



Asia Pacific Network for Food Sovereignty

APNFS CONFERENCE on CLIMATE JUSTICE & FOOD SOVEREIGNTY "Transforming the Current Economic Order"



Prepared by the Regional Secretariat
April 2016

Context:

The much hailed Paris Agreement that came out of COP 21 is a historic farce as it freed industrialized countries – the worst polluters of the planet yet least impacted by climate change – from their responsibilities, while leaving the developing countries – the least polluters yet most impacted by climate change – bore most of the burdens of this global problem. Instead of making science and equity guide the differentiated pledges of each nation in cutting carbon emissions, it settled with the ‘Intended Nationally Determined Contributions’ (INDCs), making nation’s pledges voluntary. Hence, it is non-binding. Whatever commitment the head of the most powerful nation in the world made in the COP21, the fact remains: “... the United States is not legally bound to any agreement setting emissions targets or any financial commitment to it without approval by Congress” (U.S. Senate Environment and Public Works Committee Chairman Jim Inhofe). In short, the speeches of the heads of states were plain rhetoric that won’t move a thing unless their politically divided congresses agreed, too.

Indeed, as humanity confronts worsening impacts of climate change and as science continues to provide hard evidence of the need to drastically limit rise in global temperature, the lack of decisive and legally binding commitments and actions within the UNFCCC framework presents an increasing challenge for the people and the global social movements to mobilize and work towards a sustainable, climate resilient and socially just future. There have been rising voices not only in the usual Southern countries but in highest polluting countries like the United States calling for decisive actions and civil disobedience to arrest climate crisis and protect the planet and environment.

To add into the global clamour for social and climate justice, the Asia-Pacific Network for Food Sovereignty (APNFS) held a post COP 21 regional workshop-consultation on March 11-12, 2016 in Malaysia right after the 33rd FAO-APRC Conference. The workshop did interrogate the links between climate change, poverty and food sovereignty and did provide a critical perspective on the emerging strategies and solutions to the climate crisis that are undermining food sovereignty, diversity and sustainability of agriculture and rural ecosystems. The outcome was a set of proposals and actions that guided the APNFS Workplan for 2016.

Objectives:

1. Discuss the links between climate change, poverty and hunger and the solutions being offered which are technologically based such as climate smart agriculture that may exacerbate food insecurity and vulnerability of rural communities;
2. Discuss ways how climate change mitigation mechanisms such as REDD+ and CDM are affecting communities’ access to and rights to land, water and natural resources and identify possible strategies to safeguard rights of vulnerable sectors in the post-COP21 UNFCCC negotiation;
3. Strengthen linkages among members and across networks in Asia Pacific and build cross-sectoral movements for climate justice and food sovereignty;
4. Highlight best practices in agro-ecology, sustainable smallholder farming, renewable energy that provide models for low-carbon sustainable economies.
5. Planning for regional and country-level actions post COP 21.

Topics:

1. Country cases to establish links between climate change, poverty and hunger

There has been considerable knowledge and evidence on the impact of climate change on food security. Countries and communities that have been recently devastated by phenomenally strong weather disturbances such as typhoons have seen increased incidence of hunger and poverty, not to mention an increase in the number of migrants and climate refugees. Yet, the recently concluded climate negotiations didn't recognize the concept of climate justice.

As such, our role as climate justice and food sovereignty advocate has become more vital to continuously pursue the need to build food self-sufficiency and sovereignty of countries and communities, through relevant and genuine climate change adaptation plans, programs and agriculture support policies.

2. Resisting, exposing, and opposing Climate Smart Agriculture (CSA) as a false solution while underscoring the need to promote bio-diversity, food sovereignty and sustainable agriculture

Studies show that agriculture, land use conversion, and deforestation contribute to greenhouse gas emissions. As such, agriculture is increasingly seen as a problem as well as part of the solution to the climate crisis. But such a perspective may also have significant impact on food sovereignty, given that agriculture is crucial to the nourishment of millions of hungry people in the world. Climate mitigation mechanisms and adaptation actions packaged more recently into "climate friendly" agricultural solutions may in fact lead to greater impoverishment and dispossession of the rural poor.

In 2014, the Global Alliance for Climate-Smart Agriculture (GACSA) was launched. The alliance intends to create a global consensus on climate smart agriculture, which is being peddled as a way to build climate resiliency using biotechnologies and innovations that are strengthening corporate control of agriculture and even leading to financialization of agriculture. The Alliance which is dominated by transnational agribusiness interests as well as research institutions long known for their bias to genetically modified technologies and other technological fixes is persistently pushing for "the inclusion of climate-smart agriculture in the main international processes, negotiated texts, declarations and outcome documents." Though the recently concluded Paris Agreement did not use the text CSA, it neither disapproved it wholly as it emphasized technological solutions.

Hence, the need to expose the false solution offered by climate smart agriculture remains an important challenge to us as we push for counter global consensus highlighting just and sustainable solutions embedded in the concepts of food sovereignty and ecological agriculture. Documenting sustainable agriculture and climate resilient farming systems will help inform current review and discussions of work programmes or INDCs of countries that are most vulnerable to hunger in the context of climate change.

3. Analysis of climate mitigation strategies such as the Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD) and REDD plus and CDM that are linked to resource and landgrabbing and human rights abuses.

Despite evidences pointing to large-scale displacement of communities resulting from REDD plus and CDM projects, the current debate is not whether to continue with these mechanism but rather how to improve and develop new carbon market mechanisms. New initiatives like carbon sequestration in soil may lead to large-scale privatization of land by agribusiness companies. There are also cases that REDD plus projects are creating disparities among local farmers and forest users and also undermining existing government policies on land use

These mechanisms allow greater flexibility for high GHG emitters such as the rich industrialized countries and their companies to continue with business-as-usual, while developing countries can offset the former's emissions. While such instruments clearly will not contribute to mitigation, they could even exacerbate social turmoil and inequalities, as carbon sequestration on a massive scale can lead also to large-scale privatization of land and forests.

It is important that such concepts and practices that are presenting new features of commodification not only of land but also of services provided by nature will be discussed thoroughly and relevant policy recommendations drawn up to ensure that the rights of smallholders and indigenous communities are protected.

Case studies on the impact of REDD plus, CDM and other "innovative" carbon market mechanisms will be discussed. Concepts related to carbon trading, payment of environment services (PES) and how these are linked to financialization of nature and its implications on equity, social justice and human rights will also be discussed. Issues like IP and forest people rights should be given focus.

4. Drafting of the APNFS statement calling for meaningful climate actions post COP 21.

A draft statement conveying the messages of civil society will be discussed urging governments to deliver their commitments of more ambitious reduction of GHG emissions through direct and domestic cuts based on historical responsibilities and for new and additional public climate finance that will prioritize adaptation especially of small-scale farmers and their communities. The statement will attempt to provide recommendations to put a stop to false solutions such as climate smart agriculture, REDD plus and new carbon market mechanisms as they not only weaken actions to mitigate climate change but even could harm public health and the environment. It will call for the recognition of international human rights standards as guide to the negotiations, the full participation of CSOs in the official processes, the integration of the concepts and principles of food sovereignty, and the protection of the rights of farmers, settlers and indigenous communities to their land and territories, and the rejection of international treaties, specifically the TPP that gives corporate business control over land, water, and forest resources. The statement will be the guiding framework of APNFS in launching campaigns post-COP 21.

On 11-12 March 2016 in Cyberjaya, Selangor, Malaysia, right after the 33rd FAO Asia-Pacific Regional Conference (FAO-APRC) in Putrajaya, Selangor, Malaysia, 16 member-organizations of APNFS, coming from 8 countries of South Asia (SA) and South East Asia (SEA) had come together to collectively analyze the current and emerging challenges to food sovereignty and climate justice common to the region and from there had come up with action points meant to strengthen the position of APNFS at the center of the struggle for food sovereignty and climate justice in the Asia-Pacific region.



From left to right:

Row 1 -- K.S. Gopal (CEC), Myrna Dominguez (Secretariat), Susan Herawati (KIARA), Iza Muñoz (NMFS), Anil Singh (SANSAD), Sophak Seng (FWN), Hoang Van Hein (HLAC), Ferry Widodo (API)

Row 2 -- Adrian Pereira (PaxRomana/NSI), Ikram Ismail (AB), Ysed Jahangir Masum (CDP), Le Quang Tien (CSRD), Riza Damanik (KNTI), Kariyawasam Thilak (SLNG), Frank Pascual (IRDF)

Participants:

South Asia	Bangladesh	Ysed Jahangir Hasan Masum (APNFS Execom) Executive Director –Coastal Development Partnership(CDP)
	India	Anil K. Singh Executive Director South Asian Network for Social &Agricultural Development (SANSAD) K.S.Gopal Executive Director – Centrefor Environment Concerns (CEC)
	Sri-Lanka	KariyawasamThilak Executive Director – Sri-Lanka Nature Group (SLNG)
South East Asia	Cambodia	Sophak Seng Executive Director – Food and Water Net (FWN)
	Indonesia	M. RizaDamanik (APNFS Execom) President – KesatuanNelayanTradisional Indonesia (KNTI) <i>United Indonesian Traditional Fishers</i> Susan Herawati Monitoring Officer – Koalisi Rakyat untukKeadilanPerikanan (KIARA) <i>People’s Coalition for Fisheries Justice</i> Ferry Widodo Advocacy Officer – AliansaPetaniIndonesia (API) <i>Indonesian Farmers Alliance</i>
	Malaysia	Adrian Anthony Pereira Vice President – PaxRomana& Executive Director – NSI Anne Beatrice Board of Director – North South Indonesia NSI) MohdIkram Ismail General Secretary – AngkatanBahaman <i>Bahaman Youth Peasant Movement</i>
	Philippines	Frank Pascual Board Member – Integrated Rural Development Foundation (IRDF) Iza Gonzales Coordinator – National Movement for Food Sovereignty (NMFS) Myrna Dominguez (APNFS Secretariat) Policy/Advocacy Officer-IRDF
	Vietnam	Hoang Van Hien Chairman – HienLoung Agriculture Cooperative (HLAC) Le Quang Tien Staff – Centrefor Social Research and Development(CSRD)



Day One : 11 March 2016 / Friday
Moderator : M. Riza Damanik, APNFS ExeCom

MORNING SESSION

PRELIMINARIES

Riza, who is one of the three members of the APNFS Executive Committee and also the incumbent President of KNTI – a national organization of traditional fishers in Indonesia, started the Conference by giving a little background on the context of the Conference, reading the objectives from the concept note and expounding each a little. After that, he proposed some adjustments to the program to maximize time to which the body unanimously agreed. Hence, plenary presentations were done spontaneously according to the agreed sequence with the question and answer portion reserved at the end of each session.

Before proceeding to the main parts of the Conference, Riza called on Adrian Pereira, being the host country to welcome the delegates, followed by Ysed Jahangir Hasan Masum, one of the three executive committee members of APNFS to give his opening remarks, and then, a brief self-introduction of all participants which Riza, himself, initiated, followed by Tien of Vietnam, Hien of Vietnam, Sophak of Cambodia, Thilak of Sri-Lanka, Anil of India, Susan of Indonesia, Masum of Bangladesh, Adrian of Malaysia, Ferry of Indonesia, Ikram of Malaysia, Iza of the Philippines, Frank of the Philippines, Myrna of the Secretariat, and Gopal of India. Anne of Malaysia was not able to introduce herself as she was on an errand. Most of the attendees simply gave their names, their organizations and positions in their organizations. Few told their stories as to how they came to the Conference. Thilak was the most ardent in expressing his expectations of the Conference and of the Network in responding to climate change and food sovereignty. On the other hand, Myrna took this opportunity to express her concern regarding the operations of the Network focusing on its communications, coordination, and financial capability building.

Welcome Remarks

Mr. Adrian Pereira

Vice-President of PaxRomana and Executive Director of North South Initiative (NSI)

Adrian thanked Riza and greeted everyone, good morning. He briefly introduced himself as the Executive Director of the NSI and explained NSI's involvement in the technical preparation of the Conference. He noted that it was the first time he fully participated in an APNFS Regional Conference and he was very happy being part of it. He found the Network timely as he noted how international organizations, specifically FAO, and national governments, specifically their government – the Malaysian government, are openly campaigning for pesticides to answer climate change. This was so glaring in the FAO-APRC in which he and other APNFS partners participated in the last four days (March 7-10, 2016). He was so shock, as he saw the pro-corporate technologies exhibited in the PICC – the venue of the

33rdFAO-APRC and as he heard the statements of government leaders convened in the FAO APRC. At the same time, he was also happy seeing many CSO's in that event, struggling to be heard in the plenaries during interventions and to get a meeting with FAO officers.

In this Conference, he was happy to meet different people from different parts of the Asia-Pacific region. One thing he hopes to gain from the Conference is to get more perspectives. Lastly, he took note of the objectives of the Conference saying that he's glad that the Conference defined those objectives. However he also found those objectives complex, saying that maybe "we need complex objectives for complex problems." (To which Masum reacted from his chair: "*We need simple objectives for complex problems.*") To this, Adrian called on all to give all the best for the fight for food sovereignty. He closed his Welcome Remarks by assuring everyone that they will be of assistance to everyone anytime during the Conference.

Opening Remarks

Ysed Jahangir Hasan Masum

Executive Committee Member of the APNFS and Executive Director of the Coastal Development Partnership- an NGO based in Bangladesh.

Masum opened his remarks by greeting everybody, good morning. He expressed his gladness seeing everyone in the Conference, including himself who almost failed to come, as delegates from South Asia had difficulty acquiring their visas. He focused on addressing the objectives of the Conference, reiterating his previous reaction to Adrian saying that "*complex problems need simple solutions.*" This he emphasized is the area on which the Network must focus on – to find simple solutions as simple solutions are more doable than complex ones. To this, he saw the need for more collaboration among APNFS members to learn from each other as he saw learning new simple ways is also a challenge.

Noting the theme of the Conference, he found it too huge for a task. Although on the other hand he recognized that it is really a task to be taken on. He also expressed his view on engagements with policy makers, saying that whatever negotiations that the Network and its members engage with, it should be clear that everything is running for the capitalistic order and that the current economic order is not working. Thus, it should be clear as to what can only be gained from negotiations unless the Conference settles that the struggle for food sovereignty cannot really move forward. As such, he urged the Conference to share the inner feelings of farmers emphasizing what he had learned from his recent immersion with farmers – that farmer have new ideas how to combat the problem of climate change. Masum closed his opening remarks by requesting everybody to have an open-hearted discussion and wishing everyone the best.

DISCUSSIONS

The Conferencetheme: "Transforming the Current Economic Order" offers a great challenge to the Network. To do so requires correct understanding of the neoliberal world economic order as this would put the Network in a correct perspective, thereby enabling it to come-up with correct analysis and position on issues confronting small-scale producers in the region. Hence, the program discussion was opened with the topic: "Food sovereignty & climate justice: Transforming the current social and economic order. Discussed by one of the most ardent anti-neoliberal activist in the region, Mr. Frank Pascual, this topic did sharply set the anti-neoliberal framework of the Conference.

I. FRAMEWORK SETTING

“Food Sovereignty & Climate Justice: Transforming the Current Social and Economic Order”

Frank Pascual

Board Member – Integrated Rural Development Foundation (IRDF)

(An NGO acting as the APNFS Secretariat based in the Philippines)

Political Adviser – PambansangKaisahan ng MagbubukidsaPilipinas (PKMP)

(National Union of Peasants in the Philippines)



Frank provided the anti-neoliberal framework of the Conference by trying to get everyone grasp the present food system and also the response to climate issue. Below are the main points from his discussion.

He opened his discussion by explaining the context of the call for food sovereignty. That it was a response to the WTO's food security framework. Food sovereignty – a term coined by La Via Campesina, asserts that food production mechanisms and distribution should be controlled by food producers, distributors, and consumers and not by market institutions.

To emphasize the dysfunctionalities of the present world economic system, Frank zeroed-in on the glaring ironies of the present world food system:

1. The world food system is very developed. In fact, it can provide more than the humanity can consume – that's the industrial side. The irony of it, billions of people chronically suffer hunger.
2. Food in the biological sense must fulfil a nutritional need. This is the last consideration for the world system today. The concern is the commercial value – How much profit can big corporations gain from the system. It is no longer satisfying the needs of humanity.
3. The system is highly systematized; yet, you have a dysfunctional system.
4. The distribution system is so flawed that it cannot reach the people. We put it 'right to food' and mystified of it, but when you put it in the system, you cannot really satisfy the need because the system is not meant to satisfy that need. This (the food system) is today more than ever controlled by monopolies – big chains. Probably there is still a small traditional food system in our countries but very small. These are the visible manifestations of it but there are other non-visible manifestations of it – being the subject of manipulation.
5. Trade in the world capital market is securitized, lumped together with speculative activities with bonds that are linked with gold, iron and oil --- no relations at all but are included in the security. These have nothing to do with the supply of food or the need of it but they have to cash in on the crisis of food.
6. Another dysfunctionality is the financialization of the food system. Competition policies of the WTO have only levelled the playing field to big companies, not the small farmers. To level the playing field the small farmers have to be subsidized. But this is not the case.

Hence, he stressed that to talk about food sovereignty, it is only possible to do as oppose to capitalism. In short, to achieve food sovereignty is to overturn the whole world production system.

On climate change, he stated that “the COP21 is even worse than the RIO+20. Corporations dominated the discussions and came up with empty promises. For example, the INDC – that one is something that is taken up out of the blue. It doesn’t have the Science behind. The commitments in sum are 2.7degrees decrease in the temperature by 2050 which is beyond the scientifically approved decrease, and the commitments are not even binding. But they promise that will look into it every 5 years... nothing at all, just empty promises.”

On the link between food and climate change, he stated: “There is a link but you cannot reduce food and climate change any other way.Both are rooted from neoliberalism.

On neoliberalism, these were the points he stressed on:

- Neoliberalism is not a policy. It is existing capitalism. This is what they haveto do to continue on and on.
- Neoliberalism is generalized control by monopoly capital all over the world. They have already achieved the fact that the capitalist of the countries have already aligned themselves to the international capitalist monopolist. There is a generalized control over the economy in an intensified manner more than we have before.
- Global value chain – This is neoliberal also. There are many sub-contractors but they are all under control by big monopoly. Big monopolies have nearly control of all aspects of economy.
- Agriculture is actually increasingly brought into control of finance capital.

Therefore, Frank synthesized: “Big issues confronting us have to be linked to the struggle against neoliberalism -- an international system that has been so strong. The movement for sovereignty and independence is completely decimated by the neoliberal in the theoretical spheres. There are some resistances not from academia but from the ground. This is actually what gives us hopes. We have to produce a movement capable of overthrowing a system that is well-entrenched--- an anti-neoliberal movement. Take the case of Bolivia: Small strikes of cocoa producers have become a national phenomenon even if it is not directed nationally. There were more struggles that engulfed the whole of Bolivia. The opportune moment came during the elections and they put a candidate (Evo Morales, a leader of a coca-growers union) and they won. But so, Morales cannot do the transformation because the military is of the neoliberal class. This is just to illustrate the process in which all of us can participate.”

II. COUNTRY REPORT

“Situations of Poverty, hunger, and Climate Resiliency”

This part of the program was meant to gather concrete experiences from the ground in order to understand the current situation of the agriculture and fishery sector in the region. Particular interest was to investigate the impact of neoliberal policies, programs and treaties on the lives of small food producers and on the development of agriculture and fishery. Congruently, this was also meant to assess the intervention of civil society organizations, specifically the member organizations of the APNFS as to their impact on the sector and on the development of agriculture and fishery in their specific countries. Results of which served as bases for the APNFS 2016-2017 Workplan.



Hien Van Hoang
VIETNAM



Adrian Pereira
MALAYSIA



Sophak Seng
CAMBODIA



Kariyawasam Thilak
SRI-LANKA

Country presentations were done for about 15 to 20 minutes each, mostly with the aid of a power point¹. Following the order of presentations, Hien Van Hoang – the Chairman of Hien Loung Agriculture Cooperative (HLAC) did the presentation for Viet Nam, Adrian Pereira of PaxRomana and North South Initiative(NSI) for Malaysia, Sophak Seng of Food and Water Net (FWN) for Cambodia, KariyawasamThilak of Sri-Lanka Nature Group (SLNG) for Sri-Lanka, Iza Gonzales of the National Movement for Food Sovereignty (NMFS) for the Philippines, Ferry Widodo of AliansaPetani Indonesia (API) for Indonesia, K.S. Gopal of Center for Environment Concerns (CEC) for India, and Ysed Jahangir Hasan Masum for Bangladesh. Presentations focused on country situations of poverty, hunger, and climate resiliency with particular emphasis on countryside and agriculture.



Iza Muñoz
PHILIPPINES



Ferry Widodo
INDONESIA



K. S. Gopal
INDIA



Ysed Jahangir
Hassan Masum
BANGLADESH

Country presentations show common and interrelated challenges to small-scale food producers. Most prominent of which is the issue of resource grab, specifically land, water, and forest by corporate business. Grabbing is being done primarily by corporate business and facilitated by country government themselves in the guise of development and climate mitigation and adaptation. Prominent cases of land grabbing for agri-business can be seen in the Philippines, Indonesia, Malaysia, and Sri-Lanka; many cases of forest grabbing in the guise of climate mitigation and adaptation or the so-called false solutions specifically REDD+ can be seen in Indonesiaand the Philippines;a trans-boundary case of water resource grabbing for mega hydropower damas alternative energy source is noted in the Mekong River – the 7thlongest river in Asia running from the Tibetan Plateau through China’s Yunnan province, Myanmar, Laos, Thailand, Cambodia, and Vietnam; and sea grabbing by big corporate business for tourism and other projectsis cited in Sri-Lanka.

Resource grab by corporate business is seriously threatening food sovereigntyas it has violated the basic rights (land rights, tenurial rights, right to access and use of resources) of the most vulnerable small-scale food producers (farmers, fishers, hunters)displacing,dispossessing, and disempoweringthem,who are in fact feeding majority of the people and whose lives and livelihoods depend on these natural resources. Worse, it has also converted the use of these resources from food production to non-food

¹ All Power Point Presentations can be viewed at and downloaded from the APNFS website: www.apnfs.info

activities like tourism, alternative energy production, industrial use, and others thus further jeopardizing food security in the region. Added to this, the conversion of resource use by corporate business has aggravated environmental pollution and further disturbed ecological balance which in the end has damaged the livelihood and habitat of small-scale food producers. It is worthy to note that it has always been the small food producers who are often worst impacted on by natural calamities brought about by worsening climate change. But despite their crucial role in ensuring safe, healthy and sufficient food production and the increasing challenges they are facing today, government policies and programs have neither become supportive of them. If ever there is a good policy and program for small-scale food producers, just like in Indonesia, this has not benefitted them due to inefficient implementation. Actually as governments are tied to neoliberal FTAs, small-scale food producers in Southeast and South Asia are generally not protected and supported by their governments. In fact, though Southeast and South Asia are basically comprised of agricultural countries, agriculture in these two sub-regions is actually less attended to by governments.

The increasing apathy by governments to small-scale producers which comprise majority of the region's population has pushed them further down to the bottom and excluded them from development. Hence, poverty, hunger, inequality, and mal-nutrition remain a glaring reality. Worse, cases of modern slavery are reported in Indonesian corporate fishponds. This is exacerbated by gender discrimination in labor wage.

These sad realities in agriculture have greatly discouraged today's youth to farm. Aware of the triple burdens (government apathy, climate crisis, gender discrimination) small-scale farmers bear, the youth today even those of farmer origin has chosen to abandon farming and went into more lucrative economic activities promoted to be globally competitive. Resultantly, farmers now are ageing which means no one will replenish them to continue their role in food production. Hence the conference resolved to give special attention to youth. With an ageing population of farmers, it would be important to engage the youth especially children of the farmers regarding the crucial need for them to continue small farming of their parents, rather than give the responsibility and control of food production to profit-oriented corporate business.

Committed to food sovereignty and climate justice and to uplifting the conditions of small-scale producers, APNFS member organizations carry-out programs and services promoting sustainable agriculture/organic family farming (Vietnam, Philippines, Indonesia, Malaysia, India, Sri-Lanka, Bangladesh), agro-ecology (Indonesia), paddy rice selling group (Cambodia), system of water for agricultural rejuvenation (India), developed a data gathering tool on the smart phone in order to collect data directly from small farmers with regards to the usage of pesticides (Malaysia), and building local movements for food sovereignty (Philippines, Indonesia, Malaysia, Sri-Lanka, India, Bangladesh). These efforts garnered positive results for some, and still struggling for most.

In sum, the worsening condition of small-scale food producers and food producing countries in the Asia-Pacific region has not only revealed the devils unleashed by the neoliberal world economic order, but has also further confirmed the relevance of the APNFS as a regional network for food sovereignty. In fact, on the ground APNFS members continue to struggle for food sovereignty, climate justice, and social protection for small-scale food producers.

AFTERNOON SESSION

Riza commenced the afternoon session with a synthesis of all the morning presentations, especially the country reports.

Synthesis:

Riza summed-up the country presentations stressing on the two major challenges the region's small-scale producers are facing: First is the glaring dominance of neoliberalism through regional and international agreements being imposed nationally and its negative impacts on the food production system as can be seen in the worsening situation of small-scale producers and the food system itself as country reports similarly presented; and the second one is the worsening climate change as effected by the big corporate business' over exploitation of the world's natural resources yet it's the small-food producers that are usually worst hit. These challenges however are not left unchallenged as small-scale producers and communities continue their struggle with their land, ocean, and forest, and as various initiatives to address sustainable food production such as agro-ecology, family farming, organic farming, and the like can be seen in Vietnam, Cambodia, India, Philippines, Indonesia, and more. But at the same time, regional and national decision making bodies still promote false solutions in various ways even after the COP 21. Furthermore, other serious issues threaten the region specifically the TPP.

Open Forum:

Issues raised as to what had been discussed in the morning were as follows:

- On the COP 21, Masum raised his observation as to the failure of the civil society to bring on board the issue of food sovereignty in COP 21. He suggested that it could also be a good strategy to bring to the attention of governments the good practices being done on the ground. This would help enable governments see both sides and thus help them see the CSO cause, instead of sticking on the debate.
- On Frank's presentation, Anil raised the paradox of democracy. Reiterating Frank's statement that the problem is not the lack of food but the dominance of finance capital over the food system, he raised the question of democracy which he said was believed to be the answer to the problem, yet all these problems happen under democracy: "Governments can be bought by corporations; people's protests and movements are allowed not to listen to their demands but just to quench their anger; climate change has been an agenda for the last ten years yet until now there is no roadmap as to how alternative energy could be possible; now they talk about organic farming yet they also allow agro-chemical companies."

Frank's response:

"The problem is the cognition of facts. Democracy is equated with market economies which should not be, because they are the least democratic. In fact, even capitalism claims that it's the only democratic system. There needs to have some review as to the understanding of democracy."

"Democracy would ideally be a democratic system that allows the participation of the people, not representative democracy or even electoral democracy. There is also the need to re-

conceptualize democracy.” Frank explained this by taking the case of Cambodia’s collective selling scheme, saying that “traders are much powerful than a thousand peasant individually not possessing anything but if they bond together they can overturn the movement.” This, he stressed, “is not about technique of cooperative but about the democratic principle, which is lacking in the so-called alternative thing discourse.”

Frank further went into specifics citing the case of the Philippine wherein the son, Bong Bong Marcos, of the deposed late dictator Ferdinand Marcos is running for Vice-presidency and how the elite is controlling the media and the Internet as their highway of lies. This is to stress the so much control of the system over people’s lives and thinking. Thus there is the need to overturn the whole thing and start from below.

From here, Frank focused on the task of APNFS, stressing that “the function of APNFS as a network is to be able to see the big picture. What should we do in a trajectory that is regional? For example, what do we see of ASEAN? ASEAN is a monopoly. Therefore, there is the need to raise our consciousness to fight this system at a regional level. It is where that APNFS amplifies the strategy.”

What to do? Frank said: “It is a very strategic undertaking. No one can predict the future but what we want to do is to de-legitimize the context of the current system. This system is wrong! But in order to do that, we must do our part starting from our villages on the ground with issues people can understand and then raising their awareness that we have a global monopoly controlling every aspect of our lives that we must fight collectively.”

□ More questions to Frank on democracy and the task to delegitimize corporate control over people’s lives.

- Definition of democracy:
A democracy based on the level of producers in the community level. Then, it goes-up the line until democratically chosen by society. Representative democracy has simply failed the people.
- Model of democracy:
There is no model now, not even China now which even abandoned socialist principles and even Vietnam. Some models to think about from available literature now: radical ecological democracy in India, direct democracy starting from the villages, Beun de Vier (we’re all living well). Norway’s sample of democracy which is entirely different from that of the US is also a good model to study. CSO parameters can be added. But definitely, it is not election. It cannot be now. Even good elections cannot overthrow this current question.
- Changing the system:
While we cannot still change the system, we can have schemes from the ground. For example, peoples in the community can do what they do, because the system cannot fully control communities. There is a democratic power capable of overthrowing the system.
- Delegitimizing undemocratic institutions (i.e. ADB, ASEAN):

Our first task is to tell the people not to listen to this people. But even among us, we have lots of things to study among ourselves. We should also examine our own thinking about many things. One way that could be done to promote sustaining peasant agriculture which under WTO is wiped out. Preserve small peasant agriculture today. This is one way of countering the policy.

- Observations on CSO engagements with regional institutions:
 - CSOs are also becoming part of the process.
 - CSOs are becoming dependent on funding from financial capital that is being course through the private sector, institutions. What is being left out is the tradition of activism that is reliant on what is common among those fighting the system.

III. CASE STUDIES

A. Situation of Small Farmers in Indonesia in the Context of Climate Change and Strategies for Building Climate Resiliency



Ferry Widodo

Policy Officer – AliansaPetani Indonesia (*Alliance of Indonesian Farmers*)

The situation of small farmers in Indonesia in the context of climate change to Ferry's presentation is no different to the situations of small farmers in other parts of the region as shared by participants from South and South East Asia. Of the too many problems (i.e. limited access to land, limited access to resources, heavy use of fertilizers, control of seed by corporate business specifically by Monsanto and Cargill, increasingly aggressive land conversion, lack of protection and empowerment for farmer, lack of government support to and legislation for climate change mitigation and adaptation) confronting small farmers in Indonesia, the most crucial is the aggressive land conversion which has displaced many farmers. Every year 100 thousand hectares of land are converted into housing function, industrialization and infrastructure projects like roads, etc. In fact only in a year time, land conversion has lessened the number of farmers to about 80,000.

On the other hand, the continued heavy use of fertilizers and corporate seed by many farmers remains, as the Indonesian government fully subsidizes corporate fertilizers and seeds. In fact, the Indonesian Ministry of Agriculture's three priority program covers the increased production of 3 commodities: corn, soya bean, and rice in collaboration with two of the world's largest chemical companies – Monsanto and Cargill. Such program, according to Widodo, does not do any good to small farmers. But to ensure farmer's cooperation, the government would give them more seed that would be good for additional planting season. These seeds as the government claims are good for climate change mitigation.

The lack of social protection for small farmers further puts them to a disadvantage position. Though there is a policy granting farmers social protection, its poor implementation or non-implementation has

denied them its aimed benefits. One important case is the lack of protection of the rights of small farmers to their traditional seeds. Though the Constitution grants farmers the freedom to use, breed, and disseminate to fellow farmer their traditional seeds, this is not being followed because the government is tied to Monsanto and Cargill. In the end, farmers are left open to prey by big corporate business that the government entered into contract with.

Given this situation, API works with small holder farmers and with them has developed a system of farming that is climate resilient suitable to their capacity and need. API came-up with four strategies for building climate resiliency, such as the promotion of natural or organic farming, the promotion of family farming, the campaign for agro-ecology, and policy-advocacy for the protection and empowerment of small-holder farmers.

API promotes natural or organic farming because it can be implemented by small-holder farmers not only because of its simple and very affordable requirements but also because of the rich traditional knowledge of organic farming that small-holder farmers possess. Also, Indonesian culture is actually too close with organic farming, making it very acceptable not only to small-holder farmers but to Indonesians as a whole. In fact, the organic farming culture of Indonesia was only put behind starting Suharto's regime and onwards due to the IMF-WB induced Green Revolution program.

On the other hand, family farming as defined by API is totally different from that of FAO's. To FAO, family farming is essentially family-based agricultural activities linked to several areas of rural development such as farming, fishing, aqua-culture, forestry, and pasturing. To FAO, family farming is simply a means of organizing these rural-based economic activities. In short, whenever these activities are managed, operated, and labored by the family regardless of the size and magnitude of the activity, then it is considered family farming. But for API, the size and magnitude is the crux of the matter. For API's definition, family farming is a term exclusive to small-scale/ small-holder farmers, which means farmers with 0.3 to 0.5 hectare land to work on and to be developed cooperatively by the farmer and his family.

Though it is small, family farming represents a sector of strategic value because of its economic, social, cultural, environmental, and territorial functions. The women and men engaged in family farming produce 70% of the world's food. Family farming is the basis of sustainable food production aimed towards food security and food sovereignty, of environmental management of land and its biodiversity, of the preservation of the important socio-cultural heritage of rural communities and nations.

API also campaigns for the promotion of agro-ecology farming system because of its sustainability. It is never ending and consistent. Both livestock and plants grow naturally. With agro-ecology, farmers do not simply plant and nurse naturally, but they also give plants, animals, and soil the right to live. Basically, the need of plants and animals are the same as human's. They need food, water, clean air, sun shine, and proper habitat to grow and live properly.

Actually agro-ecology is not a new concept. In fact, others are doing it without naming it agro-ecology, as can be seen from the presentations of Vietnam and India. What they do actually is API's definition of agro-ecology. In Indonesia however, agro-ecology has to be emphasized. This is to stop farmers from using chemical fertilizers and corporate business seeds. Essentially, this campaign is also meant to thwart Monsanto and Cargill's profiteering from Indonesian farmers and agriculture.

All these three strategies only reaffirm the science of maintaining life cycle in the eco-system. For instance, organic farming makes use of the surrounding to nourish the soil and the plants. In the same way, agro-ecological farming does not need synthetic ingredients to make farming inputs. Farmers can make their own inputs from their surroundings. For example, garden herbs such as ginger, curcuma, garlic and others are source of Phosphor(P) to plants; leaves from the environment are source of Nitrogen (N); kitchen wastes, like dust, are source of mineral ingredient of fertilizers (potassium, K); coconut water is a source of organic solvent and minerals in liquid fertilizers; and gregs from tofu or soyabean fibers can be used as animals' feed (goat, sheep, cow, rabbit). They also make use of natural material from surroundings to feed fish in ponds. In short, zero waste farming system is the principle that guides this farming system.

These natural inputs are used to to enrich and make the soil healthy to provide proper habitat for plants and animals to grow healthy. Healthy soil will produce healthy plants and food for human. Healthy food will make human's digest healthy, it then make people healthy. Farmers are also able to be self sufficient to provide their inputs and not depend on corporate chemical industries. But to be able to do this, cooperation and networking among farmers, and researchers is important!

Another natural practice of farmers is the use of the calendar *pranatamangsa* by the people in Java. This calendar guides them as to when to plant, and when to harvest. According to Javan farmers, following this calendar helps them to adapt to climate change. Hence, these interventions are both farmer and climate-friendly.

To further prove his point, Ferry also shared their positive experience with agro-ecology.² API keeps on telling its members that to have good quality and good quantity of produce agro-ecology is the key. For API, agro-ecology is the alternative approach to climate mitigation and adaptation.

Additional input from Riza Damanik:

Recent policy in Indonesia: village law--- a 1B rupiah for every village meant for infrastructure development. This will destroy the autonomy of villages. At present, 60% of Indonesian villages are under infrastructure and 40% are with infrastructure but without markets. If 100% go to infrastructure, it would be a waste of money.

Related to this, oil palm companies are invited to invest in any part of Indonesia to strengthen infrastructure especially in remote areas. But now, private companies could come in with a ready infrastructure built by the government using public funds.

² To view the pictures for this part of the presentation you may check Mr. Ferry Widodo's power point presentation that is uploaded in the APNFS website.

Open Forum:

- On the question of agriculture as science:
Agriculture is also a science as you need scientific understanding to achieve productivity. The science of agriculture has become much pronounced today because of climate change. Hence, understanding ecological balance has become part of understanding agriculture. Added to this, there are the different models of agriculture being researched today in order to address the rising problem of climate change, so we also have what we call climate-resilient agriculture referring to seeds, system of farming, etc.
- On the relevance of the term small-scale farming:
Scale is not irrelevant in farming as one cannot plant beyond 2 hectares using traditional tools. Small-scale is a feature of family farming not only because of technology, but more about the economic relations. Meaning the commodity aspect of food production is still present --- That is the context of sufficiency in it. This also is to differentiate subsistent farming from modern farming, for example, family farming in the US which is in a very totally different context. So to avoid mixing-up everything, small-scale farming does not simply refer to the size of the land being tilled but also of the economic relations.
- On the definition of agro-ecology:
Modern farming is not agro-ecology. Its system is completely at odds of ecology because it is mainly done for the market. In contrast, small scale farming must be ecological simply because of its scale. That's why scale is not superfluous. Farmers use limited agro chemicals but they are not mechanize that's why labor productivity is also low.

B. Fisher Folks and Women Issues and Challenges in Indonesia



Susan Herawati

Monitoring Officer - Koalisi Rakyat untuk Keadilan Perikanan (KIARA)
(People's Coalition for Fisheries Justice)

Ms. Susan started her presentation by giving an overview on the number of people involved in the fishery sector using FAO's data.

Data from FAO (2014) reveals that in 2012, at least 58.3 million people in the world are involved and depended on fishing both capture and aquaculture. Of this, 37% work full-time in fishing, 23% work only part-time, while the remaining 40% simply consume fishery resources. At least 84% of people in Asia work in fisheries sector in capture and aquaculture in Asia. Those who work in aquaculture comprise 32% (18.9 M) of which 96% comes from Asia, 1.6% from Africa, and 1.4% from Latin America and the Caribbean. Of the total number of people comprising the fishery sector, 47% are women whose involvement starts from fishing, processing to marketing, yet their contribution is far from being recognized.

In Indonesia, the fishery sector is made up of fish farmers, salt farmers, and fishermen. Each sector bear different burdens caused both by structural problems and climate change. Fish farmers' condition is not different from that of small-scale farmers in terms of resource use, access and control, and also in terms of voice in policy-making. Just like the small-scale farmers, fish farmers have limited land that can be used. Palm oil plantations have expanded their businesses to coastal areas and small islands thereby denying many fishers of their fishing areas. For example in North Sumatra, the expansion of oil palm plantation has destroyed 75% (62,800 hectares) of coastal area, leaving the mangrove forest to only 25%. Mangrove forest is very important to the preservation of communal fishing grounds. Yet, mangrove trees in coastal areas are being degraded causing coastal communities to become more vulnerable to calamities and to have lesser catch as mangroves serve as fish breeding sanctuary.

On the other hand, the salt farmers are being marginalized due to the importation policy of the government. The Ministry of Commerce issued the Regulation of the Minister of Trade No. 125 / M-DAG / PER / 12/2015 as an amendment to Regulation from Ministry of Commerce No. 58 / M-DAG / PER / 9/2012 on Imports of salt. This in effect has prioritized the importation of salt both for consumption and industrial use. So instead of supporting the local salt farmers, with this law/policy, the Indonesian government has essentially abandoned them. Salt management in Indonesia involves four ministries, namely the Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries to improve the quality of people's salt), the Ministry of Industry to collect data on the number of national salt production and provide recommendations for imports, the Ministry of Commerce to issue import licenses for salt, and PT. Garam – a state-owned enterprise in-charge in producing the state budget based on the mandate to absorb salt from the peoples.

Fishermen on the other hand are in danger at sea without any social protection. Numbers of fishermen have been lost in the sea without being found. Yearly data show that the number of fishermen lost in the sea get bigger with 86 in 2010, 149 in 2011, 186 in 2012, and 225 in 2013.

Below is a tabulated presentation of the problems that small-scale fishers face until now.

No	Problems	Note
1	No recognition of fisher women's existence and roles	The state does not politically recognize the existence of fisherwomen and because of this, there is no social protection scheme and empowerment for fisherwomen.
2	High production cost	70% of cost production is spent for fuel 65% of cost production for fish/shrimp farmer is spent for feed
3	Lack of Technology Intervention	No intergration of business system in fisheries causing the loss of chain for small scale activity starting from pre-production; small scale fisheries community still faced lack of technology intervention
4	Low price while selling the catches	Lack of information access to the market denying small scale community options in deciding quality and selling price of their catches/farm.
5	Lack of capture and ponds area	Uncertainty in the property rights of traditional fisher folks, fish farmers, fisher women in their fishing and pond area

6	Lack of Documentation of capture/aquaculture	No documentation of capture result/aquaculture in small scale community preventing them to actively involve in the international fish trade chain which requires good documentation and update
---	--	--

As stated above, fisherwomen plays an important role in the fish production value chain that they are called the nation's protein heroes with fish as a rich and affordable source of protein. There is no clear definition of fisherwomen but KIARA defines fisherwomen as those women who are involved in any fishing activity or live in coastal area doing pre-production and post-production.

The role of fisherwomen is very important in Indonesia's fishing and salting activities. KIARA's Data and Information Center noted that fisherwomen actually contribute 48% to fisherfolks' family income. Also fisherwomen work 17 hours a day in captured fishing and 15 hours a day in aquaculture. Aside from their contribution in ensuring production, fisherwomen are double burdened. The society made them responsible in ensuring the nutrition of their families; they protect the coastal ecosystem; and they are at risk of becoming widows. Aside from these, fisherwomen working in salt, shrimp ponds, and processing industry are paid below the minimum salary and compared to their male counterparts.

In its study, KIARA found the significant role fisherwomen contribute in the value chain of fishery starting from pre-production to marketing. First in pre-production, fisherwomen prepare lunch for fishermen at sea. Second in actual production, some of fisherwomen even get involved in actual fishing at the sea. Third in processing, fisherwomen have a big role in processing caught fish and coastal resources. Fourth in marketing, the role of fisherwomen is very important in terms of sorting out, cleaning, and selling caught and cultured fish. Hence in the 14th Trading Fish Meeting held by FAO Fishery, the UN asked all member-countries to:

1. Review the role of fisherwomen in the fishery sector, both in catch fish and aquaculture
2. Record the amount and distribution of fisherwomen
3. Formulate specific regulation to recognize and protect fisherwomen

However, since the establishment of the Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fishery 14 years ago and until now, there is still no space for the political recognition of fisherwomen/women fish and women salt-farmers. Indonesia fisherwomen need a room to share, to fight and to be as one family. Thus on 2010, KIARA initiated in Liwuto Island, Bau-Bau, Southeast Sulawesi an equality receptacle struggle named *Persaudaraan Perempuan Nelayan Indonesia* (PPNI) or Indonesian Fisher Women Sisterhood and formally established it in Wisma PGI, Jakarta on May 2014.

KIARA's advocacy for the recognition and empowerment of fisherwomen is guided by an international agreement – the CEDAW which upholds 10 fisherwomen's rights:

1. Right to work
2. Right to health care and safety is good
3. Right to access and get a decent education
4. Right to social security
5. Right to receive training and education (formal and informal)
6. Right to organize and set up a cooperative as a container struggle equality
7. Right to participate in all community activities
8. Right to obtain credit fisheries, marketing services, and technology
9. Right to land

10. Right to acquire houses, sanitation, electricity, water and transport.

The Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries in the Context of Food Security and Poverty Eradication obliges states to treat women fishermen/farmers /farmers in a special salt to get 11 basic rights, namely:

1. Adequate housing
2. Safe basic sanitation and hygiene
3. Safe drinking water for both individuals and households
4. Other sources of energy
5. Savings, credit and investment schemes
6. Recognizing the existence and role of women in small-scale fisheries value chain, especially post-harvest
7. Creating the conditions are free from discrimination, crime, violence, sexual abuse, corruption, and abuse of power
8. Eliminate forced labor
9. Facilitate the participation of women in work
10. Gender equality following CEDAW
11. Development of technology for women working in small-scale fisheries sector.

The House of Representatives (DPR) of the Republic of Indonesia includes the draft Protection and Empowerment of fisherfolk in the National Legislation Program (Prolegnas). On development, the title of this bill has been changed into a bill Protection and Empowerment of Fisherfolk, Fish Farmers and Salt Farmers.

In the draft Protection and Empowerment of Fisherfolks, Fish Farmers and Salt Farmers versions of the Parliament, dated August 27, 2015, fisher women/ farmers / salt farmers have not received the political recognition on their constitutional rights. The impact was that, there's no special scheme for women's protection and empowerment. Hence, PPNI continue to urge the Indonesian Government to give fisher women political recognition. For example, it submitted a petition --- "The State Must Give Political Recognition and Fulfill Constitutional rights of Fisher Women." Other than the legal framework, PPNI also urged fisher women to build local economy alternative in their areas in order to face extreme weather and to encourage them to become independent.

Ms. Susan ended her presentation by quoting Simone De Beauvoir to answer the question: What's wrong with women movement? *"They have gained only what men have been willing to grant; they have taken nothing, they have only received. The reason for this is that women lack concrete means for organizing themselves into a unit which can stand face to face with the correlative unit. They have no past, no history, no religion of their own; and they have no such solidarity of work and interest as that of the proletariat... They live dispersed among the males, attached through residence, housework, economic condition, and social standing, to certain men — fathers or husbands — more firmly than they are to other women."*

C. Interrogating REDD/REDD+ and New Carbon Market Mechanisms: Case Studies of Human Rights Violations and Dispossession in the Philippines and Vietnam



REDD and Resource Grabbing: Implications on Indigenous People's Rights

Iza Muñoz

National Secretariat – National Movement for Food Sovereignty (NMFS)
PHILIPPINES

Iza's started her presentation by giving first the background of the study saying that the study was in fact presented in the Kyoto Conference last December 2015. It covers two country studies: Indonesia and Philippines. But she will only deal with the Philippine case as somebody from Indonesia will discuss Indonesia. Her presentation was outlined as follows: Defining REDD, Philippine policies following REDD, and then the impact of REDD projects on the indigenous communities and peoples in the Philippines.

What is REDD+?

REDD programme (Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation) was first introduced in the Bali COP meeting under the UNFCCC in 2007. COP15 in Copenhagen saw the role of incentives for such initiatives through funding mechanisms from developed countries. UN-REDD Programme was then established in 2008 to facilitate global REDD-plus initiatives. It was further expanded to include conservation, enhancement of forest carbon stocks and sustainable management of forests in Cancun COP in 2010 – REDD PLUS.

REDD is emerging as a global consensus. Proofs to this were the opening of "Forest Carbon Partnership Facility" by World Bank and the embarking on REDD by South east Asian countries like Indonesia, Cambodia, Vietnam, and Philippines with support from donor governments, UN-REDD, and WB.

What is the Philippine National REDD+ Strategy?

The Philippine National REDD+ strategy has 4 major components: 1) enabling policy; 2) governance; 3) resource use, allocation and management; and measuring, reporting and verification; and 3 cross-cutting strategies: 1) research & development; 2) communication & capacity building; and 3) sustainable financing.

Enabling Policies for REDD+: Philippines

Philippine National REDD+ Strategy

- "a bottoms-up, multi-stakeholder approach"
- "presents a broad range of strategies and corresponding activities over a 10-year time horizon (2010-2020)"
- Approved by the DENR and endorsed to the Climate Change Commission for issuance of appropriate Order

Executive Order 881

- CCC to coordinate existing climate change initiatives, REDD-Plus, and other similar mechanisms
- Designates DENR as the operational implementer of REDD-Plus

Will REDD result in resource grabbing? Communities have raised serious concerns on REDD and its possible impact on their long-standing claims to their land and territories. But, REDD by putting value on carbon stock of forests, create the opportunity for markets and thus for commodifying forests. This entails issues of ownership, tenure, and access to forests which to this date remain mired in conflicting claims.

In most of the countries in Asia, about 86% of the forests are owned and controlled by the state. Under the Indonesia Forestry Law - the State has full rights over the forest area (Article 12). In the Philippines, Presidential Decree 705, called Revised Forestry Code of the Philippines which was passed in 1975 governs the use, management and conservation of forest resources. This law from mid-70's up to the early 80's had provided for the issuance of Timber License Agreements (TLAs) for big companies.

Now, resource and green grabbing are common cries of small-scale food producers. Land grabbing in the form of large-scale acquisition of land and green grabbing which is the appropriation of land for environmental ends are increasingly impacting not only on dispossessed farmers and fishers but even communities. Green grabbing, as Fairhead et al. (2012) explained may not even involve physical dispossession of claimants of land, it can also mean *"restructuring of rules and authority over the access to, use and management of resources, in related labour relations and in human-ecological relationships, that may have profoundly alienating effects."*

The Table below shows the wide coverage of REDD+ projects in the Philippines and the big financial capital supporting the project.

Location	Time Frame	Donor	Area Covered
Municipalities of Silago, Sogod, Bontoc, Tomas Oppus and Maasin City, Southern Leyte	2009 - 2013	GIZ	31,848 hectares
Municipalities of Narra and Quezon, Southern Palawan	2011 - 2013 2013 - 2015	EU Ecosystems Alliance	25,000 hectares
Municipality of General Naker, Quezon	2010 t - 2014	EU and Team Energy Foundation (TEFI)	144,000 hectares
Municipalities of Tiwi, Malinao, Tabaco City, Oas, Ligeo City in Albay	2013 - 2017	GIZ	42,000 hectares
Municipalities of Borongan City and Maydolong, Eastern Samar	2013 - 2017	GIZ	67,153 hectares
Municipalities of Manay, Tarragona and Caraga, Davao Oriental	2013 - 2017	GIZ	92,301 hectares

A study on the REDD+ project piloted in the municipality of Nakar in the province of Quezon, covering a total of 144,000 has forest, upland, and coastal areas which has long been inhabited by the Agta-Dumagat indigenous peoples, revealed the following findings.

1. The indigenous peoples have very limited knowledge of the REDD project. Flora and Fauna Inc and Haribon which are implementing partners did not provide full information;
2. Only one of several organizations of indigenous peoples was chosen as project partner. This created conflict among indigenous peoples groups as many were not consulted;
3. Only the leaders or chieftains were consulted, leaving in limbo the wider membership of the 36 settlements/communities;
4. The project did not get FPIC as certified by the National Commission of the Indigenous People (NCIP) prompting the early termination of the project. The project holders endeavored to get FPIC only from one group but this was rejected by the government NCIP.
5. IP participants were not fully informed about how benefits will be shared with the community.
6. Technical concepts such as valuing carbon credit are beyond the comprehension of IPs.
7. Recognizing, securing and realizing the ancestral domain claim of IPs remain the priority of IP communities rather than REDD.

Other emerging threats to IP communities in the area re the following:

1. The construction of the Laiban Hydropower Dam poses huge threat to the ancestral domain claim of IPs, the forests and the traditional sources of livelihoods.
2. Land acquisition of private companies, real estate developer like Green Square and other land speculators.
3. The opening of the Marikina-Infanta road in the protected area is driving deforestation as the road according to a report is being used as a "back door entry and exit of illegally harvested forest products" (GIZ, 2013a).
4. Rampant illegal logging and mining that are destroying the forests and water resources
5. Corruption and weak enforcement of environmental and forestry laws are facilitating loss of forest cover in the Sierra Madre.

In conclusion, REDD projects tend to reproduce past and existing land inequalities. For example, indigenous people's lands recognized by customary laws are now being claimed as state-owned lands. Moreover, without proper consultations and knowledge about project, local and indigenous communities are not recognized as manager of land and forest. The policy to open up land and forests for foreign investments, expansion of agribusiness (oil palm plantations), and energy and mining extraction as well as land speculation are threatening indigenous forests.

REDD cannot be seen outside of its specific context, i.e. the emerging social and economic order characterized by the rapid globalization and expansion of capital, made possible by freer flow of capital, goods and services across borders and the increasing privatization of land, water and natural resources as well as the governance and policy regimes at the national and sub-national levels.

REDD tends to fuel land and resource conflicts as conditions that exclude indigenous peoples and communities from accessing, using and owning land remain. In short, REDD+ is not solving the problem of economic crisis; it is simply giving the finance capital the free hand to exploit to their best interest the remaining resources for food production.



UN-REDD in Vietnam and Case study of Rubber Plantation in Sin Ho District, Lai Chau Province

Tien Le Quang

Researcher – Centre for Social Research and Development (CSR D)

Mr. Tien presented first to the Conference the UN-REDD Viet Nam Programme, which as the Vietnamese government claimed seeks to address deforestation and forest degradation through building capacity at the national and local level to implement the REDD+ Programme and to contribute to global efforts in reduction emission from deforestation and forest degradation within the Lower Mekong Basin. Of which, three target outcomes with specific target outputs were defined as follows:

1. Improved institutional and technical capacity for national coordination to manage REDD+ activities in Viet Nam

Target outputs:

- 1.1. National coordination mechanism in the REDD+ implementation
- 1.2. National reference scenario for REDD+
- 1.3. Framework National REDD+ Program (Strategy)
- 1.4. Performance-based, transparent benefit sharing payment system -- national to local levels
- 1.5. Communications materials for sharing lessons internationally

2. Improved capacity to manage REDD+ and provide other Payment for Ecological Services at provincial and district levels through sustainable development planning and implementation

Target outputs:

- 2.1. REDD+ potential mainstreamed in provincial and district-level forest land-use plan
- 2.2. Participatory C-stock (volumes of carbon in different forest stocks) monitoring system
- 2.3. Equitable and transparent benefit sharing payment systems
- 2.4. Awareness-raising at provincial, district and local levels

3. Improved knowledge of approaches to reduce regional displacement of emissions

Target outputs:

- 3.1: Quantification of regional displacement of emissions risk
- 3.2: Regional dialogue on displacement of emissions risk
- 3.3: Analysis of opportunities for linkage with non-REDD+ initiatives to reduce cross-border flow of illegal timber

The achievements of the project based on the above defined objectives and target outcomes were as follows: For outcome 1: national institutions and capacity, REDD+ Network and sub-mechanisms, National REDD+ Steering Committee, Viet Nam REDD+ office, NRAP first version, national MRV framework document (first version), and discussions on benefit distribution. In short, the structures and mechanisms needed to pursue REDD+ implementation are now in-placed. For outcome 2: capacity building in 2 districts in Lam Dong, REDD+ introduced and partially understood, tools developed to assist in mainstreaming of REDD+ into larger development planning, PCM piloted and lessons learned, awareness raising on REDD+ at the local level, and piloted how to do FPIC (free prior informed consent). In short, REDD+ is taking its impact on the ground. And lastly for outcome 3: improved knowledge on regional displacement, reviewed “regional displacement of emissions,” align REDD+ strategy with FLEGT to reduce regional displacement of illegal forest activities, government signed MoU with Cambodia on

cooperation in the forestry sector, and government agreed on a FLEGT Action Plan with Laos in 2012. In short, the government is now dealing with the on-going displacements of forest people.

Another objective of the programme is to enhance Viet Nam's ability to benefit from future results-based payments for REDD+ and undertake transformational changes in the forestry sector. Six target outcomes were defined

1. Capacities for an operational National REDD+ Action Programme (NRAP) are in place.
2. The six pilot provinces are enabled to plan and implement REDD+ actions.
3. National Forest Monitoring System (NFMS) for Monitoring and Measurement, Reporting and Verification and National REDD+ Information System (NRIS) on Safeguards are operational.
4. Stakeholders at different levels are able to receive positive incentives.
5. Mechanisms to address the social and environmental safeguards under the Cancun Agreement are established.
6. Regional cooperation enhances progress on REDD+ implementation in the Lower Mekong Sub-Region.

No achievements for this objective and target outcomes are reported. Perhaps, it is because this already pertains to the impact of REDD+ on communities. The truth that can be gleaned from the ground is that, land grabbing is legalized. This unfortunately is the new mechanism being used in order to acquire land for rubber plantation in Sin Ho, Lai Chau, Viet Nam.

Grabbing of uplands is signaled by the Vietnamese government's goal to increase rubber plantations in the upland in the name of job creation and the improvement upland people's lives. But to Vietnam, uplands are geopolitically important being the country's borders between Laos and China; and also in terms of national security caused by ethnic violence. Whether or not the government's stated goals are true can be proven from the case of the Lai Chau II Rubber Joint-stock Company (Vietnam Rubber Group) to which the 2,250 ha of Chan Nua commune in Sin Ho District, Lai Chau province (Northwestern Vietnam) were awarded. The project began in 2009, affecting 342 households of Thai ethnic minorities.

The Vietnamese government assures the public that all the three parties (government, community, and company) will benefit from the project and from each other. But ground reality is negating this claim. In fact affected communities revealed the various violations of Lai Chau II Rubber Joint-Stock company, as follows:

1. Lack of consultation with and access to information by affected communities: The rubber company did not conduct public consultation with affected communities; local participation in this development plan was limited, and no information was provided. Furthermore, the method used for convincing villagers to take part in this project was with a top – down approach (between local officials and village leaders).

2. Livelihood and labor issues: Local people are the ones who suffer the most. Only some became paid workers: Only 1 out of every 8 people was employed with the company or on the rubber plantation; many people have been left unemployed. Many became landless with nothing to work on and to grow crops. Land taken by the company dispossessed farmers and denied them of their livelihood. Now, they have no land to farm and are unable to do anything about this situation. However, even the employed ones suffer from the labor condition in the rubber plantation. As Mrs. L.T.Y. Chan Nua 2 said, *"Work at a rubber plantation is not easy and has not brought enough income to the villagers. Working conditions are not good."* Plantation workers were paid their wages only for the first 3 years,

but after that the company refused to pay them. As a result in 2015, company workers could not purchase their social security insurance.

3. Unfair compensation: Affected households were compensated by the government the same amount regardless of land size. Local authorities did not explain clearly about this policy on capital compensation or equal land division. Many villagers said, *"We are so worried about conflict between community members"*.

4. Lack of transparency in benefit-sharing: Villagers did not understand the benefits and risks of the project prior to signing the benefit-sharing agreements. Not only did the agreement not bring the desired benefits but it also has potential risks to the community. The company controls everything. *"We are not sure about what we own and what we are supposed to receive"*. (Mr. D.V.L, Nam Cay village).

5. Corruption of the company's staff and local authorities: Corrupt politics (interconnectedness between the business sector and the political system). The government and company took the land of the farmers to create profit for themselves. Corrupt local authorities underpaid the compensation to villagers. Some team leaders cut the salaries of workers.

From a legal perspective, the company had violated the following domestic laws: the public as regarded in the New Land Law; Articles 137, 138, and 196 of the Labor Code; land rights of farmers; and Article 3 of the Anti-Corruption Law. It has also violated Article 7 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social & Cultural Rights (ICESCR).

The following were then recommended:

1. For the Vietnamese government:

- ☐ There must be clear and transparent policies for the people to benefit from the results of the project.
- ☐ Promote the company to accept its responsibilities and ensure transparency.
- ☐ Establish communication channels with the local community.
- ☐ Amend the land law and labor code to be in line with international standards
- ☐ Amend Vietnam legal framework
- ☐ Set up a monitoring mechanism for the rubber plantation development project
- ☐ The Anti-corruption Law needed to have sanction mechanisms strict for corrupt violations.

2. For the Rubber company

- ☐ Need to follow the investment law, labor code and land law.
- ☐ Amend the government's policy and transparency benefit sharing and rights of community.
- ☐ Follow social security insurance law, land right.

3. For the NGOs

- ☐ Provide information and communication for the community.
- ☐ Raise awareness about land law, rights, and the right to access information.
- ☐ Support local community complaints to government and company.
- ☐ Connect the lawyer to help affected communities (law training, complaint mechanism)

4. For the Local Community

- ☐ Establish network with other communities affected by similar development projects and participate in network activities.
- ☐ Need to understand their rights, land law by participating in training to create effective leaders.

D. Examining Blue Carbon: Implications on Food Sovereignty and Sustainability and Climate Resiliency of the Marines and Aquatic Resources



M. Riza Damanik

Chairman – Kesatuan Nelayan Tradisional Indonesia (KNTI)
(United Indonesian Traditional Fishers)

In Indonesia, small-scale fishers are categorized as fishers who use fishing vessels with a size below 5 gross tons. Thus, in 2014, almost 90% of the total 634,000 Indonesian fishing vessels falls in the small fishing category. Small-scale fisheries are estimated to have at least 8 million workers in the production, processing, and marketing activities. They supply at least 60% of the total national fishery production, together with aquaculture production that is used to support the fulfilment of the needs for fish consumption of the people of Indonesia that has now reached more than 35kg per capita per year. Then, they keep the supply of the raw material for needs of the domestic industry. In fact, some of the production is also exported to countries such as: USA, EU, Japan, Hong Kong, China and other neighboring countries.

In addition to having a strategic role as a provider of jobs, food needs, and economic sustainability, small-scale fisheries also become an important driver in conserving fish and natural resources through a variety of local knowledge. The conservation scheme of the local communities has proved friendly in social, ecological, and economic spheres, such as: Awigawig in West Nusa Tenggara, Sasi in Maluku, Bapongka in Central Sulawesi, Manee in South Sulawesi, and Panglima Laot in Aceh.

However, all of the potential and the positive contribution of small-scale fisheries are threatened by a series of problems. Even lately under the guise of mitigation and adaptation programs of climate change. For example, to reduce reliance on fossil fuels, the use of biofuels is being promoted, including from palm oil. In its development, a number of ecosystems in coastal areas and small islands of Indonesia converted to meet the needs of the global market of biofuel. In Langkat, North Sumatra, at least 16,000 hectares of mangrove forest have been converted to oil palm plantations causing a decline in fish catches and flooding in fisher's village. Here, KNTI together with a number of organizations and local government is conducting rehabilitation to restore the ecological functions of mangrove ecosystem as fish spawning and nursery, as well as preventing coastal erosion and sedimentation.

Another example, the issue of sea level rise which is often associated as the bad impact of climate change is being used as justification to expand the development of water front cities with coastal reclamation. In Jakarta Bay, reclamation activities require at least 3.3 billion cubic meters of sand material taken from other regions, and then use them to build 17 new islands. Besides being supported by a number of property companies, this project is also supported by number of contractors and consultants from various countries, like the Netherlands and Korea which plan to build a Giant Sea Wall. Potentially, about 16,000 fishers could be robbed of their lives and livelihoods. The coastal ecosystems destroyed and even the main issue related to the termination of pollution in the Bay of Jakarta is barely a concern. So today, 5 fishers, members of KNTI, together with a number of civil society organizations brought the case to court to cancel the reclamation

permit. Similar coastal reclamation projects have also been happening in many other places of Indonesia, such as in the Gulf of Benoa, Bali, and the coast of Makassar, South Sulawesi.

Such counterproductive conditions also occur in the world strategy to combat IUUF (Illegal, Unregulated, and Underreported Fishing) and the expansion of marine conservation projects. On one side, the global instruments to stop IUUF are increasing. But, the fish trade of IUUF activities is still on-going. Even the mobilization of financing from the World Bank, ADB, GEF, USAID etc. for marine conservation activities continue to roll. Yet, a global sanction against corporations that damage the environment and pollute the ocean is not imposed. Instead, multinational companies such as: Newmont and Freeport are becoming bolder and are suing a sovereign state, like Indonesia to international arbitration.

At the end of 2009, UNEP together with a syndicate of institutions authorized under the United Nations issued two documents, each entitled: "Blue Carbon: The Role of Healthy Oceans in Binding Carbon" and "A Blue Carbon Fund: The ocean equivalent of REDD for carbon sequestration in coastal states".

Since the beginning, we agree and have the same concerns with UNEP et al. which said that global marine and coastal ecosystems were damaged severely. This includes as much as 1/3 of the world's seagrass (Waycott et al., 2009), 25% area of wetland (Bridgman et al., 2006), 35% of mangrove area (Valiela et al., 2001) that have been lost. In fact, the report also states that extinction rates of organisms in the ocean ecosystem are higher than other ecosystems in the world. For example, it is 4 times higher when compared to that of rain forest ecosystems.

With this serious crisis, why is UNEP et al., encouraging the scheme of Blue Carbon Fund (BCF), like REDD for the forest, instead of strengthening global efforts to cut carbon emissions and punish corporations engaging in activities that pollute the ocean, damage the coastal and marine ecosystems, and practice illegal fishing activities?

According to UNEP, there are two Blue Carbon commodities: marine water and main coastal ecosystems. The first commodity – marine water is assumed as a strategic medium that is able to absorb carbon (carbon sink) from the atmosphere; whereas the second commodity – the main coastal ecosystems, such as sea grass and mangrove forests. Commodification of the marine water commodity and coastal ecosystems to the offset scheme can deflect efforts to address the root problem of ecological crisis of marine and coastal ecosystem in the world. This initiative encouraged by UNEP to the Government of Indonesia since the meeting of the World Ocean Conference in Manado, 2009, and the 11th Special Session of the Governing Council/ Global Ministerial Environment Forum of UNEP in Bali 2010.

Since the sixteenth century, fisherfolks in Lamalera, East Nusa Tenggara believe that the sea is like a mother. In the local language they call: "Ina sorobudi, budi Noro apadike. Paipanaponu, tehamahama. "The sea is the mother who provides, protects and loves. Therefore, we should maintain its sustainability."

The sea is a mother, and Blue Carbon asks us to sell our mother. We know since the beginning that "mother" is sick because of the greed of the industrialized countries and corporations. Today, the same criminals come into our homes and without any guilt they say: "you need money to save the mother; there is no other way other than 'selling your mother services.'" Well, because anything 'green' has become a market strategy in the past and failed, it is now packaged as a "blue carbon". We know, they would never respect our mother and in return, the fruits they collect from her will be business as usual and a further Accumulation of Capital. We need a solution together, beyond the illusion of Blue Carbon Fund. We have seen that small-scale fishing is the real solution to address climate change problem.

First, the ocean crisis is originated by the exploitative economic policies on the land. Therefore a global agreement to ensure multinational corporations adhere to human rights protection and environmental sustainability must continue to be strengthened.

Second, the global strategy to provide protection to the fishermen and fisherwomen should be immediately implemented. The international instrument of FAO to secure small-scale fisheries (VGSSF, 2014) must be immediately followed by the national policies in each state to provide assurances as to the fulfillment of the right to coastal land for fisher family, decent work, access to fair markets, also mobilizing state resources to support mitigation and adaptation to climate change to fishers villages.

It is good to learn more from the small-scale fishers in preserving the environment and preservation of fish resources. In TanjungBalai, North Sumatra, fishers believe that the ocean is a gift of God. So there is an obligation for everyone to maintain and preserve fishery resources. When there is a full moon, traditional fishers will not go fishing. We believe it is the right time for the fish to reproduce; and then increase in abundance

E. Examining Climate Smart Agriculture and GACSA: Implications on Food Sovereignty and Sustainability and Climate resiliency of Agriculture



Kariyawasam Thilak

Executive Director – Sri Lanka Nature Group (SLNG)

Mr. Thilak opened his presentation by affirming the point of agriculture as science. He said: “Agriculture in other parts of the world is recognized as science. It is life science. It is life for the people. There are so many allegations against agriculture especially with regards to carbon emission, but it’s not the real argument they’re putting-on. In many negotiation tables it was discussed... but as other’s said the REDD after the Bali... started with REDD and then it becomes a REDD+.” Then, he proceeded to his power point presentation with the title “*COP 21: Making Agriculture Smart to Combat Climate Change.*” His presentation was on the mainstream assertion as to how climate change should be combatted which he meant to actually subject to the examination of the Conference. His presentation went as follows:

While agriculture contributes to climate change, it is also one of the few sectors that can provide solutions. Greenhouse gas emissions from human activity will have to decrease globally from 1990 levels by at least 50% by 2050 if future global warming is to be limited to a 2°C temperature increase, as currently recommended by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. This imperative was repeated by world leaders at the UN Climate Change conference in Copenhagen in December 2009.

How does agriculture produce such high emissions? One way is through farming activity itself: plugging fields release carbon dioxide in the soil, and rice cultivation and livestock breeding both emit large quantities of methane. Farming uses fossil fuels and fertilizers. Agriculture also involves land-use changes, including deforestation and desertification of fragile grasslands. These changes alter the earth’s ability to absorb or reflect heat and light.

There are challenges though, as how agriculture could mitigate carbon gas emission following the market-oriented solution, including in measurement. Quantifying greenhouse gas emissions from agricultural activities is complex and costly, given the variety of farmers and systems used over a wide range of geographic and climatic conditions. Moreover, there remains a great deal of scientific uncertainty about how to control emission from agriculture, since many factors are at play, such as local climate, soil type, slope and production practices. In other words, there is no simple relationship between the quantity of production and emissions.

However, although agriculture is a key player in global warming and erratic weather patterns, as both a contributor to greenhouse gases and a major victim of their effects, agriculture has been largely neglected in previous climate change talks, even in COP 21. The number of smallholder farmers is growing fast, from roughly 550 million farms today to an expected 750 million by 2030. Climate change puts great pressure on smallholder agriculture to rapidly evolve. To this policy makers and market forces insist on saying that "We need to see farmers adopting climate-resilient technologies on a large scale, and make the most of social and economic innovations." Hence, they introduce the market oriented solution to climate change, called climate smart agriculture.

Climate-smart agriculture (CSA) includes practices and technologies that increase productivity in a sustainable manner, support farmers' adaptation to climate change and reduce levels of greenhouse gases. Examples of CSA practices that are already producing concrete impacts include agro forestry, conservation agriculture, drought tolerant crops, low-cost livestock feeds to preserve degraded rangelands and innovative insurance schemes to protect farmers against losses.

But, there are signs that the attitude of neglecting agriculture in addressing climate change may be shifting. Many countries have included agriculture in their Intended Nationally Determined Contributions (INDC). These are climate pledges made by countries ahead of the UN Conferences of the Parties (COP21) and which are expected to help shape any new climate agreement that the conference might produce. But, nothing substantial was produced.

Calculating indirect land-use changes arising from agricultural production is another challenge. The global surge in food prices in recent years reflected competition for land use related to world food and energy markets. In particular, the links between production of bio fuels from feedstock—these are subsidized in many countries—consequent land-use changes, including deforestation, and effects on food prices need to be further explored.

Mitigation and adaptation with the right technologies and systems, improved cropland and grazing land management, restoration of degraded lands and land-use change, such as agro-forestry, can make a major contribution to limiting greenhouse gases. Emissions from livestock production can be reduced by improving nutrition and manure management.

Getting policies right in these areas will be key as well as working with markets to encourage trade and investment, and to correct distortions caused, for instance, by certain subsidies that lead to overproduction and resource depletion. In short, future policies must aim for better environmental outcomes, including lower emissions – The design and implementation of cost-effective adaptation and mitigation policies in a range of key areas.

Carbon markets are crop and disaster insurance, adoption of better crop varieties and breeds, technology, emissions monitoring, incentives for more efficient water use and compensation for vulnerable groups. Such measures, if taken together and adapted to specific country situations, would create coherent policy packages to limit agriculture's contribution to climate change, improve the environment and boost the effectiveness and value-added of the farming sector.

Thilak ended his presentation saying, "They don't like to give the Green Climate Fund because they know it will go to small farmers... that argument is not in the table... We should have a clear understanding what is climate-smart agriculture --- only considering adaptation rather than mitigation."

Open Forum

Masum reacted on the use of the term climate smart agriculture, stressing that the climate activists like, APNFS should not be using climate smart agriculture because it is the false solution being promoted by market forces made-up by four big corporations.

The rest of the conference strongly agreed to Masum's point reiterating the previous presentations' point that climate smart agriculture is not the true solution to the climate crisis because it is market-oriented and so it is only for profits of corporate business. Also the translation of climate smart agriculture into programs are in fact dispossessing, disempowering, and displacing small-scale food producers and only furthers environmental degradation.

There was also a point raised on the use of civil society terms by the UNFCCC, which actually is entirely different from what the CSO means. This was also to impress the point of the conference that the solution to climate crisis is actually linked to the framework of food sovereignty. It is in promoting food sovereignty, which can be in the form of agro-ecology, family-based organic farming, etc. that climate crisis can be truly addressed. In relation to food sovereignty, it was clarified that we you talk about family-farming, you are talking about small-scale family farming, not the family-farming that modern countries have.

Since the discussion was already tackling issues about the results of the recently concluded COP 21, it was decided that discussion should proceed to the COP 21 update. But since the next topic was not only about COP21, but includes other international engagements, it was agreed that recent engagements will be discussed first before the discussion of the COP 21. Besides next to the topic is the discussion on the draft Post COP21 statement.

The discussion on international engagements was meant not only to update the conference but also to give the conference some insights on the relevance of these engagements, because this was raised in the conference – Should APNFS engage with these international and regional organizations that do not really listen to the issues and agenda of the people being raised to them by civil society groups because they are in fact neoliberals?

Day Two : 12 March 2016 / Saturday
Moderator : Ysed Jahanghir Hasan Masum
APNFS ExeCom



MORNING SESSION

IV. UPDATES ON INTERNATIONAL ENGAGEMENTS



Sharing of CSO Position on the 33rd FAO Asia-Pacific Regional Conference

Ms. Myrna Dominguez

Policy/Advocacy Officer – Integrated Rural Development Foundation
Secretariat – Asia Pacific Network for Food Sovereignty

Myrna represented APNFS in the CSO Consultation in Conjunction with FAO-APRC, which was held two days prior to the FAO-APRC. Her update stressed on the point of the shrinking democratic space for civil society in FAO. One indication was the limited budget provided to the CSO consultation, resulting to only 35 organization's participation all over Asia-Pacific region. And it was this consultation that drafted the CSO agenda to the FAO-APRC.

She also moderated the discussion on the Blue Growth Initiative in the CSO consultation that's why she was tasked by the consultation to intervene in FAO for its Blue Growth Initiative agenda, which to the CSO analysis might displace small-fishers and coastal communities from their fishing resource and livelihood. Even CSO intervention was now reduced from 3 to only 1 intervention per FAO agenda for only 1-3 minutes. Full text of the CSO agenda and Blue Growth intervention are in Appendices.

The FAO Director General, Assistant Director General, and the FAO Food Security Committee Chairperson did however meet with the CSO in a separate short meeting. The first and shortest meeting was with the ADG, but everybody was invited here. Discussion with her focused mainly on how the CSO can influence FAO decision making, especially in defining programs that directly impact on the most vulnerable groups of people. The second meeting and the longest one was with the DG but with only 10 CSO representatives allowed to participate. The APNFS representative was among those invited since she intervened for the Blue Growth Initiative. All 10 CSO representatives were allowed to speak and bring up their agenda to the DG to which the DG responded one-by-one stressing that FAO is fighting for the improvement of the lives and livelihoods of the most vulnerable groups of society around the world and that FAO is not working for corporate business. However, he also stressed the challenges FAO confronts in pursuing its goals and objectives, saying that FAO is not the government. What FAO can do is to encourage governments to implement FAO's programs and to support its implementation. Funding for FAO programs can also be accessed by CSOs provided they submit project proposals. The last

meeting was with the FAO FSC Chairperson. In this meeting, issues threatening food security were raised to which the FSC Chairperson assured the CSO that she will raised it in the committee.

Analysis of UNFCCC Negotiations, Green Climate Fund, and Civil Society Response

Ysed Jahangir Hasan Masum

Executive Director – Coastal Development Programme
Executive Committee Member – Asia Pacific Network for Food Sovereignty



Masum started his discussion by addressing what is the reality with CSO engagement with the UNFCC saying: “You should know what and where are you.” This question is actually in reaction to the expressed frustration of conference participants on the result of COP 21 bordering to questioning the relevance of CSO engagement with the UNFCC. A case in point he showed was the fossil energy, saying that “because companies have invested in fossil fuels, it is also where their governments are looking at.” Meaning, the call to stop the use of fossil fuels is a big economic question not only to the big companies engaging in it but also to governments which rely primarily on taxes paid by these big companies, so it is not easy.

He also pointed out the weakness in CSO engagement which to his observation has focused more on theoretical debates rather than putting forward alternative solutions and good practices so that governments will be able to see other options for them to choose and promote. CSO should provide concrete doable solutions not simply assertions and criticisms.

Thilak intervened pointing on how APNFS could improve its engagement with the UNFCC, saying that it should have a better understanding of the process. The network should be capacitated for its future engagement. This he suggested could be one of the action plans of the network, but for better engagement APNFS needs capacity building. From which he asked Masum how APNFS could access the capacity building mechanism of the UNFCC. But Masum answered that Capacity building by the UNFCC is quiet limited and mostly focus on party delegates.

Masum stressed that “most network organize their own capacity building. You can read lot you can talk a lot, but there should be somebody with experience. APNFS could identify and seek funding for capacity building by having more participation in the UNFCC negotiation process not only in the CSO. We can do also get accreditation from organizations working on this. However, there are so many things you need to prepare. So what he suggested for APNFS is to build its own capacity program and to look for resources to ensure participation of members in the negotiation.

V. APNFS Post COP 21 Statement

Hard copies of the draft statement were distributed to each participant. But to make discussion faster, the soft copy of the draft statement was posted on the wall using LCD. See full text of the Draft statement in the appendices.

Comments and suggestions to improve the draft statement:

1. General impression on the statement:
 - The statement is for the CSO, not for the UNFCCC.
 - The statement is very general. There is nothing unique in it that would give importance on it. Demands should be stated clearly.
 - The statement should be a multi-stakeholder statement.
2. Issues to include in the statement:
 - Forced displacement of farmers and fisherfolks
 - Put agro-ecological agriculture and put more weight on it as a genuine alternative
 - Stress more on the food part issue and the displacement issue
 - CSA, REDD+ as false solutions -- just solutions for big multi-nationals
3. Corrections on the use of terms:
 - Use developed countries rather than global north. The latter is about the country and the people and we have allies in those countries.
 - Sustaining communal fishing is negative in the context of India. Change it to community fishing.
4. Corrections/clarifications on the content:
 - The removal of human rights in the UNFCCC text is not true. The problem is they did not talk on that. What is better is the need to highlight more of human rights and food sovereignty is a mechanism to secure human security.
 - Demands during the COP21 were 1.5C, Green Climate Fund – should be grant-based not loan, and more attention and support for displaced farmers and fisherfolk communities.
5. Length of the statement: Make it shorter
6. On what to demand to UNFCCC:
 - IP has not taken or highlight an agenda
 - Put emphasis on most vulnerable countries like island countries and under developed
 - More space for the civil society in the formal negotiation process --- we can demand this to our national governments

VI. STRENGTHENING APNFS ADVOCACY FOR FOOD SOVEREIGNTY & CLIMATE JUSTICE



Building Cross-Sectoral Alliances and Movements for Climate Justice and Food Sovereignty

Anil K. Singh

Executive Director

South Asian Network for Social & Agricultural Development (SANSAD)

Anil started his presentation with a question: With whom and how should we build cross-sectoral alliances and movements for climate justice and food sovereignty? He enumerated some steps that are being done, such as

- ☐ Build from national to global level
- ☐ Participating in their events
- ☐ Inviting them and start participating in their programs

Each of these, he elaborated well giving concrete experiential examples.

Another point he stressed was the capacity of the organization to enable it to build alliances and movement. “How to build our own capacity; what is our strength?” Maybe, he said, “we have better research-knowledge? or we have better network with other institutions? or we have better connections? or we have better resources?” The answer to these questions he said determines our alliance building. So, if the answers to these questions are all negative; then, APNFS should start building these.

His next point was the configuration of forces in the region. “What is our adversary in the region?” He pointed out that APNFS is not working as a single force in the region. There are other networks and individuals also promoting the same advocacy but in a different way. If they are stronger than us then they will be able to mobilise more than us. He named some possible regional groups. To this he stressed the possibility for members of APNFS to build their own networks, since many are already part of other networks. By doing this, it would in effect broaden the network of APNFS.

Masum added in the discussion that alliance building is also mutual respect for each other. He stressed that in building alliances, APNFS should also think who is important to the network.

Building Movement for Food Sovereignty and Climate Justice: Challenges and Opportunities

Adrian Pereira
Executive Director – North South Initiative (NSI)
Vice President – PAX Romana



Adrian briefly discussed what he sees as challenges and opportunities in building movement for food sovereignty. He started his discussion with a question as an afterthought question to Anil’s presentation: “How do we network with existing networks?” Of course there is politics, he said expounding on it. But, his main concern is how not to experiment with failure.

Among the challenges he mentioned were:

1. Gender balance: There is still a huge gap in terms of representing the advocacy for climate justice and food sovereignty. This conference also reflects this problem.
2. Funding for the network to be able to meet often: He asked, “How do we use our grassroots network? Maybe some programs on the ground which we can maximize and fund to further strengthen the network.
3. Consolidation of what APNFS is trying to achieve.

As to the opportunities, Adrian brought back the question to the Conference, asking: “Why should we build the movement?” To which the conference participants actively answered:

1. Climate change as an opportunity

2. Engaging the youth
3. Engaging with the ASEAN
4. Technology sharing

Open Forum:

Some more insights were shared during the open forum:

- ☐ Alliance building requires confidence, because without confidence no one will believe in your organization or network especially among regional networks. Regional politics is also as delicate as the government. Hence there is the need to invest on developing the capacity of the members. APNFS should define its thematic positions that all of its members should have a common understanding.
- ☐ Networks are having their uniqueness. Don't criticize other coalition; instead try to bring them to pour network. In any of our statement, in international conferences, always try bringing in other networks.
- ☐ In terms of generation gap, there is the need for the younger generation to carry through the cause.
- ☐ Though ASEAN is a waste of resources; there is the need to think more how the network can make the best out of this engagement.
- ☐ Technology sharing is a good point since data base is very important. How to do about this can be in the Website.

AFTERNOON SESSION

VII. ACTION PLANNING FOR 2016

"Strengthening Regional and National Movement for Food Sovereignty and Climate Justice"

1. Review of the APNFS 2014-2015 Work Plan
 - ☐ Discussion on the evolution of APNFS as a network from the WTO to climate change now and how this has affected member's participation in the last three years
 - ☐ Revisit on the process of determining the national coordinating committees
 - ☐ Review on the issues included in the work plan
2. Discussion of issues and concerns
 - 2.1. Organizational matters:
 - Discussion on the translation of APNFS in the country level: Bangladesh has a secretariat for food sovereignty and climate justice; the Philippines has a movement for food sovereignty; India has a food sovereignty and climate justice network – Let country level decide on what kind of structure they want.
 - National coordinating council to give management support to the Secretariat: Raise it to three per country which role is to ensure coordination and communication among country members and between the regional committee and the country members.
 - Contribution of member organizations to the APNFS in terms of expertise, funding sources, and bringing members to the network.
 - The responsibility to communicate and coordinate is not only for the Secretariat but for every member.

- Present the unique chemistry on the members of APNFS --- build a profile for each of the members --- let each member send their profile. Build a profile that will also give the media as to who they should be talking to and also give the FA the idea on the integrity of the Network.

2.2. Campaigns:

- Country level monitoring of the REDD+ since most of the country members are already in the REDDiness phase. For the funding, there are funds to REDD that are not harmful to the poor, for example forest verification. Make a good documentation of this. Thilak volunteered to start this and ask others to compliment.
- Engagement with the UNFCCC in Marrakesh: Conduct regional and national research study that will highlight APNFS position with good documentation and with good articulation.
- Continue engaging with climate change issues.
- Youth organizing (specifically students) for food sovereignty and climate justice – Adrian volunteered to facilitate the process which could be a national or regional level.

Suggested Activity:

Competition with a prize (e.g. \$1,000) that would bring youth attention and interest to agriculture and focus on the local language not English

- Dam campaign, land grabbing and others to link with food sovereignty.
- Policy dialogue on budget, land management, irrigation system, rice price
- Water and land issue, water and soil issue, rice issue
- Publish a book with contributions from members where every issues can be discussed
- Good documentation on the history of the network and what has been done before to ensure good transmission of knowledge to new members
- Document women's work within the network to bring-up to this COP22
- How to give more legitimacy to fisher, farmer, and IP groups' engagement in the regional or international arena --- how to package --- have a committee in this group... have 2-3 story with good champion of vulnerable communities and make story and make this a case to the UNFCCC --- we need something visual, a figure that we can bring before the meeting but the story has already circulated --- build a trademark for APNFS.
- There should be a group that would be monitoring the issue we want and develop the issues as they come --- Set-up a monitoring body and use the social media and once a while use the mainstream media --- we can assign one to do this guided by the fundamental analysis we had discussed.
 - Build-up first a collection of stories
 - Knowledge of issues of what is happening everywhere and what is happening in the international bodies
- Continue and systematize engagement with the engagement with the ACS/APF for the SEA members of APNFS – conduct side events
 - Prepare somebody to systematize engagement to this and Adrian was proposed to be that somebody
 - The same thing with the SAPEAN
- Explore opportunities in sub-regions and invoke APNFS --- cross-participation of APNFS in sub-regional engagements
- Be conscious in introducing yourselves as part of the APNFS

2.3. Funding

- Share resources

- Find other funding for specific projects
3. Key action plans
- 3.1. Climate change action plan --- to be done together
 - 3.2. Young generation's involvement --- to be done together
 - 3.3. Policy dialogue on water issue and land issues; water and soil issues
 - 3.4. Engage and promote APNFS in the regional platforms by any way possible
 - 3.5. Thematic issues to pursue:
 - Climate change
 - Food sovereignty issues: water, land, and others
 - Youth
 - Social media

Closing Remarks

Riza gave the closing remarks expressing his thanks to all those who attended and especially the organizers both for the local host and the Secretariat, and his happiness for having defined the workplan of APNFS for 2016. But he impressed that the most important thing is after the Conference as to how what had been agreed upon will be implemented. He wished everyone a safe trip.

As the local host, Adrian also thanked the Network for the confidence on them and for involving him and his organization to the Network. In behalf of his colleagues, he also expressed his happiness in having hosted the Conference.

On the other hand, the participants also thanked Adrian and his staff who did helped in preparing the Conference. Everyone wished each one a safe trip.