

Additional CGIAR comment on the Zero Draft on 'Agroecological and other innovative approaches'.

During CFS46 plenary a number of delegates, including regional groups, supported using the recommendations of the HLPE report as the basis for the CFS policy convergence process. The open meeting on 27 January confirmed the general support for this approach; in other words that the HLPE report presented a balanced analysis, and that the 5 recommendations are welcomed. Comments below reflect in part that sentiment.

1. The order of the zero draft headings is different to the order of the HLPE 5 Recommendations, which is fine, but the wording of the Recommendations is changed in some cases, which raises questions. The first zero draft heading reads:

I. Lay policy foundations for transforming food systems to ensure sustainability and enhance food security and nutrition through agroecological and other innovative approaches
States should: etc etc

Not clear why the 'lay policy foundations' could not be followed by the wording of Recommendation 1: PROMOTE AGROECOLOGICAL AND OTHER INNOVATIVE APPROACHES IN AN INTEGRATED WAY TO FOSTER TRANSFORMATION OF FOOD SYSTEMS. More importantly all the recommendations in this zero draft talk of 'states should.....' whereas Recommendation 1 and the other recommendations of the HLPE emphasise the need for a multi-stakeholder approach:

"All stakeholders involved in food systems (including: States, local authorities, intergovernmental organizations (IGOs), civil society and the private sector, research and academic institutions) should learn from agroecological and other innovative approaches concrete ways to foster transformation of food systems by improving resource efficiency, strengthening resilience and securing social equity/responsibility."

Further the CFS has spent considerable effort looking at the merits of the MSP approach to FSN in 2018 and 2019, specifically on the HLPE consultation on the Report – Multi-Stakeholder Partnerships (MSPs). This MSP approach should be (re)-adopted in this zero draft.

2. The second zero draft heading uses the same words as recommendation 2, HLPE:

2. SUPPORT TRANSITIONS TO DIVERSIFIED AND RESILIENT FOODSYSTEMS
States should, etc

I recommend that Paragraph 21 on family farmers, should refer explicitly to the UNDFP.

3. The third zero draft heading relates to HLPE recommendation 5:

III. Strengthen comprehensive monitoring and impact assessments to ensure that innovative approaches support sustainable food systems that enhance food security and nutrition

The wording is marginally different, but the following paragraphs focus on impact assessment, and lack the heavy emphasis of the HLPE on the need to:

‘develop practical, scientifically grounded and comprehensive performance metrics and indicators of agriculture and food systems as a basis for assessment, policy implementation and investment decisions, including total factor productivity of livelihoods, land equivalent ratio multi-functionality of landscapes and ecological footprint of food systems, as well as impacts on beneficial organisms, dietary diversity and nutritional outcomes, women’s empowerment, income stability and employment conditions, as appropriate’

That element is also relevant to paragraph 6 (digital agriculture) of the opening section of this zero draft; and indeed to the CFS-organised seminar on “ bridging the data divide’ on 10 February 2020, and to the CFS work-stream on data collection and analysis tools (mentioned in paragraph 62 on the last page of this zero draft).

4. The fourth zero draft heading is the same wording as HLPE recommendation 3:

3. STRENGTHEN SUPPORT FOR RESEARCH AND RECONFIGURE KNOWLEDGE GENERATION AND SHARING TO FOSTER CO-LEARNING.

But the text focuses on public research, whereas the HLPE states:

‘States and IGOs, in collaboration with academic institutions, civil society and the private sector should: a) increase investments in public and private research and development, and in national and international research systems to support programmes in agroecological and other innovative approaches, including to improve technologies;’

5. The final zero draft heading relates to HLPE recommendation 4 and the different lines taken on the agency approach debated at our open meeting on 27 January.

Dr. Rod Cooke

CFS Advisory Group member, representing the CGIAR System Organisation

26 March 2020