-Marc Boffa
World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF)	Ms. Salla Rantala
World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF)	Dr. Brent Swallow

Secretariat Staff and Conference Services

Organization	Name
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (SCBD)	Mr. Oliver Hillel
International Institute for Sustainable Development Reporting Services (IISD)	Ms. Leonie Gordon
International Institute for Sustainable Development Reporting Services (IISD)	Ms. Asheline Appleton
International Institute for Sustainable Development Reporting Services (IISD)	Ms. Karen Alvarenga

Annex II

NAIROBI STATEMENT ON SUSTAINABLE USE OF AGRICULTURE BIODIVERSITY

The participants in the African Regional Workshop on Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity, held in Nairobi, and coming from 15 African countries (Cameroon, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Egypt, Kenya, Mali, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Seychelles, South Africa, Togo, Uganda, Zimbabwe) including 13 officially designated representatives of Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, and of various representatives of Governments, United Nations and specialized agencies, inter-governmental organizations, non-governmental organizations, indigenous and local community organizations, international research institutions, farmers federations and pastoralist people's organizations acting as observers.

Having consulted background documents provided by the organizing partners, including reports from previous and related events, and the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines on Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity adopted through decision VII/12 of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity,

Based on the presentations and case studies shared by the participants, as well as on the breakout and plenary discussions,

Agree on the following conclusions and recommendations:

1. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (SCBD) are invited to formulate a draft report of the Workshop output based on this provisional title "Application of the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines on Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity to the Sustainable Use of Agricultural Biodiversity", based on the results of the group and plenary discussions, to be circulated and validated by participants, as a contribution to the in-depth review of the Convention on Biological Diversity's agricultural biodiversity programme of work.

2. To follow up on the process initiated through expert regional workshops organized by the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, including the present African Regional Workshop, and in order to better contribute to the in-depth review of the Convention's programme of work on agricultural biodiversity by the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) at its thirteenth meeting, planned for February 2008 in Rome, participants recommend the organization, in 2007, of a global ad-hoc technical expert meeting, with due representation from all regions, relevant international organizations, and indigenous and local communities, to refine and further develop specification on the application of the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines on Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity as they apply to agricultural biodiversity and to develop a set of 2010 biodiversity targets specifically aimed at agricultural biodiversity.

3. In preparation for the proposed global expert meeting, Parties and relevant international organizations are encouraged to facilitate and finance national and sub-regional workshops to build on results of this workshop in further developing operational guidelines and mechanisms for the sustainable use of agricultural diversity.

4. The FAO and the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity are invited to develop a process of consultation with countries, regions and relevant international organisations with the view of preparing a consolidated working document as a basis for the global ad-hoc technical expert meeting, and to make it widely available before the meeting.

5. Agricultural biodiversity is recognized as a major and vital aspect of biodiversity, as the basis for food security and livelihoods worldwide. In considering how to ensure its sustainable use and conservation, due attention is needed to issues of monitoring and assessment, adaptive management, capacity building and mainstreaming, and to the application of the ecosystem approach, in line with the programme of work on agricultural biodiversity under the Convention on Biological Diversity and with work of the Convention on sustainable use. Emphasis is required on the interactions at all levels between

components of biodiversity and the functioning of agricultural ecosystems, with reference to both above- and below- ground biodiversity.

6. The wide range of ecosystem services that are provided by healthy agricultural ecosystems (including provisioning, regulating, supporting, cultural services and option values) and their contribution to risk alleviation, nutrition and food security, have to be incorporated into assessment and economic valuation processes. When making decisions towards the conservation and sustainable use of agricultural biodiversity, economic, social and cultural issues need to be taken into account. This is essential for an increased recognition of the benefits of agricultural biodiversity to national economies as well as to farmers, herders, other users of agricultural resources and to rural livelihoods in general.

7. In developing guidelines for the sustainable use of agricultural biodiversity, it is important to consider relevant existing international agreements, and to recognize the specific characteristics and nature of agricultural biodiversity and of associated ecosystems, including:

- Their importance for food security;
- The role played by human management to maintain and allow the continued evolution of agricultural biodiversity (especially by local communities and indigenous peoples);
- The relation between genetic resources, at both inter- and intra-species diversity, and the ecosystem;
- The influence of market forces.

8. The issue of rehabilitation of degraded genetic resources as a result of loss of species and habitats is not specifically covered in the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines on Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity. In this regard, guidelines for agricultural biodiversity need to address the need and opportunities for the rehabilitation of already degraded agricultural ecosystems and threatened genetic resources.

9. In implementing the guidelines, partnerships are essential, linking farmers, pastoralists and livestock managers with research institutions and service providers including extension processes supported by universities, government agencies, non-governmental organizations and the private sector.

10. Specific strategies need to be developed by Parties to protect agricultural biodiversity of particular importance for the rural poor, inter alia, indigenous crop and livestock genetic resources, indigenous trees and medicinal species, non-domesticated species collected and those used indirectly in agricultural systems, associated species important for ecosystem functions.

11. There is a need for capacity-building and technical and financial support for promoting the conservation and sustainable use of agricultural biodiversity. In particular training and expertise is needed for the use of assessment and monitoring tools, geo-referencing and spatial monitoring tools, as well as economic valuation tools.

12. Given the trend towards decentralized planning and resource allocation at the level of local authorities, such capacity-building should integrate agricultural biodiversity into education materials and implementation tools and mechanisms for grassroots communities, farmers, herders, other users of agricultural biodiversity resources, as well as government decision makers. This should integrate agricultural biodiversity into wider natural resources management approaches and strategies, including coping with drought and conflict-resolution strategies, for community territories, watersheds and landscapes. Available technology to display geographically referenced information on agricultural biodiversity is an important tool for land-use planning and resources management at all scales.

13. National Governments should consider and/or expand policy tools and instruments to enhance and support land stewardship and best management practices for national agricultural biodiversity initiatives. This should be backed up by applied research using participatory processes, with a focus on adaptive management and technology transfer. Also essential are stakeholder involvement, setting and monitoring targets for agricultural biodiversity, and public awareness campaigns.

14. Due attention needs to be given to developing required mechanisms for information sharing and monitoring at all levels, to ensure that progress is made towards defined national and international targets such as the 2010 biodiversity target and the Millennium Development Goals, especially those relating to poverty alleviation and food security.

15. Joint strategies and improved coordination between concerned institutions and actors need to be developed to bridge environmental, social and agricultural plans, policies and practices addressing agricultural biodiversity, and to solve conflicts between conservation, food security, poverty alleviation and commercial agriculture interests at various levels. Many of those strategies require international cooperation and cross-border resource management mechanisms.

16. Pastoralism is recognized as an important - and often optimal - land use strategy in the sustainable use of agricultural biodiversity, especially for fragile dryland environments. Governments often support industrial livestock production preferentially, as pastoralists may not be perceived as contributing directly to gross national product (GNP) and the value of such livelihood strategies and the ecosystem services they provide are undervalued. There is a need for transboundary collaboration for livestock movements and grazing, including long term drought management and breed conservation strategies as well as pest and disease management and control. Pastoralists need clear mechanisms to influence international and national negotiations and decision-making processes, and specific resources such as mobile education and health services.

17. Indigenous peoples and local communities have valuable experiences and skills in ecosystem management respectful of agricultural biodiversity, but their inclusion as active stakeholders in national and international negotiations is not adequate. They do not necessarily have the skills and resources to follow international processes. Negotiations and documents should avoid unnecessarily technical jargon and facilitate understanding and involvement by all stakeholder groups. The Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, FAO, relevant international organizations and Governments are encouraged to provide mechanisms and resources for indigenous peoples, pastoralists and local communities to participate at all levels in the agricultural biodiversity programme of work as partners to the Convention, including in monitoring and evaluation processes to ensure implementation and updating of action plans.

18. In order to effectively implement the results and recommendations on the application of the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines on Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity for the sustainable use of agricultural biodiversity, it is essential to involve all concerned stakeholders, farmers' organizations, indigenous and local communities, pastoralists and NGOs, the various Ministries and research institutions responsible for agriculture, livestock and the environment, Convention on Biological Diversity and FAO focal points, and others as appropriate.

19. Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity and member countries of FAO are encouraged to develop, implement and report on their strategies and actions on agricultural biodiversity in their national biodiversity strategy and action plans and national reports. Moreover, national focal points to the Convention should ensure that mechanisms are established to bring together the various sectoral policy makers to address agricultural biodiversity, for example, through the establishment of a national multi-sectoral agricultural biodiversity committee and operational networks.
