

# WORK PROGRAMME ON AGRICULTURE: WHERE DO SMALL HOLDER FARMERS STAND

SB 36 SIDE EVENT

16<sup>th</sup> May, 2012, Rail (MoT)

ORGANIZERS:

CECOEDECON, PAIRVI & BEYOND COPENHAGEN

# Brief background

- Industrial countries and ag business companies have been pushing soils in carbon markets since run up to Kyoto, which was rejected by the COP.
- Negotiations on ag in UNFCCC have been promoting linear ag, monoculture of genes, hugely contested and untested solutions for mitigation like no-till, biochar, agro fuels, GMOs etc, in the guise of “climate smart agriculture.”
- A growing number of studies have debunked the claims associated with these technologies.
- Mitigation in small landholdings in DCs and LDCs will deprive farmers of their land rights, strengthen the hegemony of ag business companies, and take away their sovereignty of producing what they want, and seriously affect food security, and in fact increase GHG emissions

# Submission of country parties (Annex 1)

- Most of the Annex 1 countries see this as an opportunity to push so called “climate smart agriculture” and mitigation in agriculture
- The prime concern for Annex 1 countries is “food security (read enhanced production and availability of food grains in the market),” “emission from agriculture,” and “agriculture as major driver of deforestation.”
- Most of them see work programme as important for “exploring linkages, synergies and trade offs between mitigation and adaptation.”
- Fail to provide any support to the non Annex countries and see market based mechanisms as major source of funding.

# Submission from Annex 1 countries

- Japan: “it is useful to pursue cooperative sectoral approaches in order to ensure fairness and to proceed concrete steps to achieve effective emission reduction.”
- EU: “ag has to address new global challenges, in parallel to the needs of adaptation, mitigation potential exists in the sector.”
- Switzerland: “ag sector is severely affected by climate change, ...responsible for consideration share of the GHGs....” however, “....ag has an important potential for mitigation...”
- USA: “a wide range of practices exist to reduce GHG emissions, increase carbon sequestration, develop renewable energy sources, and improve energy efficiency on farms and forests lands.....we fully realize the potential for GHG mitigation from agriculture and forest lands..” supports technical meeting on adaptation in COP 18 and a workshop on mitigation in 2013.

# Submission from non Annex 1 countries

- DCs&LDCs are far more comprehensive in their approach and considerations include poverty reduction, environmental and livelihood sustainability, sustainable development and focus on small holder farmers.
- For them adaptation is far more important than mitigation, few want to explore co benefits from mitigation.
- Many recognize emissions in ag are essential for their basic survival.
- Many refer to the principles of equity and cbdr in addressing emissions in ag sector.
- Prefer exchange of practices, knowledge, and technological transfer and capacity for adaptation, for consideration of SBSTA.
- Forewarn against decisions leading to commitment in mitigation for non Annex 1 countries.

# Submission from non Annex 1 countries

- Gambia views “adaptation as key to LDCs as expressed in the NAPAs,” prefers “poverty eradication” as broader objective, and welcomes opportunity to “....broaden the scope of discussion including issues related to adaptation and not only mitigation as happened under the AWGLCA.” also forewarns that LDCs will pay particular attention to... “any efforts by Annex 1 countries to adopt potential measures under the guise of mitigation which negatively impact LDCs trade in ag.” also emphasizes that LDCs are responsible for very few emission in ag and OECD emission far exceeds those of the rest of the world.
- It also promotes rather a work programme on “loss and damages”
- Tanzania feels “mitigation should be seen from SD approach” and international community should avoid giving international guidelines...which will undermine national sovereignty in addressing their SD needs .....

# Submission from non Annex 1 countries

- G-77 and China submits “mitigation and adaptation deserve equal attention...”...However, adaptation is more important than mitigation for developing country parties” ...”GHG emissions are unavoidable and for the DCs the emission from ag sector are essential for their basic survival...”, and that decision should not lead to any mitigation commitment for DCs.”
- Iran says “adaptation in ag is prior to other issues for DCs..so it should be considered for developing national adaptation plans..... It is necessary to ensure that sufficient resources are provided for DCs...” and also that “climate smart agriculture should be clearly defined”
- SA thinks “significant synergies exist between mitigation and adaptation....” and that “adaptation remains a priority,” suggests three work programme on adaptation, mitigation under LCA and SBSTA work on mitigation under REDD...”

# Submission of annex 1 country parties

- None of them differentiate industrial ag and ag in developing countries/LDCs
- None of them talk about socio-economic impacts of climate change and assessing loss and damage, technology assessment, or assessment of on going mitigation projects
- None of them talk about providing any safeguard so that mitigation does not create barriers of ag exports of DCs/LDCs
- None of them talk about providing additional finance and technology
- None of them talk about equity and CBDR in mitigation.



# A reality check

- With high per capita emission in Annex 1 countries far exceeding that in non Annex 1 countries, mitigation efforts should be concentrated in Annex 1 countries.
- Industrial ag systems emit over half of world's total in methane and nitrous oxide emissions with less than 20% of total world population.
- Annex 1 countries are responsible for 26% of global nitrous oxide emissions from soils, 30% of methane emissions from enteric fermentation, and 52% of methane and nitrous oxide emission from manure management.
- Globally NZ, Ireland and Australia ranked as top three emitters for per capita ag production in 2005, while the OECD outpaced the entire world.
- According to the IPCC, these emissions increased by nearly 17% between 1990-2005. ag emission in North America increased by 18% and from OECD Pacific by 21%.
- In terms of ag related methane, Amongst Annex 1 countries only EU has reduced emissions significantly while Australia has reduced slightly. NZ, Canada and US have significantly increased their methane emissions.
- NZ, Australia and Canada have also increased their nitrous oxide emissions above 1990 levels
- North America has the highest per capita meat consumption, the EU consumption increased by 50% between 1961-2007.

# How negotiations and false solutions affect smallholders

- NAPCC and SAPCC in India are high on technology, mitigation in agriculture, and suggest bringing soils in carbon markets.
- False solution such as no till ag, agro fuels, GMOs are being promoted in a big way.
- There is no adaptation support for adaptation.
- Laser land levellers, Connoweeders, sprinklers, are being marketed to farmers having less than 2 ha of lands, farming with family labour and hoe and sickle
- Subsidies to ag business companies are routed through farmers.

# Issues for consideration for SBSTA

- SBSTA must put small holder farmers including women, and agro ecological ag in the centre of efforts as they are the only solution to food security, climate stabilization, and well being of the farmers
- SBSTA must distinguish ag in Annex 1 countries and developing countries and enhance support for adaptation, while suggest mitigation in ag in Annex 1 countries.
- Focus of discussion should be on providing enhanced, additional and predictable finance, knowledge sharing, R&D and international cooperation in adaptation.
- Many platforms created by the CGIAR, Global Alliance for GHG emission in ag, the EU and the US, World Commission on Food Sec. are already mitigation focussed and SBSTA should not duplicate its work.
- SBSTA should ensure that discussion/decisions should not create additional externalities in trade, or mitigation commitments for DCs and LDCs.
- It should emphasize the need for scaled up public investment in ag.

# References

- IATP
- GAIA FOUNDATION
- MISEREOR
- BEYOND COPENHAGEN
- OCASSIONAL PAPER SERIES PAIRVI
- SUBMISSION OF VIEWS ON ISSUES RELATED TO AGRICULTURE BY CECOEDECON,PAIRVI AND BEYOND COPENHAGEN
- UNFCCC DOCS

Thank you for the attention.  
Comments and feedback are welcome  
at [k.ajay.j@gmail.com](mailto:k.ajay.j@gmail.com)