



CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/11/INF/21
14 November 2005

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH AND
SPANISH

SUBSIDIARY BODY ON SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVICE

Eleventh meeting

Montreal, 28 November–2 December 2005

Item 6.5 of the provisional agenda*

REPORT OF THE LATIN AMERICAN AND CARIBBEAN REGIONAL EXPERT WORKSHOP ON SUSTAINABLE USE OF BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

I. INTRODUCTION

A. *Background*

1. In decision VII/12, the Conference of the Parties 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 paragraph 3, decision VII/12 also requested the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice to explore the applicability of these principles and guidelines to agricultural biodiversity, in particular domesticated species, breeds and varieties, and make appropriate recommendations.
3. The Latin American and Caribbean Regional Expert Workshop on the Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity was the second regional workshop organized, with financial assistance from the Government of the Netherlands, in response to this request. The workshop took place in Buenos Aires, at the kind invitation of the Government of the Republic of Argentina, from 13 to 16 September 2005.
4. In accordance with the request in decision VII/12, the workshop focused on ecosystem services assessment, financial costs and benefits associated with conservation of biodiversity, and sustainable use of biological resources. In order to assist the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice in the development of recommendations on agricultural biodiversity as requested in paragraph 3 of decision VII/12, the workshop also focused on, but was not limited to, agricultural biodiversity. It provided a forum for government officials and practitioners to enhance their awareness and understanding of the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines for the Sustainable Use of Biodiversity and promote the use of these guidelines in an integrated manner, as a contribution to facilitating the achievement of the 2010 target, sustainable development and poverty alleviation.

* UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/11/1.

5. Participants in the Workshop were invited to present case-studies on the sustainable use of biological resources in their home countries. Guidelines for the preparation of case-studies were provided to participants in advance of the Workshop. The case-studies were selected to cover a broad spectrum of resource uses and regional or local conditions, with focus on, as appropriate: (i) best practices and lessons learned from the use of biological diversity; (ii) implementation of the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines for the Sustainable Use of Biodiversity; (iii) lessons learned as regards to ecosystem services assessment; and (iv) lessons learned as regards to financial costs and benefits associated with the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity.

6. In order to prepare adequately for the regional workshop, a training manual on the Sustaining Uses of Biological Diversity was prepared by IUCN in coordination with the Secretariat and distributed to participants at the venue of the workshop. In addition, a provisional list of the documents for the Workshop was also provided in annex I of document UNEP/CBD/RWSU-LAC/1/Add.1.

B. Attendance

7. The meeting was attended by:

(a) Twenty-one government-nominated technical experts from the following countries: Argentina, Bahamas, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, México, Panama, Peru, and Saint Lucia.

(b) Thirteen representatives of organizations and institutions acting as observers.

8. A list of participants is attached as annex II.

ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

9. The meeting was opened by the representative of the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, Mr. Markus Lehmann, at 9.45 a.m., on Tuesday, 13 September 2005. He welcomed participants and briefly recalled the process that led to the meeting. He conveyed his gratitude to the Government of Argentina for hosting the meeting, and to the Government of the Netherlands for financial support. He then welcomed the representatives of the Government of Argentina: Mr. Miguel Campos, Secretary of State for Agriculture, Livestock and Food of the Ministry of Economy; Mr. Homero Bibiloni, Sub-secretary of State for Natural Resources, Ministry of Health; and Ms. Maria Esther Bondanza, Ambassador and Director General for Environmental Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs. He also welcomed Mr. Carlos Cheppi, President of the *Instituto Nacional de Tecnologia Agropecuaria* (INTA), as the representative of the institutional host. He then gave the floor to the representatives of the Government of Argentina and of INTA for opening remarks.

10. In her statement, Ms. Bondanza welcomed participants to Buenos Aires. She recalled the process that led to the adoption of the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines, underlining that they were developed in a highly collaborative manner, and welcomed the adoption of the Principles and Guidelines. She welcomed the regional workshop and said that its focus on agricultural biodiversity was important for Argentina because of the significant role of agriculture in the Argentinean economy. She expressed the hope that the meeting would contribute to the implementation of the Convention as well as assist in other pertinent processes under the Convention, such as on protected areas and on access and benefit sharing.

11. In his statement, Mr. Cheppi welcomed participants to INTA and underlined that the sustainable use of biodiversity is an important topic given the key role of biodiversity in the provision of food and of numerous other ecosystem services. He explained that INTA, as an institution engaged in research and development of agricultural technology, views biodiversity as an integral part of productive ecosystems and assigns, in its strategic plan, high priority to further work on this topic. He expressed the hope that the workshop would provide an important opportunity for deepening cooperation on sustainable use at the international level, and wished participants a productive week and a pleasant stay in Buenos Aires.

12. In his statement, Mr. Campos thanked the organizers of this workshop and underlined the importance of the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines for achieving sustainable development. He

highlighted the challenges faced by developing countries in achieving sustainable development that result from the international trading system, such as the distortionary trade practices by many developed countries. He said that new international rules and guidelines should not contribute to erect further barriers to international trade, and invited participants to the workshop to address the role of the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines in achieving economic and social development in developing countries.

13. In his statement, Mr. Bibiloni, on behalf of the Secretary of State for the Environment and Sustainable Development, Mr. Atilio Savino, welcomed participants to Buenos Aires. He highlighted the importance of this workshop for Argentina in light of the key role of biodiversity in agriculture, which is a major economic sector in the country. He said that the fact that the workshop was organized in conjunction with the Secretariat of Agriculture and INTA sent a strong message that the government of Argentina is willing to work in an integrated, intersectoral fashion on matters related to biodiversity. He expressed his confidence that the workshop would prove to provide a forum for useful discussions, and would also initiate a process of work towards implementing the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines in the region.

14. Following the opening remarks, the representative of the Secretariat introduced the facilitator of the workshop, Mr. Stephen Edwards, IUCN. He also welcomed the local organizers of the workshop, Ms. Maria Elena Zaccagnini (INTA and IUCN Sustainable Use Specialist Group), Ms. Victoria Lichtschein (Secretariat for the Environment and Sustainable Development), and Mr. Jose Luis Panigatti (INTA), and explained that they would contribute to facilitating the meeting.

15. Upon invitation by the facilitator, participants introduced themselves and briefly explained their expectations for the Workshop.

ITEM 2. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

2.1. Adoption of the agenda

16. The representative of the Secretariat referred to the provisional agenda (UNEP/CBD/RWSU-LAC/1/1) and explained that it reflected the mandate of the Workshop as provided in decision VII/12 of the Conference of the Parties. He provided a summary of that mandate and also referred to the documents provided by the Secretariat to facilitate the work of the Group.

17. The Workshop adopted the following agenda on the basis of the provisional agenda (UNEP/CBD/RWSU-LAC/1/1):

1. Opening of the meeting.
2. Organizational matters:
 - 2.1. Adoption of the agenda;
 - 2.2. Organization of work.
3. Review of key terms and concepts used in the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines and other relevant tools and instruments of the Convention on Biological Diversity.
4. Review of the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines for the Sustainable Use of Biodiversity.
5. Application of the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines for the Sustainable Use of Biodiversity, in particular to agricultural biodiversity.
6. Ecosystem services assessment.
7. Financial costs and benefits associated with the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity.
8. Assessment of the Workshop.
9. Other matters.

10. Adoption of the report.

11. Closure of the meeting.

2.2. Organization of work

18. The representative of the Secretariat explained the suggested timetable for the Workshop as provided in annex II of the annotated provisional agenda (UNEP/CBD/RWSU-LAC/1/Add.1). He also explained that the case-studies provided by participants would be allocated to items 4 to 7 of the agenda and would be used as input for the discussions of the items under consideration.

19. Participants decided to adopt the suggested timetable for the workshop, indicating the allocation of time for each agenda item, contained in annex II of the annotated provisional agenda

ITEM 3. REVIEW OF KEY TERMS AND CONCEPTS USED IN THE ADDIS ABABA PRINCIPLES AND GUIDELINES FOR THE SUSTAINABLE USE OF BIODIVERSITY AND OTHER TOOLS AND INSTRUMENTS RELEVANT TO THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

20. Based on a presentation by the facilitator, participants reviewed a number of key terms and concepts to ensure that they are communicating effectively. The following terms and concepts were briefly reviewed and discussed: biological diversity, biological resources, sustainable use, use, sustainability, factors affecting sustainable use, ecosystem, ecosystem services, adaptive management, use regime, resource manager.

21. Based on a presentation by the representative of the Secretariat, participants also reviewed a number of other relevant tools and instruments that were developed under the Convention and provide further guidance in the implementation of the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines. The following tools and instruments were briefly reviewed:

- (a) The ecosystem approach;
- (b) The target of Parties to the Convention to achieve by 2010 a substantial reduction the current rate of biodiversity loss at the global, regional and local level (“the 2010 target”);
- (c) The programme of work on incentive measures adopted by decision V/15 of the Conference of the Parties and the recent activities under this programme of work;
- (d) The Proposals for Design and Implementation of Incentive Measures endorsed by the Conference of the Parties in its decision VI/15;
- (e) The Akwé: Kon Voluntary Guidelines for the Conduct of Cultural, Environment and Social Impact Assessment regarding Developments Proposed to Take Place on or which are likely to Impact on, Sacred Sites and on Lands and Waters Traditionally Occupied or Used by Indigenous and Local Communities, adopted by the Conference of the Parties in its decision VI/16;
- (f) The Guidelines on Biodiversity and Tourism Development adopted by the Conference of the Parties in its decision VII/14.

22. Under this agenda item, statements were made by experts from the following countries: Argentina, Bolivia, and Brazil.

ITEM 4. REVIEW OF THE ADDIS ABABA PRINCIPLES AND GUIDELINES FOR THE SUSTAINABLE USE OF BIODIVERSITY

23. Introducing the item, the facilitator explained that three case-studies would be presented by experts from Argentina and Peru with a view to provide practical background information for an initial discussion of the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines.

24. Ms. Julieta von Thungen from INTA EEA Bariloche, Argentina, addressed the sustainable use of guanacos in mixed production systems in the Patagonian steppe. She explained that increased

desertification in Patagonia made preservation of this CITES-listed species a particular challenge, and that guanacos are so far not officially used. The preservation programmes supported by INTA foresees the use of guanacos as a means to diversify of production and sources of income for small and mid-size and farmers, through the production of high-quality fibre and meat as well as through tourism.

25. Mr. Ricardo Banchs, Secretariat of Environment and Sustainable Development, Argentina, presented on the sustainable use of talking parrots in Argentina. He explained that the exportation of living birds, and of talking parrots in particular, is of major commercial importance, with almost 50000 specimens exported per annum. The lack of regulation in the 1980s led to severe management deficiencies and to the endangerment of the species. After an experimental phase, a formal management plan was established in the mid-1990s, which, *inter alia*, involves the establishment of protected areas and a fund for parrot management and preservation, both funded by parrot sales. He also pointed to existing difficulties and limitations, including a lack of understanding for the viability of sustaining uses, rooted in a certain preservationist mood, as well as the fact that breeding of parrots in captivity competes with the sustainable use of populations in the wild.

26. The expert from Peru, Ms. Maria Gloria Quispe Quispe, presented a study of management challenges and opportunities for *in situ* conservation of amaranth in the western Andes. She explained that, while amaranth is a major traditional food crop in the Andes with widespread commercialization of some varieties, other varieties are presently under-utilized. This lack of exploitation is a threat to the preservation of these non-commercial varieties. Guided by the ecosystem approach, current initiatives seek to encourage the use of these varieties by providing various incentives for their ongoing use.

27. In the initial discussion of these presentations, statements were made by experts from the following countries: Argentina, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Mexico.

28. Based on a presentation by the facilitator and the representative of the Secretariat, which build on the points made in the initial discussion, the fourteen Addis Ababa Principles for the Sustainable Use of Biodiversity, as well as their rationale and operational guidance, were reviewed by participants.

29. In the discussions under this item, statements were made by experts from the following countries: Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Mexico, Peru, Saint Lucia.

30. Interventions were also made by several observers from INTA.

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

31. Under this agenda item, experts explored the applicability of the Addis Ababa Guidelines in concrete biodiversity management problems, giving particular focus to agricultural biodiversity. Case-studies were presented from the following countries: Argentina, Bahamas, Brazil, Chile, Mexico, and Saint Lucia.

32. Mr. Jorge Adamoli from the University of Buenos Aires, National Council for Scientific and Technical Research, Argentina, talked on the need of a new paradigm for ensuring the sustainability of agricultural ecosystems. He presented a study on developments in the Chaco region in Northern Argentina as a concrete example for the ongoing advancement of the agricultural frontier, leading to an important reduction in forest ecosystems, and the concentration processes in the agricultural sector. Recent activities to address the subsequent decline in biodiversity include awareness raising and rewarding good agricultural practices, through *inter alia* certification and labeling, and the establishment of carbon bond markets. He said that one important ingredient of these activities is to identify and recognize common interests between farmers and the State.

33. The expert from Chile, Mr. Leonardo Nunez Montaner, presented a case study on the sustainable management of the Northern Scallop (*Argopecten purpuratus*) at *la Rinconada* marine reserve, Antofagasta II Region de Chile. He explained that the opening of export markets in the 1970s, in conjunction with inadequate regulations, led to a depletion of stocks and a collapse of the fishery. A temporary fishing ban was subsequently introduced, and a network of marine reserves was established to keep and enhance ecosystem services that are of critical importance to small and medium-size fishery operations. Simultaneously, a long-term management plan was developed and implemented, which led to an increase and stabilization of stocks. He said that important lessons learnt from this case are of a more general nature and also apply to the sustainable use of agricultural ecosystems, such as the need to achieve changes in mentality of relevant actors, as well as to strengthen co-management; participation and empowerment.

34. Ms. Andrea Clausen from the INTA Estación Experimental Agropecuaria Balcarce, Argentina, gave a presentation on the sustainable use of phylogenetic resources in Argentina, with focus on the case of wild potatoes. She provides an overview on the use of germplasm banks in Argentina. Despite the value of these resources, challenges can be identified in preserving some varieties in northern Argentina, including through a reduction in use of several varieties and a lack of healthy seed. Current initiatives seek to foster in-situ preservation, through *inter alia*: improving the knowledge-base by research; the identification of viruses and the production of healthy seedlings. She highlighted the importance of interdisciplinary research and of collaboration with farmers.

35. The expert from Mexico, Mr. Jorge Larson Guerra, described opportunities and challenges in the development of the mescal industry in Mexico. In addition to the building of capacity, and the raising of awareness on the value of the biological resource, he also highlighted the challenge related to the protection of geographical indications. As another case, he described recent activities to preserve local maize varieties by improving their competitiveness including through the identification and dissemination of good agricultural practices.

36. The expert from Brazil, Mr. Rubens Onofre Nodari, described some of the activities undertaken by agricultural biodiversity irradiation centers in Brazil as they relate to the promotion of under-utilized domestic varieties and landraces, including medicinal plants. He explained that the promotional activities by these 23 centers cover, directly or indirectly, some 70,000 farming households. The centers address the diversity of biomes and geographic regions through activities that are participatory and community-based, and that are designed and implemented in close cooperation with relevant non-governmental organizations.

37. The expert from the Bahamas, Mr. Kenneth Richardson, presented a case on the preservation of two local hot pepper varieties. He explained that, as most food including seeds is imported to the Bahamas, the utilization of traditional landraces, including local goat and finger peppers, is under threat. Activities to promote their utilization include the support of production of seedlings as well as the exploitation of niche markets for the production of non-gmo food, as part of the national biosafety strategy of the Bahamas.

38. The expert from Saint-Lucia, Mr. Rufus Leandre, provided an overview on activities that seek to ensure the sustainable use of Cassava (*Manihot Esculenta*) in Saint Lucia. He explained that ensuring food security is a relevant issue for Caribbean countries and that cassava, as a traditional food crop, provides good opportunities for diversification. However, the production of cassava is presently threatened because of a decline in export opportunities. Activities that seek to promote the production of cassava include the building of capacity for extension services as well as sensitization and public awareness through for instance the holding of a cassava festival.

39. In the discussions under this item, interventions were made by experts from the following countries: Argentina, Bolivia, Colombia, Cuba, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Mexico, Panama, Peru.

40. Interventions were also made by representatives from INTA and from the Instituto de Recursos Biologicos (Herbario).

41. Further to the discussion, experts split into four break-out groups. Each group was requested to identify four key topics/issues to consider when assessing the applicability of the Addis Ababa guidelines, in particular to agricultural biodiversity. The breakout group reported back to the plenary and presented their results.

ITEM 6. ECOSYSTEM SERVICES ASSESSMENT

42. The item was introduced by the representative of the Secretariat. He recalled the classification of ecosystem services developed under the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment framework and how that classification related to the concept of total economic value (TEV). He explained that the benefits that biodiversity provided to people had not been well reflected in decision-making and resource management and, as a result, the current rate of loss of biodiversity was higher than what it would have been, had those benefits been taken into account. He also gave a brief overview of the various valuation methods that are available to estimate the different biodiversity values and their changes under different policy or management alternatives.

43. The expert from El Salvador, Mr. Ernesto Lopez Zepeda, gave a presentation on a national project to establish a system for payment of ecosystem services such as freshwater protection or erosion control, through the creation of markets for ecosystem services. He explained that an autonomous institutional framework and a fund were created through the support of the World Bank and the GEF as well as through payments by the beneficiaries of ecosystem services. Monies in the fund would be used to compensate suppliers of ecosystem services for costs incurred in maintaining or enhancing the quality of these services, such as through improved agricultural processes or reforestation. Specific payment programmes would be driven by the expression of a concrete willingness-to-pay by beneficiaries.

44. Mr. Nestor Maceira from the INTA Estación Experimental Agropecuaria Balcarce, Argentina, provided an overview on the biodiversity-based ecosystem services provided by pampean grasslands in Argentina. He noted that, due to agricultural expansion, temperate grasslands are one of the most threatened ecosystems worldwide; in Argentina, grassland areas were reduced to up to 30 per cent in some regions in the last decades. He also described recent efforts to curb further reductions by, inter alia, the establishment of MAB reserves and the implementation of management plans.

45. The expert from Colombia, Mr. Jose Antonia Gomez, presented the national strategy developed by the Alexander von Humboldt Institute to promote the sustainable use of medicinal plants in Colombia. He explained that this programme is based on the voluntary participation in particular of small and medium and is implemented in close cooperation with international processes such as the UNCTAD biotrade initiative. Important activities include the development of institutional capacity and infrastructure (for instance greenhouses), as well as the support of related research.

46. The expert from Panama, Mr. Eustorgio Jaen Nunez, presented a study on the valuation of the ecosystem services provided by Coiba National Park. The valuation was undertaken by means of a benefits transfer analysis, involving a total of 150 primary studies. He discussed the methodological assumptions of benefits transfer and explained the mechanisms by which data in the primary studies were adjusted to reflect the specific conditions prevailing in Panama and in Coiba National Park.

47. Under this item, statements were made by experts from the following countries: Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Mexico, Panama.

48. A statement was also made by the representative of the Instituto de Floricultura of the Instituto de Recursos Biologicos, INTA, Argentina.

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

49. The item was introduced by the representative of the Secretariat. He recalled the different types of costs and benefits, including financial costs and benefits, and said that they need to be adequately taken

into account for effective policy planning and decision-making through appropriate capture mechanisms such as incentive measures. He discussed the implications of different mechanisms for the funding of activities for conservation and sustainable use, and also highlighted the distributional implications associated with the changing costs and benefits under different policies.

50. Ms. Laura Gassoni from the Instituto Microbiología y Zoología Agrícola, INTA, Argentina, highlighted the key environmental services provided by microorganisms in maintaining soil fertility. She said that biocontrol measures provide excellent options for the preservation of soil biodiversity, and noted that increased understanding of the complex linkages between biocontrol agents, soil biodiversity, and soil fertility is a key precondition to the economic valuation of soil biodiversity and to the capture of the economic benefits associated with soil biodiversity.

51. The expert from Bolivia, Mr. Mario Baudoin, first gave a general overview on trends in biodiversity conservation in Bolivia, noting progress such as through increases in protected areas and in forest areas under sustainable management, and proceeded to present a programme on the use of caimans (*lagartos*) as an instrument to ascribe value to wetlands and capture their economic benefits. Financial benefits would result from the export of leather and meat, thus generating incentives for the preservation of the caimans' habitat.

52. Mr. Carlos Reboratti from the University of Buenos Aires, National Council for Scientific and Technical Research, Argentina, reported on the social implications of the recent developments of the agricultural sector in Argentina. These developments are characterized by a fast moving of the agricultural frontier, which includes the transformation of reserves into soybean farmland, and by a sharp increase of lease rates because of the expanding production of soybeans. He noted the common commercial sense of many farmers is often set against the preservation of agricultural biodiversity and sustainable practices more generally, the latter being evidenced by the fact that even minimum crop rotation is often not implemented, and identified a critical need for policy measures to capture the economic benefits associated with the conservation of biodiversity.

53. Mr. Carlos Mezzadra, INTA Estación Experimental Agropecuaria Balcarce, Argentina, presented recent initiatives in Argentina that aim to preserve animal genetic resources. He noted animal genetic resources are an important component of agricultural biodiversity and discussed how to value them. He underlined in particular the social functions and values of landraces in remote rural areas. He described a number of success stories in preserving the resource by using it (involving for instance creole goats or vicunas); Programme that promote the wider use of specific traditional landraces seek to improve market opportunities, thus generating financial benefits for local farmers, in the case of vicunas for instance through the improvement of fiber quality.

54. Ms. Alexandra Sarquis, Secretariat for Agriculture, Livestock and Food, Argentina, analysed the impacts of agricultural subsidies on agricultural production and export opportunities for Argentina. She noted that Argentina is an agricultural country and that agricultural products are a major share (60 %) of Argentina's exports. Agricultural production and exports are increasing and 35% of the work force is employed in agriculture. She explained that the volume and structure of subsidies provided by OECD countries to domestic producers, in particular by the European Union, reduces development opportunities for Argentina's agriculture and also distorts the structure of the agricultural sector. The current trade regime provides high incentives to increase the production of soybeans (for feed), for which a comparatively open international market exists. However, the large-scale production of soybeans is detrimental to biodiversity, and, by replacing the production of other crops, also increases economic dependency.

55. Under this item, interventions were made by representatives of the following countries: Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Cuba, Colombia, Mexico, Peru.

56. In closing the discussion, the facilitator announces the establishment of four break-out groups to further develop recommendations on the items discussed.

ITEM 8. ASSESSMENT OF THE WORKSHOP

57. Based on the discussions in the breakout groups, the workshop identified a number of elements that would be important to consider in further work on the sustainable use of biodiversity, in particular agricultural biodiversity. These elements are attached to the present report (see annex I (a) for the English version, and annex I (b) for the Spanish version).

58. Participants were requested by the facilitators to evaluate to what extent the Workshop achieved their expectations and its objectives, and to provide feedback thereon by completing an assessment form. This feedback will help revise the structure of the workshop to better serve future participants.

ITEM 9. OTHER MATTERS

59. There were no other matters.

ITEM 10. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

60. Participants in the Workshop considered and adopted the present report and the annexed elements for consideration in further work on sustainable use of biodiversity, in particular agricultural biodiversity on Friday, 16 September 2005. The final report of the Workshop will be submitted to SBSTTA at its eleventh meeting for its consideration prior to the eight meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

ITEM 11. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

61. Closing remarks were provided by the representatives of the Government of Argentina: Mr. Roberto Casas, National Center for Natural Resources, INTA, and Secretariat for Agriculture, Livestock and Food; and Mr. Homero Bibiloni, Sub-secretary of State for Natural Resources, Ministry of Health.

62. Closing remarks were also provided by the representative of the institutional host, Mr. Roberto Bocchetto, National Director of the *Instituto Nacional de Tecnologia Agropecuaria* (INTA).

63. In closing the meeting, the representative of the Secretariat thanked the participants for their dedication and hard work. He also thanked the host country authorities and the local organizers for hosting and organizing the meeting.

64. Following the customary exchange of courtesies, the Workshop closed at 5.30 p.m. on Friday, 16 September 2005.

Annex I (a)

The Latin American and Caribbean Regional Experts Workshop on Sustainable Use of Biodiversity recognized that the following elements would be important to consider in further work on the sustainable of biodiversity, in particular agricultural biodiversity:

Item 5: Application of the Addis Ababa principles and guidelines for the sustainable use of biodiversity, in particular to agricultural biodiversity

1. All 14 principles apply to the sustainable use of agricultural biodiversity. However, different options are available with regard to the future inclusion of agricultural biodiversity in these Principles and Guidelines. For example, a specific principle on agricultural biodiversity might be considered, or each principle could be analysed more profoundly in terms of agricultural biodiversity.

2. In section A of the Guidelines (Underlying conditions for sustainable use) a specific paragraph on agricultural biodiversity could be included, pointing out, *inter alia*, that *in situ* conservation of agricultural biodiversity is impossible without use, and that, therefore, this depends on the viability of rural lifestyles that engage in practices involving sustainable use.

3. Throughout the principles, rationales and operational guidelines, agricultural biodiversity should be included as applicable, without need for further amendments. For example: operational guideline 1 under Principle 10 only requires assessments on “natural” ecosystems. “Agricultural ecosystems” should be included as well.

4. In principle 1, a new operational guideline could be included stating: “to create mechanisms that may strengthen rural lifestyles that may contribute to *in situ* conservation and sustainable use of agricultural biodiversity.

5. Moreover, in 1, it is necessary not only to emphasize the consistency of policies and laws, but also to recognize that the conservation and sustainable use of agricultural biodiversity is a cross-cutting issue. It is suggested to amend the existing operational guidelines on the identification of overlaps, omissions and contradictions to include a reference to sectoral programmes.

6. In principle 12, Operational Guideline 5, alternatives for supporting the internalization of management costs should also include economic instruments such as subsidies on sustainable practices, technical support, resources for the startup of businesses, acknowledgement of ownership rights, labeling and certification (sustainability, organic products and geographic indications, etc).

7. Principle 13 states that management and conservation costs should be borne within the relevant area, and this is hardly applicable to agricultural biodiversity. We believe that this principle calls for careful reflection by the SBSTTA in connection with the use of biological resources in general, and agricultural biodiversity in particular, because the global benefits of its conservation have not been considered.

8. Guidelines should be stated on three levels: international, national and local.

9. The operational guidelines need to be differentiated in connection with the distribution of benefits arising from the use of agricultural biodiversity components (in particular, but not limited to, principle 8):

(a) Ecosystem services (soil, water, carbon, etc...);

(b) Biologic resources (extraction and harvesting of populations with either or not intensive management, but whose practices should contribute to conservation);

(c) Genetic resources (in a context of access and conservation). If the market of genetic resources is inadequately regulated, the resulting distortions will be unacceptable because they will entail appropriation of the value of collective and heritage resources. The ongoing negotiations in the CBD on an international regime for access to genetic resources and benefit sharing, is of strategic importance, and should take into consideration International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture of the FAO.

10. The role of invasive species is not been mentioned in any guidelines, and, given its importance for agricultural biodiversity an operational guideline might be created in that regard. It should fit into Principle 8, on account of its international cooperation component, which is the only option for effective activities on the control of alien invasives.
 11. The concept of cross-border resources in Principle 8 calls for a different interpretation in the context of agricultural biodiversity, because conservation is local, whereas benefits are global. SBSTTA could re-consider this concept from the standpoint of agricultural biodiversity.
 12. The governance of these principles in Latin American countries was analysed:
 - (a) It is suggested to suggest create Political and Technical Councils so as to decentralize decision-making and empower users. This is connected with Principles 7, 9 and 12;
 - (b) We suggest, based on existing institutional models in the region, to create an applied research agency in charge of transferring and promoting sound agricultural practices, and of addressing sustainability issues. This is connected with Principles 2 and 6;
 - (c) We suggest promoting the creation of an environmental information system including environmental performance indicators and economic valuation of environmental services. This is connected with Principles 4, 7 and 10.
 13. SBSTTA may wish to take into consideration the effects of the advancement of agricultural frontiers or “agriculturization”, i.e., the intensification and expansion of frontiers, on biodiversity.
 14. SBSTTA may wish to consider how to include urban and peri-urban agricultural biodiversity components.
 15. It may also be necessary to introduce amendments or adjustments to the Principles in order to take into account issues related to commercialization.
 16. Further guidelines should also call for improved market access for products that are the result of environmentally friendly processes.
 17. The Executive Secretary could be requested to renew its request for observer status in the relevant Committees of the World Trade Organization (WTO).
 18. The principles and guidelines could be further developed with a view to highlight more clearly the significance of giving added value to biodiversity.
 19. The principles should provide further guidance on the necessity to strengthen institutions, and to create or enhance capacities at both national and local levels.
 20. Guidance could be provided on the interaction of the Principles and Guidelines with the programme of work on agricultural biodiversity, in particular with regard to formulation or review of legal and regulatory frameworks, in accordance with the specificities.
 21. Further guidance could be provided on the involvement of stakeholders: their involvement should be from the bottom up and based on the understanding that participation entails commitment.
 22. In accordance with their possibilities, the Parties should allocate funds for the development of these programmes at a local level. At a global level, the Convention on Biological Diversity should encourage donor parties to increase their assistance to the more neglected countries.
- Item 6: Ecosystem Services Assessment***
23. The economic dimension of environmental services should be highlighted more forcefully in the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines.
 24. States must endeavor to include ecosystem services in the national accounting system, so that their decisions may be supported in a quantifiable fashion.

25. It would be desirable to have guidance provided to the Global Environment Facility (GEF) to consider this topic and support countries in this endeavor.

26. Countries should promote human resource training in methodologies for the evaluation of ecosystem goods and services, as there is no or little knowledge of this topic in many parts of the region.

27. Models for the evaluation of ecosystem services should be further developed with a view to enhance their validation, and to better reflect the importance of ecosystem functions. Academic research on this topic should be supported.

28. Ecosystem services should be valued on different scales.

Item 7: Financial costs and benefits associated with the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity

29. Global costs and benefits related to the conservation and sustainable use should be internalized at such a level that they generate resources for the local implementation of programmes on the conservation and sustainable use of agricultural biodiversity, and that they contribute to poverty alleviation.

30. Actual cost and benefit calculations based on various scales and uses of agricultural biodiversity should be made available and ought to be included – in a differentiated fashion – in national accounts, so that they may be available for sustainable development planning, and could be used as a means to promote new alternatives for the sustainable use of agricultural biodiversity.

31. The financial costs of foreign debt are collectively borne by societies in the region, and affect in particular investment opportunities in long-term development, particularly in conservation investments. Financial institutions should include this dimension when they negotiate with the countries, and should have ways of channeling resources towards the development of conservation and sustainable use programmes, including debt discounts and relief.

32. Guidance could be provided to the GEF, and other donors by invited, to provide financial resources for the conduct of biodiversity assessments and for pilot projects on sustainable practices.

33. The variables that guide the distribution of benefits provided by ecosystem services, in particular with regard to agricultural biodiversity, should be clearly identified and developed.

Note

34. The Latin American and Caribbean Group of experts requests the Executive Secretary to revise the Spanish translation of the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines, where linguistic and conceptual issues have been detected (e.g., “local communities” translated as “private communities”).

Annex I (b)

El Taller Regional de Expertos de América Latina y el Caribe sobre Utilización Sostenible de la Diversidad Biológica reconoció que los siguientes elementos son importantes para ser considerados en el trabajo futuro sobre uso sostenible de la biodiversidad, en particular la agrobiodiversidad:

Tema 5: Aplicación de los principios y directrices de Addis Ababa para la utilización sostenible de la diversidad biológica, en particular la diversidad biológica agrícola

1. Los 14 principios aplican al uso sostenible de la diversidad agrícola; sin embargo, surgen opciones para proceder a la integración de la agrobiodiversidad en estos Principios y Directrices. Por ejemplo, se podría considerar la redacción de un principio específico sobre agrobiodiversidad, o bien proceder a un análisis más específico de cada principio en términos de agrobiodiversidad.

2. En la sección A (“Condiciones subyacentes para la utilización sostenible”) de los Principios y Directrices, se podría incluir un párrafo específico sobre agrobiodiversidad en el que se señale, entre otras cosas, que sin uso no puede haber conservación *in situ* de la agrobiodiversidad y que, por tanto, ésta depende de la viabilidad de los estilos de vida rural que realizan prácticas de uso sustentable.

3. En todos los principios, motivos y directrices operacionales, la agrobiodiversidad debería incluirse cuando aplique, sin necesidad de modificaciones mayores. Por ejemplo, la directriz operacional 1 en el principio 10 sólo pide estudios en “ecosistemas naturales”, deberían incluirse los agroecosistemas.

4. En el principio 1, podría incluirse una nueva directriz operacional: “Crear mecanismos que fortalezcan los estilos de vida rurales que contribuyan a la conservación *in situ* y el uso sustentable de la agrobiodiversidad”.

5. Además, en este mismo principio 1, es necesario no sólo enfatizar la coherencia de políticas y leyes, sino reconocer que la conservación y uso sustentable de la agrobiodiversidad es un tema transversal. Se sugiere modificar la directriz operacional sobre la identificación de superposiciones, omisiones y contradicciones para que incluya una referencia a programas sectoriales.

6. En el Principio 12, directriz operacional 5, las opciones para apoyar la internalización de los costos del manejo deberían incluir también instrumentos económicos como subsidios a prácticas sustentables, apoyos técnicos, recursos para iniciar negocios, reconocimiento a derechos de propiedad, etiquetado y certificación (sostenibilidad, orgánico e indicaciones geográficas, entre otros).

7. En el Principio 13 se establece que los costos de la gestión y la conservación deben interiorizarse dentro del área de manejo y esto nos parece que en pocas ocasiones será aplicable a la agrobiodiversidad. Consideramos que este principio amerita una reflexión cuidadosa por parte del OSACTT en relación con el uso de recursos biológicos en general y en particular, en materia de agrobiodiversidad, ya que los beneficios globales de su conservación no están siendo considerados.

8. Las directrices deben estar en 3 niveles: Internacional, Nacional y Local.

9. En el caso de la distribución de beneficios por el uso de componentes de la agrobiodiversidad es necesario diferenciar en las directrices operacionales (particularmente en el principio 8, pero no únicamente):

(a) Servicios ecosistémicos (suelos, agua, carbono, etc.);

(b) Recursos biológicos (extracción y cosecha de poblaciones cuyo manejo puede ser o no ser intensivo, cuyas prácticas deben no obstante contribuir a la conservación);

(c) Recursos genéticos (en un contexto de acceso y de conservación): si el mercado de los recursos genéticos no está bien regulado, las distorsiones resultantes son inaceptables, ya que implica una apropiación del valor de recursos colectivos y patrimoniales. Las negociaciones actualmente en marcha en el marco del CDB sobre un régimen internacional sobre acceso a los recursos genéticos y participación en los beneficios son de importancia estratégica y deberían tomar en cuenta adecuadamente el Tratado sobre Recursos Fitogenéticos para la Agricultura y la Alimentación de la FAO.

10. El papel de las especies invasoras no se menciona en ninguna directriz operacional y podría incluirse una directriz operacional al respecto, dada su importancia para la agrobiodiversidad. El lugar adecuado para su inclusión sería el principio 8, debido a que en éste se menciona el componente de cooperación internacional, que constituye la única opción de acción efectiva para el control de las introducciones.
11. El concepto de recurso transfronterizo en el principio 8 requiere de una lectura diferente en el contexto de agrobiodiversidad ya que la conservación es local y el beneficio global. El OSACTT podría reconsiderar este concepto desde la perspectiva de la agrobiodiversidad.
12. Se analizó la gobernabilidad de la aplicación de estos principios en los países latinoamericanos:
- (a) Se sugiere la creación de Consejos Político-Técnicos, para descentralización de la toma de decisiones y empoderar a los usuarios. Vincula con los principios 7, 9, y 12;
 - (b) Se sugiere la creación de agencias de investigación aplicada, sobre la base de modelos institucionales existentes en la región, que transfieran y promuevan buenas prácticas agrícolas y que aborden en forma integral las problemáticas de sostenibilidad. Vincula con los principios 2 y 6;
 - (c) Se sugiere promover la estructuración de un sistema de información ambiental que mantenga indicadores de desempeño ambiental y realice las valoraciones económicas de los servicios ambientales. Vincula con los principios 4, 7 y 10.
13. El OSACTT podría considerar los efectos de los avances en las fronteras agrícolas o de la agriculturización (intensificación más expansión de las fronteras) sobre la biodiversidad.
14. El OSACTT podría considerar la inclusión de los componentes de la agrobiodiversidad urbana y peri-urbana en la Principios y Directrices de Addis Abeba.
15. También podría resultar necesario introducir enmiendas o ajustes a los Principios y Directrices para tomar en cuenta asuntos vinculados con la comercialización.
16. Deberían elaborarse nuevas directrices que apunten al mejoramiento en la apertura de mercados a los productos que sean el resultado de procesos ambientalmente amigables.
17. Se debería solicitar al Secretario Ejecutivo que renueve las gestiones tendientes a lograr el estatus de observador en los comités relevantes de la OMC.
18. Los principios y directrices podrían desarrollarse de forma de resaltar más claramente la importancia de agregar valor a la biodiversidad.
19. Los principios deberían proveer directrices adicionales sobre la necesidad de fortalecer las instituciones y crear o mejorar las capacidades en el ámbito local o nacional.
20. Deberían proveerse directrices sobre las interacciones entre los Principios y Directrices y el programa de trabajo sobre diversidad agrícola, en particular respecto a la formulación o revisión de marcos legales o regulatorios, teniendo en cuenta las particularidades de cada país.
21. Podrían brindarse directrices adicionales sobre la participación de los actores involucrados; este debería ser un proceso “desde abajo hacia arriba” y entendiendo que la participación también implica compromiso.
22. Las Partes, de acuerdo a sus posibilidades, deberían destinar fondos para el desarrollo de estos programas a nivel local. A nivel global, el CBD debería invitar a las partes donantes a incrementar la ayuda para las regiones o países más limitados.
- Tema 6: Evaluación de los Servicios de los Ecosistemas***
23. La dimensión económica de los servicios ambientales debería resaltarse más decididamente en los Principios y Directrices de Addis Abeba.

24. Los Estados deben realizar esfuerzos para incluir los servicios ecosistémicos en sus sistemas de cuentas nacionales, de manera que sus decisiones cuenten con respaldos cuantificables.
25. Sería deseable que se indicara al Fondo para el Medio Ambiente Mundial que contemple este tema y provea financiamiento para apoyar a los países en estos esfuerzos.
26. Debería promoverse en los países la formación de recursos humanos en metodologías de evaluación de los bienes y servicios de los ecosistemas, sobre las cuales existe escaso o ningún conocimiento en gran parte de la región.
27. Los modelos de evaluación de los servicios ecosistémicos deberían desarrollarse a fin de mejorar su validación y de reflejar más adecuadamente la importancia de las funciones del ecosistema. Debería apoyarse asimismo la investigación académica sobre esta materia.
28. Es necesaria la valoración de los servicios ambientales de los ecosistemas a diferentes escalas.

Tema 7: Costos y beneficios financieros asociados a la conservación y utilización sostenible de la diversidad biológica

29. Los costos y beneficios globales asociados con la conservación y el uso sostenible deben ser interiorizados en ese nivel, de forma de generar recursos para la ejecución local de programas de conservación y uso sostenible de la agrobiodiversidad y contribuir a la mitigación de la pobreza.
30. Es necesario disponer de cálculos reales de costos y beneficios a diferentes escalas y modalidades de uso de la agrobiodiversidad e incorporarlos diferencialmente en las cuentas nacionales, de modo que estén disponibles para la planificación del desarrollo sostenible y puedan ser utilizados para promover nuevas alternativas para el uso sostenible de la biodiversidad agrícola.
31. Los costos financieros de la deuda externa recaen colectivamente en las sociedades de la región y afectan particularmente las posibilidades de inversión en desarrollo de largo plazo y en especial, en inversiones en conservación. Los organismos financieros deberían incorporar esta dimensión en sus bases de negociación con los países y disponer de formas para canalizar recursos hacia el desarrollo de programas de conservación y uso sostenible, incluyendo descuentos y condonación de deuda.
32. Se podría indicar al Fondo para el Medio Ambiente Mundial e invitar a otros donantes de fondos que provean recursos financieros para estudios de valoración de la biodiversidad y para la ejecución de proyectos pilotos con prácticas sustentables.
33. Las variables que intervienen en la distribución de beneficios provenientes de servicios ambientales deben identificarse y desarrollarse, en particular en relación con la agrobiodiversidad.

Nota

34. El grupo de expertos de América Latina y el Caribe solicita a la Secretaría del CDB que revise la traducción del documento de los Principios y Directrices de Addis Abeba, donde se han detectado problemas de lenguaje e incluso de conceptos (Ej. “local communities” traducido como “comunidades privadas”).

*Annex II***LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**

Country	Expert
Argentina	Ms. Andrea Clausen
Argentina	Mr. Claudio Gutierrez
Argentina	Mr. Nestor Maceira
Argentina	Mr. Ramiro Saravia
Argentina	Ms. Julieta von Thungen
Bahamas	Mr. Kenneth Richardson
Bolivia	Mr. Mario Baudoin
Brazil	Mr. Rubens Onofre Nodari
Chile	Mr Leonardo Núñez Montaner
Colombia	Mr. José Antonio Gómez
Cuba	Ms. Lourdes Coya de la Fuente
Dominican Republic	Mr. Angel Daneris Santana
Ecuador	Mr. Luis Arreaga Ochoa
El Salvador	Mr. Ernesto Lopez Zepeda
Mexico	Mr. Jorge Larson Guerra
Panama	Mr. Eustorgio Jaen Nunez
Peru	Ms. Maria Gloria Quispe Quispe
Saint-Lucia	Mr. Rufus Leandre
Representatives of the host country and organizing institution	
Secretaría de Ambiente y Desarrollo Sustentable (Secretariat for the Environment and Sustainable Development)	Ms. Victoria Lichtschein
Instituto Nacional de Tecnología Agropecuaria (INTA), Instituto de Recursos Biológicos	Ms. María Elena Zaccagnini
Instituto Nacional de Tecnología Agropecuaria (INTA)	Mr. José Luis Panigatti
Organization	Expert
Instituto Microbiología y Zoología Agrícola, INTA	Ms. Laura Gassoni
Instituto de Economía y Sociología Rural, INTA	Ms. Estela Cristeche
Centro Nacional de Recursos Naturales, INTA	Mr. Roberto Casas
INTA Estación Experimental Agropecuaria Balcarce	Mr. Carlos Mezzadra
Instituto de Recursos Biológicos, Centro Nacional de Recursos Naturales, INTA	Ms. Laura Bullrich

Instituto de Recursos Biológicos (Herbario), Centro Nacional de Recursos Naturales, INTA	Ms. Renée Fortunato
Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Department for Environmental Affairs, Argentina	Ms. Silvana Merello
IUCN (Switzerland)	Mr. Steve Edwards
Secretariat for the Environment and Sustainable Development	Ms. Ines Kasulin
Secretariat for the Environment and Sustainable Development	Ms. María Tonelli
Secretariat for the Environment and Sustainable Development	Mr. Ricardo Banchs
Secretariat for Agriculture, Livestock and Food	Ms. Alejandra Sarquis
University of Buenos Aires, National Council for Scientific and Technical Research (Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas; UBA-CONICET)	Mr. Jorge Adámoli
University of Buenos Aires, National Council for Scientific and Technical Research	Mr. Carlos Reboratti
UNEP-SCBD	Mr. Markus Lehmann
