

Report on the FA2 Montpellier Meeting 13-15th of May 2015

A workshop of the Global Agenda for Sustainable Livestock (GASL) theme FA2 “Valuing Grasslands was held in Montpellier on the 13-15th of May 2015. The purpose was to:

- Collate examples of how various stakeholders have managed to improve grassland management for multiple benefits, based on existing pilot studies.
- Identify the principles and lessons learnt from successful examples of grassland management for multiple benefits; identify how we best communicate and translate these into practice change
- Analyse the impact of public policies on both collective and private grassland management, for instance with respect to land tenure and land rights, subsidies, payment for environmental services, etc.
- Identify a set of coordinated actions to be considered for inclusion in the FA2 business plan
- Develop and agree the Terms of Reference for a consultant to formulate a business plan for FA2

There were 31 participants (Appendix 1) and 21 pilot sites were presented (Appendix 2). In addition to the presentations a document describing each of the sites was prepared following a set template (Appendix 3). All of this material is available on the GASL web site.

The first day of the workshop was dedicated to the presentation of all the sites. Day two was spent building a common view, identifying key messages and actions and the final day was spent on finalizing the actions and developing work streams. Following the workshop the co-chairs worked with the secretariat to develop a terms of reference for a consultant to develop a business plan for FA2 based on this work.

Synthesis of issues highlighted in the pilot sites:

The co-chairs undertook a synthesis of the consistent issues that were appearing in the pilot sites and this was discussed by the participants and added to on day 2 following presentation of all the sites (Appendix 4). The synthesis came up with four themes:

Theme 1 Enabling institutions including

- Land tenure/ transhumance
- Community collectives around planning, decision making and management
- Cooperatives for product supply
- Financial mechanisms for ecosystem services

Theme 2 Capacity building including

- Education
- Farmer to farmer learning
- Sharing knowledge between different stakeholders

Theme 3 Supporting Practice change

- Stakeholder motivation
- Family life cycle (succession; next generation)
- Collaborative approaches to influence individual practice change

Theme 4 Resource management including

- Measuring
- Monitoring
- Reporting/verifying
- Technological inputs

A series of questions (Appendix 5) was applied to each theme and participants were allocated to a theme.

Theme 1 Enabling institutions:

What are the commonalities/similarities between sites?

- Necessity to have clear, fair, and transparent rules to access land and other resources which must be followed
- Building up strong communities groups in order to push toward requests to decision makers
- All stakeholders in plots sites need proof of outcomes to be disseminated by "institutions " and to be implemented which might need new policies
- Weak legal framework regarding sustainable livestock production

What outliers exist and what opportunity do they pose?

- Pioneer activities ("crazy ideas") might have an impact on other pilot sites to stimulate policy decision makers to get a new outlook of the problem, do report such cases.
- Ex. Import exotic cattle to a country, government support the action, risks and success are shared with site farm
- publish mistakes and learn from them (e.g. sheep distribution chaco)

What are the positive or negative impacts of the approaches you are addressing?

- Community empowerment is an important approach
 - Positive
 - More influence on decision makers, more sustainability
 - Negative
 - but it takes long time, wrong strategies
- Built network - email GASL, network , platform, list of NGOs, institutions engaged in pilot sites, grasslands synergies
 - Positive
 - Easier access to information, no splitting of different actions in the same field
 - Negative
 - Need resources, who does it (FAO?)

- Develop, propose, demonstrate , and recommend standard frameworks principles for governments

What key lessons have emerged regarding land access or sustainable livestock production?

- Structured planning approach is needed.
- Evidenced based success or failure information is needed.
- Financing mechanism for sustainable pasture management is needed but it must be specific to the context, within context PSE must be in the financial flow
- Money would be available; therefore action of GASL must follow compliances (consumer, international industry, policies).
- Disseminate examples which have a big impact on sustainable livestock production or grassland.
- Governments must put in place “green frameworks”, coordinate and implement them (certificates, environmental taxes, and others)

What is missing (gaps) and how to fill them?

- Assessment of applicability of solutions within another context projects is missing
- Fill it with
 - Systematic framework (table, matrix) with several issues/points (columns) that can be filled out by pilot sites leaders. Help for others: table to be used within project context but also to be used as indication for others.
- Many other projects visited or not by us can provide best practices successfully implemented, tables needed to disseminate information.
- Contribution of sustainable pasture management (including livestock) has not yet been formulated. Ex. Grassbased livestock is less destroying climate than feedlots
- Alternative assessments for good practices of sustainable pasture management is missing.
- Pilot sites shows only negative impacts, are not enough integrated and do not really show effects on social, economic and ecologic aspects.
- Develop pilot sites where efficiency levels nutrient cycling (soil,water,fodder,GHG) can be assessed under different conditions/countries. Comparable evidence based information.

What is required to make the answers to these questions globally relevant?

- Outcomes must be evidenced based
- Network is required
- Set priorities – path forward one by one

Theme 2 Supporting Practice Change

The factors identified for practice change were:

Motivation/ Adaptive capacity

- “If anything is permanent it is change”.

i.e. change is a given, we do not necessarily assume that all change, or change for the sake of change is good, but that when we talk about it here, that is desirable.

Is the concern so much with motivation or adaptive capacity (two sides of the same coin)? We discuss adaptive capacity more than motivation.

It is then imperative that we work on reinforcing adaptive capacities to change, to increase resilience. The factors or elements of such adaptive capacity are:

Regulatory or institutional framework including self organizing capacities and nested multi scale connectivity (linking to theme 1)

Access to resources, both Natural Resources and knowledge resources, ability to learn and respond to uncertainty – (linking to theme 2)

Trajectory of development: governance, market, tenure, demographics

Management of diversity e.g. of resource use at farm level and landscape level.

Family life cycle

aging farm population

education

economic opportunities outside agriculture

economic barriers to new entrants due to rising land price / land speculation.

What are the commonalities?

Importance of institutions at various levels

Importance of mobility, the influence of tenure systems

The need to collect and present evidence to policy makers

Importance of multi stakeholder engagement

What were the outliers?

Science / evidence on the economic evidence of better climate adapted & mitigating measures to convince policy makers. This is however seen as a priority.

Geographic gaps in major private & leasehold land tenure systems; US and Australia

Key lessons?

Common land can be managed well & Private land ownership does not guarantee sustainable systems

Mobility is a key issue in sustainable use of grasslands, and relates to land tenure

Frame / Context is key (understanding development trajectories including tenure)

Decentralization of land and water management is delivering benefits, most successfully with wider level landscape planning.

It is important to maintain or develop inter sectoral linkages.

Need to stimulate demand for products from sustainable systems. (we have seen the power of market demand, but need to link that to system in order to see benefits).

Multiple actors / MSIs have a role to play in the development of systems e.g. donors, scientists, NGOs, producers, in addressing changing demands.

Public policy is often the most effective tool in effecting change.

Increased communications has radically improved ease of access to support tools for producers, which can be used along the chain.

Gaps ?

Science on economic evidence of better livestock keeping practices

Poor representation of systems that compensate good practices

ICT for helping livestock keepers on resources, information..

Collaborative approaches to influence practice change

(not necessarily individual – social norms are important).

Focus is on policy makers to create awareness of land users for rangelands

Develop a general understanding of the different development trajectories/scenarios. Depending upon the historical contexts, both regulatory and incentive based systems seem to work for better governance of resources and mobilizing change.

An analysis of trajectories of changing contexts

governance – centralized or decentralised

market or subsistence

tenure

demographics

land use choices ...measures

what is the added value of FA 2 or GAA in supporting adaptive capacity at Global level?

develop understanding of the different trajectories

promote or recognize a mix of local level organization, combined with multi scale institutions embedded on with a wider landscape level planning

How ? – Conferences, publications.... Influence other groups on land, governance, sustainability... Civil society forums, International land forums, Private sector organizations

Support science for systems research on positive outcomes from improved livestock keeping, including the non traditional such as climate mitigation and adaptation.... Or also appreciate extensive livestock systems

Frame –

Who should be there?

What linkages

How to organize?

Theme 3 Capacity Building

Education

Cases:

- APESS (Burkina, Togo) – literacy, livestock management
- Laikipia/Il Ngwesi (Kenya) – ‘eco-literacy’
- La Laiterie Berger (Senegal) – milk production hygiene, forage production

- Formal vs. informal education?
- Training of pasture management specialists in universities is generally lacking — reduces effectiveness of informal education efforts as well
- Formal education for farmers is lacking, including marketing, etc
- Need to reach everyone involved in animal care & management — e.g., women, children
- Need to supplement extension services to provide non-traditional knowledge — multiple uses, co-production, carbon etc
- Extension services are rarely available for pastoralists
- Computer and mobile phone training materials
- Games

Farmer-to-farmer learning

- Canadian example
- Scientists/specialists as facilitators
- How to avoid the spread of ‘bad advice’?

Sharing knowledge between stakeholder groups

- Scientists/specialists as facilitators
- Buyers & suppliers can be a way to reach farmers for improved practice in some areas
- Roles of governing institutions in providing a platform for exchange – laws, policy, process, e.g. national roundtables
- Participatory planning in collective systems, other tools for collective decision-making, e.g. games
- Network for sharing local/traditional knowledge

What are the commonalities/similarities between sites?

- Formal education is not represented
- Training of pasture management specialists in universities is generally lacking — reduces effectiveness of informal education efforts as well
- Knowledge of land tenure rights and regulations is often lacking, especially in areas where land conversion is rapid
- Importance of mobile & internet information resources – but quality control?

What outliers exist and what opportunity do they pose?

- APESS & transborder education – Reducing violence/improving social integration & cohesion, maintaining the option of traditional livelihoods
- Canadian case – mentorship for farmer-farmer interaction
- Kyrgyzstan, Mongolia, Kenya cases – ‘triple wins’

What are the positive or negative impacts of the approaches you are addressing?

- Building shared frameworks for collective action, improving collective decision-making
- Donor-driven programmes often lead to problems

What key lessons have emerged?

- Sedentary & mobile systems require fundamentally different approaches – different capacity building needs, methods, ...
- There is much work to be done to develop approaches for capacity building for collective decision-making
- PES capacity is poor, and will require major capacity building
- Goals/objectives of policymakers need to align with the goals/objectives of producers
- Donors should fund planning, not implementation
- Silvopastoral systems are promising, yet neglected in some areas

What is missing (gaps) and how to fill them?

- Illiteracy a constraint in Africa, South Asia, Afghanistan, Andes? (esp. indigenous); Supplementary education, alternative materials, regional/national commitments
- Language barriers; Translation of materials, regional/national commitments
- Local/traditional knowledge is often not valued, and is disappearing; Compilation & leveraging or formation of local knowledge networks
- Few cases of successful management; Literature review, surveys, databasing
- Targeting products to markets; Formal education for farmers, including marketing

How is this theme connected to the others?

- Education is important for mobile groups to know their rights, regulations, and their role in decision-making
- Education provides technical knowledge to support practice change, and to improve management knowledge and skills

What is required to make the answers to these questions globally relevant?

- Grassland policy/pastoralism in Middle East: Farmers, extension, government, scientists needed for global engagement
- Sedentary & mobile systems require fundamentally different approaches – different capacity building needs, methods, ...

Theme 4 Resource Management

Documentation:

- Case studies of good practice (techniques, extension / support methods...)
- For policy makers, practitioners, educational use...
- Activities: (i) prepare matrix of cases with common criteria (ii) select case studies...

Share Knowledge:

- Share good practice through web-site format
- Standard template format, members contribute and can access
- Who can manage the site and process?

Filling Gaps

- Scoping of sustainability assessment tools
 - Ecological: environmental services

- Economic: Analysis methods
- Social: social impact assessments
- What tools are there? What do they cover? How are they used?
- Are there additional needs from FA2 members / stakeholders?

After the group work, we identified what kind of activities (documentation and/or ground activities) we might prioritise.

The following were the potential activities that were identified

Documentation

- Document evidence on the contribution of grassland systems to wellbeing etc.....What are the questions the global dialogue requires i.e. policy
- Disseminate information on grassland management including the use of local and traditional knowledge
- Document the impact of land tenure systems and mobility on grassland management
- Document the diversity of institutional arrangements in place to manage grasslands across scales (local, region, nation, international)
- Design a framework for assessment and planning to inform the choice of grassland system
- Document the capacity building needs and approaches for stakeholders (e.g. herders, policy, society, researchers, agribusiness)

Coordinated on the ground activities:

- Scope and develop a formal and non- formal education on grassland management E.g. international course; e learning
- Define a range of activities to share information: virtual, face to face, social media
- Application of an integrated assessment methodology on contribution of grassland systems to multiple benefits within a range of sites
- Cross site comparison of the impact of global, national, regional and local drivers (e.g. policy, CC, market, financial mechanisms, tenure) on grassland dynamics and trajectories..... to inform effective policy development
- Testing and implementing good practice in capacity building on the ground in a range of cases
- Test and implement the integrated assessment framework across a range of case sites
- Identify needs of investors and policy at that global level

The following work streams were identified with participants who wanted to be involved and the people who would lead the work:

Topic	People	Lead
Design/test an integrated assessment framework	JFT Hermes Rogerio Andreas (Central Asia) Jacques Sylvie Fernando (test Pablo, Jason)	JFT/Hermes
Document and standardise information	Catherine Isabel Han Jagdeesh Huyen Ehab, Alain, Qi	Catherine
Document/Test the capacity building needs and approaches	Barry Marie Wilhelm, Carola Mona, Pablo	Barry

It was agreed that each of the work stream leaders would work with the two FA2 co-chairs (L.Wederburn and A.Ickowicz) and Andrea Wilkes (the consultant) to identify and build an action plan going forward and incorporate this into the FA 2 business plan. The Terms of Reference for the consultant are in Appendix 6.