

Views of Uruguay on the three questions to guide the Workshop on the identification and assessment of agricultural practices and technologies to enhance productivity in a sustainable manner, food security and resilience, considering the differences in agro-ecological zones and farming systems, such as different grassland and cropland practices and systems (SBSTA 44).

As food systems are the backbone of the economy of Uruguay, the identification and assessment of practices and technologies to enhance productivity in a sustainable manner, food security and resilience is a fundamental priority. Agriculture is more climate dependent and climate impacted than many other activities, and agricultural systems have to build productivity and resilience at the same time.

QUESTION 1: EXPERIENCE OF THE COUNTRY

Uruguay is building experience in integrating dimensions of resilience into the agenda of sustainable development. This process is leveraged on inter-institutional frameworks in which public and farmers' organizations interact.

Identification and assessment of technologies and practices that enhance productivity and resilience in our country is mostly related to the challenges of current variability and observed trends. Instead of the question "To what shall we adapt?", we are privileging the question "**What has to be adapted?**". In other words, we are focusing on which are the gaps in adaptation in the present that we have to close to enhance productivity in a sustainable and resilient manner.

We can briefly share three examples of technologies that Uruguay is currently implementing and assessing on their capacity to increase productivity and resilience, and other co-benefits.

(1) **Soil use and management plans**, which consist, briefly, on establishing rotations to restore or increase fertility and organic matter and carbon in soils and minimize erosion through conservation practices, considering soil aptitude. Planned rotations potential is leveraged by the fact that zero-tillage is a widely adopted technology in Uruguay cropping. Soil use and management plans are obligatory in Uruguay since 2013, and now cover 98% of the cropland. These Soil management plans are based on the Universal Soil Losses Equation (USLE/RUSLE) equation, calibrated for Uruguay;

(2) **Resilient grassland and cattle management**: a set of technologies is currently under validation at pilot scale, to promote innovative grazing and cattle management practices that increase forage supply from natural grasslands without significant increase in production costs. These technologies have what we call win-win potential: high increase in productivity, increased resilience, soil restoration of degraded lands and increased overall efficiency. A project has just been approved by GEF for Uruguay in order to give continuity to the validation process of these technologies in vulnerable smallholders

initiated with an Adaptation Fund project. We see points in common with the elements presented by Portugal in this workshop, regarding strategies and benefits of soil restoration. We also share the views of New Zealand on the particular characteristics of climate action in Agriculture compared to other sectors.

(3) **Associative irrigation:** Supplementary irrigation aims to cope with present climate variability and future climate change to increase and stabilize productivity, in particular with regard to frequent and intense droughts. Uruguay has deficit of knowledge on supplementary irrigation, as our agriculture is mostly rain-fed. In particular, we lack experience on the institutional arrangements to implement associative irrigation by small and medium size farmers. We find points of contact with what other countries as India has presented on the benefits of irrigation, with the “more crop per drop” purpose. We are aware that many parties have accumulated important experience on this, which we would like to access.

Recalling what we said in the first Workshop: Uruguay is starting its NAP process jointly with other 7 countries in the framework of a global programme with FAO and UNDP. In the context of the NAP process we expect to increase our capacities to assess vulnerabilities and risks and to identify and assess technologies and practices that help managing climatic risks and adapt to climate change. We expect learning from other countries in the process and also sharing lessons learned.

Question 2) HOW PROCESSES UNDER THE CONVENTION FACILITATE THE IDENTIFICATION AND ASSESSMENT OF TECHNOLOGIS AND PRACTICES:

The mandate of SBSTA, established in Article 9 of the Convention is in our view a very relevant guideline for further work in Agriculture and can guide the agenda of SBSTA after the assessment of the four workshops held in SBSTA 42 and 44 (which will occur during SBSTA 45 in November 2016).

In this regard, we think that in SBSTA 45 Parties could consider how to move forward on issues as the ones contained in the statement of the G77 and China: a) Crop and livestock breeding; b) Water management and irrigation, c) soil management, d) grasslands management; e) ecosystem based approaches for adaptation; f) access to integrated technologies for pest and disease including emerging climate change pests and diseases; g) Improve climate information services; h) Enhanced information and knowledge sharing as public goods; i) means of implementation to developing countries for the identification, assessment and adoption of agricultural practices and technologies that increase adaptive capacity and productivity; j) enhance capacity building services for producers; k) risk management systems; and l) participatory and gender responsive approaches to climate actions.

In relation to the above, we consider that among other, it could be useful that SBSTA provide assessment on the following issues that crosscut the literals a) to l) described in previous paragraph: (1) taking stock of the state of the art; (2) identification of indicators to quantify the impact of practices and technologies in terms of both productivity and resilience.

SBSTA could provide advice on the above e.g. through technical papers and promotion of knowledge exchange among Parties.

Question 3: SYNERGIES BETWEEN PROCESSES UNDER THE CONVENTION

It is key for a successful implementation on ground to identify technologies and practices that suit the **national** and **local** needs. So the broad institutional framework under the Convention (Technology Mechanism-CTCN, Adaptation Committee, Nairobi Work Program, etc.) and outside of it (IPCC, FAO, UNDP, UNEP, GRA, CCAFS, among others) should be connected to the national frameworks to reach an effective and efficient adaptation process. In this regard, sharing experiences of adoption and implementation of practices technologies between **countries with similar agroecosystems and similar needs** is of utmost relevance to speed up productivity and adaptation processes

Uruguay would like to emphasize the fundamental role of national and international institutions in the provision of **public goods** that foster the identification, validation, assessment and adoption in the ground of technologies and practices related to resilience, adaptive capacity and productivity. Facilitating access to information and knowledge, through different mechanisms is one of the principal ways to reduce the asymmetries among Parties and move forward in a more equitable manner.

Thank you very much.