

Agroecological and Other Innovative Approaches

Zero Draft CFS Policy Recommendations

WFP comments and suggestions March 27th, 2020

WFP focal points for this workstream appreciate the consideration and the integration of earlier comments forwarded on 12 February. Thank you.

We found this version much better, broadly in line with the Agenda 2030 but also referring to several recent scientific and policy publications. These efforts are very much appreciated.

More specifically:

Para 2. Three broad food systems under the final report of CFS 44 – it would be good to mention these straight from the beginning so that the reader is clear on what will be developed further.

Para 3. In the second sentence, we think resource endowment is important before engaging in production and we suggest it be mentioned – “Innovations include changes in practices, norms, markets and institutional arrangements, which may foster new networks of **resources endowment**, food production, processing, distribution and consumption that may challenge the status quo”.

We also suggest that innovations be directed to all food system stakeholders, particularly to family farmers. Innovations, which include but are not limited to technologies, must be appropriate to the context, affordable, accessible and respond to the needs of **family farmers**.

Para 6. In the second sentence “Digital technologies, services, products, and skills are fundamentally transforming modern economies and entire systems of production, management, and governance at a rapid pace” – we recommend adding consumption: “...governance, production, management, and **consumption**...”.

Para 7. Very well-articulated. This is something that we should not forget: yes, technology such as digitalization is strongly changing patterns but is it benefitting all in the same way? Do vulnerable people have the capacity to fully take advantage of it?

Section I

“States should” or “states are encouraged”, or “states are recommended to”:

Para 15. The para refers to “protect common natural resources” *But we could also call for the restoration and the preservation of all what could be recuperated.*

Para 17. The idea conveyed is not very clear – do we refer to employment creation through agroecology compared to other intensive approaches?

Section II

Para 20. The para refers to reduce over usage of agrochemicals – this may not meet the agreement of some stakeholders (misuse/mismanagement), so we suggest deleting “over usage”: “Optimize the use of agrochemicals and promote innovative systems that reduce ~~over-usage-and~~ dependency. Strengthen and enforce regulations on the use of agrochemicals in order to protect and improve human, animal and environmental health”.

We recognize the importance of post-harvest losses reduction and its mention in **para 23**. However, it is also largely known that not only such programmes influence availability buy they also add value, that is why we also suggest that these be integrated under the “markets for sustainable food systems” sub-section.

Para 29. We recommend making the para more smallholder sensitive by adding incentives particularly for smallholder farmers: “Promote local, regional and global markets that provide **incentives for smallholder** farmers and contribute to sustainable food systems that ensure food security and nutrition”.

Section IV

We suggest finding room for risks and trade-off dimensions.

After para 37 (or further down)

Undertake risk and trade off analysis associated with transition to sustainable food systems and strengthen risk management mechanisms for diverse stakeholders particularly micro insurance and other financing services schemes for smallholder farmers.

Section V

Para 48. *Strengthen capacity development to* Support the role of smallholder, peasant, indigenous, and family farmers, including women and youth, as central agents in transitions to sustainable food systems that ensure food security and nutrition, including through the progressive realization of the right to food.

It is noted that a specific space has been provided to women and youth, as a special focus group that can make difference in the transition to sustainable food systems. The content is mentioned elsewhere in the document and this sounds like a repetition. Does it make sense to refer to these special groups where it is most relevant?

Para 55. We suggest adding access to production factors as follows “Establish mechanisms to address power imbalances and conflicts of interest in relation to **access to production factors (land, finance, labour)**, food production, processing and marketing, ensuring appropriate consultation mechanisms”.

Next steps

Para 68. We think it should be RBA Responsibility, including WFP, so it should be under CFS and RBA or stand alone and reads FAO, IFAD and WFP.