

ROSA Newsletter

Zoom

Looking back at the Cancun Conference Main issues for food security

The 16th Conference of Parties (COP16) of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change met in Cancun from 29 November to 10 December 2010. It succeeded in (i) consolidating the process of UN negotiations that had been badly shaken in Copenhagen in 2009, (ii) integrating the advances acquired by the Copenhagen agreement in a UN decision and (iii) making progress on specific points in the negotiations. Therefore many people consider that the COP16 was relatively successful. For others, however, Cancun confirms that international climate negotiations are running out of steam. Much progress still needs to be made to achieve an ambitious and legally binding international agreement.

This article presents the results of this Conference, and questions the place given to agriculture and food security in international climate talks.

Current status of negotiations

COP16 helped to restore confidence and legitimacy in the UN process. It also took some steps forward, especially by creating institutional measures that needs to be put into operation (see Box N°1).

Nevertheless, the outcome of Cancun is not satisfactory in two areas: the reduction of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and the second period of commitment to the Kyoto protocol. Critical issues related to agriculture in sectoral approaches to mitigation are also absent in the final text.

Box N° 1: Key elements of the Cancun Agreement

- Acknowledgment for the first time in a UN document that temperature increases must be kept below 2°C compared to the pre-industrial temperature;
- Establishment of a process for reviewing the adequacy of this target by 2015, including consideration of strengthening the goal to 1.5°C;
- Recognition of the commitment of developed and developing countries for reducing greenhouse gas emissions;
- Confirmation of the goal that developed countries will mobilise US\$ 100 billion in climate funding for developing countries annually by 2020, and establishment of a "Green Climate Fund" through which much of the funding will be channelled;
- Adoption of the Cancun adaptation framework;
- Launch of a "REDD+" mechanism;
- Establishment of a technology mechanism to enhance technology development and transfer.

Key players in the climate change talks at Cancun

Renewed transparency in the negotiation process made it easier to reach a compromise in Cancun. Mexico, the host country, played a central role in assuring that the process was well organised and transparent.

Some countries also helped to facilitate negotiations. India contributed to break deadlock with new proposals for monitoring actions undertaken in developing countries. A **measurement, reporting and verification (MRV) system** was adopted in Cancun.

Other countries refused to renew their commitment to the Kyoto Protocol as long as major emitters are not bound by similar commitments. Therefore, no consensus was reached on this point.



Box N°2: The European Union position

In Cancun, the EU took a more flexible position than the other industrialised countries that signed the Kyoto Protocol. It accepted a second period of commitment to the Protocol, on certain conditions¹. In 2011, the EU should continue its efforts to achieve a legally binding framework of the Kyoto Protocol.

The continuation of the two negotiating tracks

The **Cancun agreements** adopted at COP16 are the result of discussions within the Ad Hoc Working Group on the **Kyoto protocol (AWG-KP)** and discussions of the Ad Hoc Working Group on **Long-term concerted action** within the framework of the **Convention (AWG-LCA)**².

They maintain both tracks of negotiation (Kyoto Protocol and Convention) that have coexisted since the Bali COP in 2007. So for the moment the Kyoto Protocol survives, but is not off the danger list. More generally, setting up a legally binding framework for combating climate change has been postponed.

Integrating the advances from Copenhagen into the UN process

The Cancun agreements enshrine the gains from the Copenhagen agreement³ in an official UN decision. They recognise the unilateral commitments made by industrialised countries since Copenhagen to reduce GHG emissions. But the commitments are not binding or ambitious enough to deal with the size of the problem⁴.

The COP16 also recognizes the financial commitments made in Copenhagen by industrialised countries. They undertook to commit **30 billion dollars between 2010 and 2012** to support mitigation and adaptation actions in developing countries. This would gradually increase to **100 billion dollars annually by 2020**. However, no compromise was reached on the crucial question of **sources of funding**.

¹ Conclusions of the Council on 14 October 2010.

² Negotiations under the Kyoto protocol involve revising quantified commitments for reducing GHG emissions by countries that signed the Protocol. Negotiations under the Convention involve long-term commitments of countries.

³ The Copenhagen Agreement is not in the category of UN decisions, since it was not adopted by the Conference of Parties to the Climate Convention.

⁴ According to a UNEP report (2010), current commitments by countries to reduce emissions will lead to a global temperature increase of 3.2°C by the end of the century. But according to the IPCC, temperature increases must be kept below 2°C to avoid “dangerous” climate change.

Institutional progress

The COP16 created institutional measures that meet certain demands from developing countries. In particular, a “**Green Fund**” was created to address climate change in developing countries, although the source of funding remains unclear.

In addition, the COP16 reaffirms the vital role of adaptation. It created an **adaptation framework** that aims at coherence and synergy of adaptation actions in order to improve the resilience of socioeconomic systems and ecosystems. The Framework is yet to be put into operation and more details are needed on how it fits with other Convention measures (including the Green Fund).

Box N°3: The Cancun adaptation framework

It will depend on an **adaptation committee**, with the following functions:

- Providing technical support for developing countries;
- Fostering exchanges of experience and synergies between adaptation centres and networks;
- Making recommendations.

The adaptation framework will also include a **specific process for helping least developed countries** (LDC) to draw up and implement national adaptation plans.

The COP16 has also launched a work programme to define the modalities of a **mechanism of “compensation for loss and damage”** associated with climate change impacts (a demand from developing small island states). This would aim to cover very vulnerable developing countries facing extreme climate events, especially when the risks are so high that insurance cannot cover them.

The Cancun Conference also launches REDD+ and provides a framework for its implementation. Social and environmental principles are adopted for the implementation of the mechanism, and will be monitored. However, many issues related to operationalisation, governance and funding of REDD+ remain.

The Cancun Conference also created a mechanism for supporting technology development and transfer in developing countries.

Agriculture, absent from the final decision

The agricultural sector accounted for 13.5% of total greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, the third largest contributor. But it is also the sector that is the most vulnerable to the effects of climate change.

The Cancun text on agriculture

Agriculture was only included in climate negotiations at a late stage. Since 2009, however, it has been discussed as part of “sectoral approaches to mitigation”. In 2010, negotiations on agriculture began again, based on the text that was not adopted in Copenhagen. They focused especially on launching a work programme on the modalities of agriculture’s contribution to mitigating climate change.

At the Cancun Conference, despite relative consensus between countries on the parts of the text about agriculture, no decision was made. This was because discussions stalled on the connection made by the G77 with other sectoral approaches such as maritime and air transport (bunker fuels)⁵.

Rethinking the role of agriculture

Agriculture has a real potential for reducing GHG emissions and adapting to climate change. So, climate negotiations must address simultaneously the problems of mitigation and adaptation, especially vis-à-vis food security.

The inclusion of agriculture in sectoral approaches for climate mitigation would make it possible to support measures enhancing its potential for reducing GHG emissions and low-carbon agriculture. Particular attention should be paid to the strong link between adaptation and mitigation. The negotiating text discussed at COP16 (but not adopted) referred to this point, although insufficiently developed.

Adaptation to climate change in the agricultural sector is not sufficiently taken into consideration in international negotiations. It is not directly addressed as a sectoral approach to adaptation is not under negotiation. Furthermore, the chapter on adaptation in the Cancun decision mentions the role of agriculture and food security – but only in a footnote.

⁵ These subjects were put into the same chapter on sectoral approaches to reducing GHG emissions. The disagreement was on the common preamble, which referred to the “common but differentiated responsibilities” of states.

Lastly, agriculture, change in soil use and deforestation are dissociated in international negotiations. This separation makes it difficult to deal with them as interconnected phenomena. They are, however, inextricably linked, and account for some 30% of global emissions. The interaction between forests and agriculture needs to be strengthened to promote an integrated approach in the fight against climate change.

Including nutrition in climate negotiations

For a long time, nutrition remained outside the scope of international climate negotiations. However, at present it is brought to the negotiating table by international and civil society organisations. Several reports have highlighted the strong correlation between the consequences of extreme climate events on food availability, and also on health and child nutrition. Food and nutrition security is one of the pillars of the resilience of populations facing the negative effects of climate change.

Before and during the Cancun Conference, the UN Standing Committee on Nutrition (SCN) began advocacy to integrate nutrition in international discussions. The SCN asked for the development of adaptation policies and actions, mitigation, technology transfer, etc. in favour of nutrition in developing countries. However, nutrition is still the poor relation in UN negotiations, and for the moment is only discussed by civil society observers and international organisations.

The reaffirmation of the importance of adaptation, on a par with reducing emissions, is crucial. It could make it easier to better take into account the impacts of climate change on nutrition, and the need to enhance food and nutrition security for addressing vulnerability.

Future issues

The Cancun Conference made some progress, but also had some failures. However, it put climate negotiations back on track, and avoided the breakdown of UN negotiations. Agriculture was a victim of compromise, and a decision should be made in 2011 at the COP17 in Durban. As for nutrition, the consideration given in climate negotiations is still not commensurate with the task. The foundations for the future climate change regime were laid. The challenge remains to translate political commitments into concrete actions on the ground.

Views on current news:

The 2011 World Social Forum: Addressing the issue of land grabbing

Ten years after its first edition, the World Social Forum took place in Senegal on 6-11 February 2011. The WSF provides an open platform to stimulate debate, reflection and exchange of experience among its participants (social movements, NGOs and other civil society organisations).

Land grabbing emerged as the hot topic in this year's forum. In this interview, Sofia Monsalve from FIAN⁶ International (Fighting Hunger with Human Rights) shared her insights on the works of the WSF. She raised concerns on initiatives taken at the international level and shed light on how human right tools can be used to support actions against land grabbing.

FIAN was strongly involved in the WSF, in particular in work relating to land grabbing. What do you consider to be the most valuable outcomes?

Land grabbing was one of our main areas of mobilisation in Dakar. A FIAN delegation participated in various activities and worked together with groups of farmers, development, human rights and other organisations. Our aim was to strengthen the building of alliances among the groups struggling against all forms of land dispossession. In that sense, Dakar was a valuable opportunity to share experiences and testimonies from different countries on strategies for facing the threats of land grabbing.

One of the most relevant events was jointly convened by La Via Campesina and the West African Network of Agricultural Producers (ROPPA), focusing particularly on future action. Rural leaders from different countries called for joint actions at all levels and in different fields, including information, research, media outreach and bringing the cases to court.

The launch of the "Dakar appeal" is also a strong outcome of the 2011 WSF. The idea was to build on the joint position of civil society organisations (CSO) developed during the last session of the Committee on World Food Security in October 2010⁷. La Via Campesina and ROPPA, with the

support of FIAN and other organisations⁸ took leadership to facilitate an assembly of convergence. As a result, an **appeal against the land grab** was launched⁹. There was a broad consensus among participants on the need to use all possible tools. The proposal of calling for a moratorium on large-scale land acquisitions was not included in the appeal as more consideration is needed on measures necessary to put it into operation.

What are the main challenges for future action?

FIAN strongly support initiatives at the national and local levels. As mentioned in the appeal, it is important to support communities and organisations that are defending themselves against land grabbing. In Mali for instance, we are collaborating to build an alliance of key stakeholders and working closely with farmers' organisations, some parliamentarians and other CSOs.

At the international level, we strongly support the FAO voluntary guidelines on responsible governance of land and natural resources tenure. This work is not limited to land grabbing. It deals with food and agriculture in a broad and comprehensive framework. Throughout this year, we will continue to follow closely the process of negotiations concerning the FAO guidelines. A draft is likely to be submitted for approval at the next session of the CFS in 2011. It is important to ensure that these guidelines are based on human rights and refer to existing binding international human rights obligations on land and natural resources. These rights will be effective only if legal instruments are implemented at the national and international level to force States to comply with their obligations.

Concerning the World Bank principles for responsible agricultural investment (RAI), FIAN is not of the opinion that the CFS should endorse these principles given that fundamental issues about this instrument, such as nature, content and scope, are deeply inadequate as an international response to land grabbing. The issue points out that not all investment in agriculture can be regarded as a development opportunity.

⁶ FIAN is an international human rights organisation that advocates for the right to food. It is a not-for-profit organisation with a consultative status to the UN.

⁷ During the CSO forum, held prior to the CFS, civil society organisations developed a common position on land issues which was presented to the CFS policy round table. For more information: <http://cso4cfs.org/>

⁸ Friends of the Earth International, CCFD – Terre Solidaire, Peuples Solidaires and AGTER.

⁹ The appeal will be open for the endorsement until March 31.

Agenda

Past events

- **International symposium on food and nutrition security** (7-9 December 2010, Rome): The FAO convened an international symposium to collect and better document evidence that demonstrates the impact and effectiveness of nutrition-sensitive, food-based approaches for improving diets and raising levels of nutrition. The publication “Combating micronutrient deficiencies: Food-based approaches” was launched during the symposium. A booklet that provides a summary and contains the abstracts for each of the 19 chapters is available on ROSA’s library. [>>>](#)
- **The World Social Forum** (6-12 February, Dakar): This forum brings together a wide range of actors from NGOs, social movements and other civil society organisations. In Dakar, about 60,000 people attended the 2011 WSF. The aim is not to build common positions but to promote dialogue between participants. Different workshops, organised by each organisation or by small group of organisations, provide a space for debate, reflection and exchange of ideas. During the two last days, the "Assemblies of convergence" aimed to join forces on common themes. Two themes emerged from the discussions: the migration and land grabbing, often treated in terms of the approach by human rights.

Forthcoming events

- **29 March-1 April:** 3rd European forum on rural development – Palencia (Spain)
- **21-22 April:** Restrictive meeting of the Food Crises Prevention Network (RPCA) - Paris
- **26-27 May:** G8 Summit (France)
- **1 June:** First draft of the FAO voluntary guidelines on responsible governance of tenure of land and other natural resources
- **22-23 June:** Ministerial meeting - G20 Agriculture (France)
- **18-22 October:** 37th session of the FAO Committee on World Food Security (CFS) - Rome
- **3-4 November:** G20 Summit (France)
- **28 November - 9 December:** The 17th UN Conference on Climate Change (COP 17) - Durban (South Africa)

For further information: [Upcoming events](#)

EC's latest news



DEVCO K-Day, a special knowledge sharing event

A one-day event dedicated to knowledge management took place on the 3rd of February 2011 in Brussels. The aim of this event was to raise awareness on knowledge management and encourage the culture of sharing. It provides DEVCO staff from headquarters and delegations opportunities for networking and learning more about how knowledge sharing could increase the effectiveness and impact of working practices and field-level activities.

[>>>](#)

- **3rd European forum on rural development** (29 March-1 April 2011, Palencia Spain): This forum is convened by the European Commission, the Government of Spain and the Global Donor Platform for Rural Development. What kind of rural development should be promoted to tackle food insecurity and hunger? This question will be at the heart of the forum. The main objective will be to share and learn from relevant experiences. A main outcome of the forum will be a priority list of rural development principles and actions that effectively contributes to achieve food security. [>>>](#)

- **European Development Report 2010 now available:** The ERD 2010 “Social protection for inclusive development” was officially launched on 7 December 2010 at the European Development Days, in Brussels. What can be done to build resilience and reduce vulnerability to shocks? According to this report, the answer lies in social protection, which is rapidly becoming a priority in the development agenda, both for donors and local governments. [Read the document](#)

- **Prize Belgian Development Cooperation 2012 “Social determinants of health”:** Financed by the Belgian Development Cooperation, this prize invites young people from the North and the South to take an interest in international cooperation and to stay committed after completing their studies. Students and young scientists can submit a Master's or postgraduate thesis, a Ph.D. thesis or a publication. For more information: <http://www.btcctb.org/en/news/prize-belgian-development-cooperation-2012-social-determinants-health>

New online documents

➤ Nutrition

Achieving nutritional impact and food security through agriculture, USAID - February 2011

The USAID through its project IYCN (Infant & Young Child Nutrition) published a set of resources to help agricultural professionals maximise nutritional benefits. Of particular interest, a fact sheet focuses on the relationships between agriculture, food security and nutrition. It provides examples of what works and what does not, serving as a basis for people involved in the design and planning of projects. A review of experience also summarises project and research experience on food security and nutrition impacts of agricultural interventions in low-income countries. [>>>](#)

Landscape analysis on countries' readiness to accelerate action in nutrition, UN Standing Committee on Nutrition – 2009

The "Landscape analysis" is a WHO-led interagency initiative that has developed a readiness analysis of countries to accelerate actions in nutrition. This issue of SCN News features papers that describe the methodology and country assessments undertaken in five countries that are part of the 36 high-burden countries (Burkina Faso, Ghana, Guatemala, Madagascar, Peru and South Africa). It examines how existing commitment ("willingness to act") and capacity ("ability to act") at country level can be utilised to scale-up evidence-based nutrition interventions and to further strengthen weak areas. [>>>](#)

Situation analysis on fortified complementary foods in Latin America and the Caribbean region, UNICEF – 2006

This situation analysis was conducted to obtain a better insight into the role of fortified complementary foods (FCF) on the child nutrition situation and. It recommends ways to strengthen the formulation, production, distribution and adequate use of these products. It covers a wide scope of countries involved (20), experiences studied (35), and variables and indicators analysed. The study reviews the existing and past initiatives on non-commercial FCF, including a discussion of availability, affordability, awareness, acceptability, and, if information was available, impact on nutritional status, and the support provided in these programs for continued breastfeeding. [>>>](#)

Nutrition agenda setting, policy formulation and implementation: Lessons from the "Mainstreaming nutrition initiative, D. Pelletier et al, Health Policy and Planning Journal - February 2011

This paper presents the findings from studies in Bangladesh, Bolivia, Guatemala, Peru and Vietnam which sought to identify factors that can influence policy making, notably with respect to commitment, agenda setting, policy formulation and implementation. [>>>](#)

➤ Social transfers

Nutritional dimension of the social safety nets in Central America and the Dominican Republic, World Food Programme – April 2010

This report brought together a wide array of experts from WFP, local governments, NGOs, the World Bank, the Organisation of American States (OAS) and the Central American Integration System (CAIS). It examines whether social safety nets have a nutritional dimension and give priority to children under two years, pregnant women, breastfeeding mothers and other vulnerable groups. Based on the analysis of 110 programmes in eight countries, this report provides key lessons learned and a SWOT analysis (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats) of programmes. It suggests concrete actions to strengthen social programmes with a nutritional dimension in the framework of a human rights approach. [>>>](#)

Assessment of graduation from the Programme PNSP in Ethiopia, the IDLgroup, AZ Consult Ethiopia, ODI – August 2010

The Productive Safety Net Programme was launched in Ethiopia in February 2005. It has been linked with other food security programmes (OFSP), particularly household packages through credit, since 2006. The objective of these combined programmes (under the umbrella of the Food Security Programme) is to enable chronically food insecure households to improve their lives and, once they have achieved food sufficiency, to graduate from the PSNP. This assessment provides a review of the experiences to-date of identifying households ready to exit the PSNP. [>>>](#)

➤ External links

Bi-monthly newsletter No. 4, ACF-E Central America – January: Welcome to the first issue of 2011. This interesting newsletter provides an update on project progress and activities undertaken by ACF in the region. To access all publications (in Spanish): <http://www.scribd.com/doc/45005381/Publicacion-es-Online-de-ACF-E-en-Centroamerica>

➤ Training

Nutrition in emergencies short course: A course designed for both nutritionists and non-nutritionists working in relevant sectors (e.g. food security, health, logistics). The course will be held in Chiang Mai, Thailand, from the 23rd May to the 2nd June. For more information: <http://www.nietraining.net/>

Standardized training package (STP) on SMART methodology – ACF Canada: The French version of the STP is now available at the www.smartmethodology.org website.

Network activities

- **ROSA at the DEVCO K-Day:** ROSA's moderating team participated to the session "Communities of practice - Sharing without borders". The idea was to discuss on main challenges faced at different communities of practice and try to collectively provide ideas to address key issues e.g. participation, facilitation, sustainability, monitoring and tools. 35 people participated to this session. Experiences from 4 CoPs (ROSA, Capacity4Dev, CISOCH and electoral assistance) helped identifying the biggest challenges faced by DEVCO CoPs. >>>
- **CD-rom now available:** It contains all the information and resources available on ROSA's website in November 2010. It gives also a direct access to specific information : i) a section containing all the documents (agenda, list of participants, presentations, minutes) relating to regional and thematic seminars organised by the EC during the 2007-2010 period and ii) a selection of key documents representing the basis of EC initiatives for food security. If you are interested in receiving a copy please send an e-mail to EuropeAid-ROSA@ec.europa.eu and/or animation@reseau-rosa.eu

*This bulletin was written by the GRET team in charge of animating ROSA. The network is an initiative of EuropeAid (Unit E6 – Natural Resources in collaboration with Unit G4 – Training and Knowledge Management).
The points expressed do not reflect the official position of the European Commission.*