

## CSIPM intervention to Agenda Item VI: Empowering Youth in Inclusive and Sustainable Food Systems.

12 October 2022

Thank you, Chair.

I'm Tyler Short. I practice agroecology as a worker on a small-scale family farm, and I am a member of the CSIPM Coordination Committee for the Youth constituency, representing the international peasant movement La Via Campesina.

As Sefu from the CSIPM indicated, our youth working group determined that **there are some positive elements in the policy recommendations**, and we believe that if States actually implemented these relatively good aspects, then **the engagement of youth in food systems could truly improve and expand**.

However, there are also several elements of the policy product that will have the opposite effect - that, if implemented, they will limit youth engagement - and in some cases, they might actually cause harm.

While we **support the adoption of the document**, we cannot do so without communicating our reservations. Following the precedent set during CFS47, we sincerely request support from Member States to include an explanatory note containing our reservations as an appendix in the final report of this current Plenary. Though, due to time limitations, I can only outline a few of these. We have provided a full copy to the CFS Secretariat.

First, the CSIPM dissociates with all textual references to youth "in diverse situations and conditions." This language does not recognize the **diversity of youth**, especially with respect to **multiple, intersecting identities and the identities of persons historically subjected to discrimination based on their sexual orientation and gender identity**. The CSIPM also takes serious issue with the exclusion of **peasants** as a key constituency to be addressed by these recommendations and consulted for their implementation.

Second, the CSIPM notes the great failure of the policy product to explicitly recognize **women's rights**. In addition, we disassociate from the caveats attached to **human rights** in the recommendations, particularly the caveat of "as far as they have been agreed, acknowledged and/or endorsed" before **UNDROP, UNDRIP, CEDAW**, and other human rights instruments as well as the caveat "as applicable" attached to all references to the right of **Indigenous Peoples** to free, prior and informed consent. These caveats make the references inconsistent with international law.

Third, the CSIPM disassociates from language calling for "equitable access" to productive resources, rather than recognizing that youth have **human rights to these sources of life**, including **rights to land, seeds and water** as enshrined in UNDROP and UNDRIP.

Fourth, the CSIPM disassociates from references to "other innovative approaches" that the recommendations situate alongside **agroecology**. In conflating these approaches, the recommendations fail to recognize agroecology's transformative potential..

Fifth, **food sovereignty** – which was central to the HLPE report on youth but not accepted into the final text of the policy product – incorporates various dimensions of youth agency as well as the fundamental importance of human rights for the radical transformation of food systems. The CSIPM therefore

disassociates from the multiple phrases supporting youth entrepreneurship due to the overall lack of balance in the document.

Sixth, the CSIPM dissociates from the weak language on young people's **ownership and control over digital and other tools and their data**. The policy recommendations fail to formulate a conception of innovation that acknowledges diverse forms of social, technical and cultural innovations that support transitions towards **economies of well-being**.

Finally, the CSIPM has serious concerns about the treatment of the **HLPE report** in the negotiation process, in particular the failure to take seriously the HLPE's scientific assessment of the structural challenges for youth engagement and employment.. The CSIPM therefore disassociates from the language describing this policy product as "informed by" the HLPE report. Had these recommendations truly been informed by the HLPE, they would have offered the steps forward for the **urgently needed radical transformation of our food systems**.

In conclusion, we want to reiterate that this was a very challenging process for us. But, Mr. Chair, if I may end on a positive note:

As we celebrate 10 years since the adoption of the Tenure Guidelines, we must underscore the crucial importance of the reference to redistributive reforms in Recommendation 3. As the Guidelines indicate, redistributive reforms are particularly relevant due to **gender-based inequalities** and where a high degree of **ownership concentration** combines with a significant level of **rural poverty** attributable to lack of access to land, fisheries, and forests. Comprehensive and genuine agrarian reforms are necessary to ensure that youth - in all of our diversities - can have a dignified future in agriculture and food systems.

Thank you.