



## **Fighting Hunger and Solving the World Food Crisis**

### **Recommendations to the EU for the World Summit on Food Security 16-18 November 2009**

CIDSE and APRODEV advocate a just and peaceful world where peoples dignity is ensured and rights are respected; where basic needs are met and resources are shared equitably and in a sustainable manner; where people have control over their own lives and those in power act for the common good. Hunger and poverty are unethical and unjust. It is for this reason that we have a shared commitment to defend and promote the universal right to food. We believe this right can be achieved when the objectives of inclusive participation, poverty reduction and environmental sustainability are met.

In the run up to the World Summit on Food Security, both networks call upon the European Union to improve its policies, accelerate its resource mobilisation and support proposals for a new global food governance structure. An EU leadership role at the Rome Summit requires a combined effort in these three areas. This is a precondition for the Summit to have any meaningful impact on the lives of over 1 billion people who are today hungry and food insecure. We call upon the EU and its member states to use the voluntary guidelines on the right to food as a framework for EU action to respond to the food crisis and achieve MDG-1 by the year 2015. EU action should start by hearing the voices of those suffering from food insecurity. The participation of producer organisations and other civil society organisations working to fight against hunger and poverty must be genuine and effective, from the stage of consultation and reflection to decision-making.

From this perspective, APRODEV and CIDSE are proposing **10 key recommendations**, in the areas of policies, resources and governance:

#### **Better policies:**

##### **1. Focus on small scale producers**

The relative neglect of investment in agriculture over the past three decades and the promotion of various 'modernisation models' of farming has led to an overall neglect of and discrimination against the majority of small scale producers, because they do not have the preconditions to implement the model. For the past two years, however, this trend has increasingly been called into question. Alternative policies are being developed to promote small producer organisations and strengthen their ability to improve production, harvesting, processing, stocking, transport and capacity to negotiate with buyers and other market actors. The EU should support such diversified policies, and particularly focus its policy interventions on increasing farmers' and small producers' engagement in policy development, and on securing their access to productive resources, including land and water, inputs,

**APRODEV** is the Brussels-based association of 17 Protestant development organisations in Europe, that are related to the World Council of Churches [www.aprodev.net](http://www.aprodev.net)

**CIDSE** is an international alliance of 16 Catholic development agencies from across Europe and North America working together for global justice [www.cidse.org](http://www.cidse.org)

credit, insurance, markets and market information, training and extension services. Particular emphasis is required to address the needs of women producers, who play an important role in the rural economy, as well as in meeting household nutritional needs and catalyzing community development. This means that policies have to be adapted to the specific local situation. There is no universal blueprint for agricultural development.

## **2. Support biodiverse and sustainable agricultural systems**

Agricultural practices and policies should do no harm to the environment and should help to preserve and conserve land and water for future use in agricultural production. The EU should prioritise support to agricultural practices based on local agro-ecological systems and involving mixed land use. Whilst the contribution of capital intensive agricultural practices to global warming is significant, small scale farming methods of diversification help farmers to adapt to climate change and reduce environmental degradation. The EU should actively discourage the introduction and promotion of genetically modified crops and seeds. GM crops have not been adequately and independently tested under tropical conditions in terms of their impact on human and environmental health. In addition, the market concentration of large agro-chemical companies and the intellectual property rights afforded to GM crops and seeds create growing dependency by farmers on one type of seed, and prevents them from saving and improving their seeds. Agricultural policies should improve the availability, access and distribution of food, and also help to improve the nutritional content of the diet.

## **3. Regulate agricultural markets**

Far reaching trade liberalisation policies have played a significant role in creating the current state of global food insecurity, and must be reversed. There must be an asymmetric system of trade rules that allows for sufficient policy space for developing countries to develop national agriculture and food security policies. Such rules should allow for various means to protect local food producers from destructive market forces. The proposed provisions on Special Safeguards and Special Products need to be strengthened in trade agreements to make them more effective tools in the food security strategies and in the protection against import surges. These mechanisms should be flexible and easy to invoke for developing countries, and should be included in all trade agreements with developing countries.

## **4. Secure land tenure for producers**

Secure land tenure, especially for women is paramount. The food, climate and energy crises have coincided with a sharp increase in competition for land. Capital rich countries and private entrepreneurs are actively pursuing land concessions/leases in low income developing countries, particularly in Sub-Saharan Africa. Within an increasingly competitive land market for food, animal feed or bio-energy, the right of local people to their land, and local people's livelihoods need to be respected, protected and promoted, in particular the security land tenure of women needs to be improved. The EU should support an International Code of Conduct to regulate land investment and guide the responsible governance of land tenure and other natural resources for the promotion of food security

and rural livelihoods. This should encompass a mechanism of monitoring and implementation. Countries should have the freedom to reserve the ownership of good agricultural land to their domestic family farms, as is the case in some European countries.

### **Sufficient resources:**

#### **5. Upholding ODA commitments**

In Monterrey, the EU and its Member States have agreed to commit 0.7% of GNI to Official Development Assistance (ODA) by the year 2015. In 2005, France, Germany, Italy and the UK agreed to reach the interim target of 0.51% of GNI by 2010. Luxembourg, Netherlands, Sweden and Denmark are currently meeting the required commitment. However, shrinking economies have resulted in decreasing aid budgets. Moreover, shrinking national budgets result in increasing pressure on development budgets. Given the disproportional negative impact of the global economic crisis on least developed countries– with lower exports, unemployment and fewer remittances and private investment leading to an increase in hunger and poverty – it is imperative to maintain and even increase the levels of ODA support from the EU and its member states.

#### **6. Investing in agriculture and rural development**

The relative neglect of agriculture and rural development over the past three decades has led to an under investment in the sector by national governments, international organisations and donor countries. This negative trend is now being reversed. In 2003, African NEPAD governments have committed to spending a minimum of 10% of their national budgets on agriculture and rural development, aiming to reach a 6% sector growth rate by 2008. In 2008, the UN has called for an annual budget of 40 bn US \$ to effectively tackle the food price crisis. The EU has created the 1 bn Euro 'Food Facility'. Last July, the G8 meeting in L'Aquila announced the 'Food Security Initiative' which intends to mobilise 20 bn US \$ for a 3 year period. We oppose the proposal to create a multi-donor Trust Fund to advance agricultural productivity under the auspices of the World Bank.

The EU and its Member States should increase their share of ODA to sustainable smallholder agriculture and rural development to at least 10%, allowing national donor programs, NGO support initiatives and international funds to be adequately resourced.

#### **7. Conversion of agricultural budgets**

Whilst agricultural subsidies in the North have to shrink, the budgets for global food security policies need new resources. Legal avenues have to be explored on how to make contributions to global food security part of the agricultural policy and on how to transfer funds from one task to the other.



## **Better global food governance:**

### **8. A Global Partnership on Agriculture and Food Security (GPAFS)**

The idea for a Global Partnership on Agriculture and Food Security (GPAFS) has been initiated and propagated by the G8. The GPAFS should incorporate the reform of the Rome-based global food institutions such as the Food and Agricultural Organisation (FAO) and the Committee on Food Security (CFS), and should not be used as a way to sideline these reforms or the key role of the UN. The EU should ensure that the FAO, as well as the International Food Aid Convention (to be transferred into a Food Assistance Convention) are an integral part of the new governance structure.

### **9. The reform of the Committee on Food Security (CFS)**

The reformed CFS should be at the heart of a new system of governance of world food security. We welcome the proposal "Draft Four 10<sup>th</sup> Sep. 2009" on the reform of the CFS. For us it fulfils the criteria of an inclusive international and intergovernmental platform of a broad range of committed stakeholders. This should constitute the political pillar of the GPAFS. With regard to the private sector and the philanthropic foundations, their kind of membership should depart from that of the Civil Society Organisations. It is inappropriate to draw up a detailed consultation or coordination mechanism for CSOs/NGOs under the new global food governance structure. They should be free to organise themselves as they see fit.

### **10. The High Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition (HLPE)**

The HLPE should represent the scientific pillar of the GPAFS. The members of the HLPE should be independent of UN organisations, intergovernmental bodies, policy making institutions, and should not have any affiliations with the private sector and the philanthropic foundations. They should be nominated solely in their individual capacities. Its role should be that of an independent monitoring on the fulfilment of promises and pledges, impact assessment and identify emerging issues. The Panel should build on the unique experience of the IAASTD, its research results and methodology of work.

Brussels, 28 September 2009