



2nd Development Forum for the G20 Exploring Alternative Development Strategies

24–25 October 2011 ■ Paris, France

Summary of the forum co-organized by UNRISD and Pax Romana
with the support of Caritas-France and the Rosa-Luxemburg-Foundation

Introduction

Multiple crises of unanticipated scale and intensity have not only produced dramatic negative effects on people's livelihoods across the world, they also present certain opportunities for critics of mainstream development based on free market liberalism. Widespread concern about increasing inequality within and between countries is accompanied by demands for stronger market regulation, in particular of the financial sector. Civil society organizations and social movements around the world are among those most visible drawing attention to these developments and their negative consequences, in particular for developing countries, and formulating alternative development vision and strategies. One potential entry point for civil society to voice these concerns and to introduce alternative visions and strategies into the development discourse lies in the growing prominence of international policy forums for regional and international cooperation with emerging economies such as China, India, Brazil and the Republic of Korea. The G20 Summit, which provides such a forum for governments to act and advocate for global well-being beyond national self-interest, is a case in point.

But civil society organizations, in particular those with a strong interest in alternative development visions and strategies, face several challenges when it comes to genuine participation in such processes. Again, the G20 is a case in point. First, although the issues placed on the G20 agenda, for example, food security and the financial transaction tax (FTT) are interrelated the G20 discourse is very fragmented, focusing on certain issues in isolation without offering a more comprehensive framework for discussion. Second, civil society from the South is chronically underrepresented and marginalized in the G20 process. Third, there are few official channels for civil society to voice their views and to allow for alternative development visions and strategies to be incorporated into the G20 process.

In an effort to overcome these challenges in engaging a public space for development discourse for the G20, the 2nd Development Forum for the G20 was organized by UNRISD and Pax Romana, an international NGO in consultative status with ECOSOC, with support from Caritas France and the Rosa-Luxemburg Foundation on 24 and 25 October in Paris. This

was a follow-up to the Seoul G20 development forum¹, which produced the Seoul Development Consensus for Shared Growth.

With the theme *Exploring Alternative Development Strategies*, the 2nd Development Forum for the G20 aimed to provide stakeholders, in particular civil society, with a space for holistic and comprehensive discussion of, and formulation of joint strategies around, relevant development issues related to the current G20 agenda. A key output of the Forum was a joint civil society declaration which was delivered to President Nicolas Sarkozy as chair of the G20, by Father Antoine Sondag of Caritas France, when the president received the official Civil Society delegation to the G20 on 2 November, 2011. Four representatives of international organizations and governments, 15 representatives of research institutes and academia, and 29 civil society organizations participated in the Forum. All 29 civil society organisations signed the declaration.

¹ In 2011 UNRISD explored a new type of engagement with academia, civil society groups and government and intergovernmental agencies during the process of the G20 in Seoul. Presenting research findings in particular those from past work on Social Policy in a Development Context to the forum, UNRISD organized a set of activities under the title of the Seoul Development Forum for the G20¹: a web-based discussion forum; a symposium held in Seoul, Republic of Korea on 21-22 October, 2010 and a televised debate among leading development thinkers aired on the Korean Broadcast System on the occasion of the Seoul G20 Summit. These activities contributed to enriching the discussions around the agenda set by the G20, and disseminating various alternative approaches on development issues within and outside Korea.

Box: DECLARATION

To the Heads of States and Governments of the G8/G20 Summit

Outside the G8/G20 Summit, we, civil society and social movements from the North and the South, meeting at the 2nd Development Forum in Paris on October 24th and 25th 2011, have explored, hand in hand, alternative development strategies and discussed urgent and interdependent issues such as unemployment and universal social protection, debt and innovative financing for development, climate change and food and water security.

It has been three years since the world was plunged into a financial and economic crisis in 2008. As the heads of States and Governments of the G8/G20 meet in November, the harmful effects of this crisis continue to cause suffering and insecurity worldwide: massive job losses and increased vulnerability, as well as more hunger and conflict. Countries of the South, where the World Bank and the IMF have forced their neoliberal structural adjustment programs for more than a generation continue to suffer from the privatization and deregulation of basic services essential to life, such as health care, water, electricity and education. Countries are forced to produce for export rather than for domestic consumption. European countries, with their more stable and complete social protection systems, are now starting to feel what the rest of the world has been enduring for years. Their governments have slowly shifted to neoliberal policies and the current austerity programs aim at dismantling the welfare states, labour rights, and public services - the results of hard-fought struggles of past centuries.

The persistence of underdevelopment and the recurrent crises (food, health, social, environmental, financial, economical, and political) that affect more and more severely humanity are evidence of the ineffectiveness of economic development policies in recent decades. Both the North and the South need alternative development strategies to overcome the financial and economic crisis and give people the protection they are entitled to.

The world is demanding social justice and respect for all human rights as the major backbone for political democracy. This is what the popular uprisings from Tunisia, Egypt and Yemen to London, Greece, Spain, France, Chile and the USA have shown. Urgent measures are needed to stop the growing inequalities, the concentration of wealth and power for a few while the large majorities live in poverty. Existing poverty reduction policies are largely ineffective because they perpetuate the economic, social and political gap between the powerful and the powerless, the rich and the poor, the haves and the have-nots.

More than simply coordinating the economic policies of major economies, G8/G20 governments must re-think the goals of their development strategies. Beyond reforming the international monetary system or addressing the volatility of commodity prices, they must seriously consider the common good and survival of humanity: regular and decent jobs, social protection, food security, access to water and other essential services, and stopping and reversing the effects of climate change. This requires first and foremost a new financial architecture.

As western countries with well developed welfare states have shown over the past decades, universal social protection are efficient factors for growth and development, both economically and socially. Third world countries which did reduce poverty and succeeded in promoting growth and development are those which did not follow the dominant neoliberal policies and introduced important social innovations. Universal social protection systems are at the core of the developmental State which history has demonstrated as the most successful approximation of social justice. The 2nd Development Forum Meeting therefore demands the introduction of transformative social policies, based on a universal social protection system in order to guarantee for all people the respect for and fulfilment of their fundamental human rights and more particularly article 25 of the UDHR.

We consider social protection as a common good of humanity. Due to the continued crisis and the successive economic shocks caused by unregulated market speculation, most countries are faced with huge debt burdens and public finances are under stress. However, corporate taxes have been lowered in many countries, whereas trade liberalization has cut public revenues in significant ways. G8/G20 countries must embark on a debt audit and the cancellation of illegitimate debts. While most third world countries have a huge potential for raising domestic progressive taxes, it seems obvious that the enormous growth of the global financial sector which now largely escapes all domestic taxes, can also contribute to raising income for economic and social development. The 2nd Development Forum Meeting therefore demands the introduction of a Financial Transaction Tax to be used to fund transformative social policies.

While technological progress has allowed food production to grow – faster than population growth - famine still occurs and kills too many men, women, and children. These famines can be a consequence of a distorted distribution system, too high prices due to climate change, land grabbing policies, shifts to agro-fuels and food speculation. Food is a basic human right which should alongside with water be guaranteed for all people, all over the world. The 2nd Development Forum Meeting therefore demands urgent measures to treat food and water as basic human rights and a common good through measures influencing the root causes of their scarcity.

In 2012 a World Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio + 20) will be held in Brazil to follow-up on the Conferences of Rio (1992) and Johannesburg (2002). Climate change is part of the systemic crisis we are living today and will not be solved as long as there is no political willingness to seriously tackle the problem and significantly reduce the emission of greenhouse gases. The 2nd Development Forum Meeting therefore demands respect for the political commitments taken in Rio and Johannesburg as well as urgent measures to show the willingness of the international community to save humanity from climate disasters.

The 2nd Development Forum Meeting has worked in the long term perspective of a common political agenda aimed at social and climate justice. We are committed to continue our work and mobilize social movements all over the world to initiate and support measures for a universal social protection, health care, education and other public services, work in dignity, food security, access to water and stopping climate change, irrespective of the existing national development models. These are universal needs in conformity with the universal human rights, which everyone should be able to enjoy. They can only be delivered through broad structural reforms in order to achieve just, equitable and ecologically sustainable societies.

We seek to build broad strategic alliances and consider these goals as being part of a long term process. Finally, we call to support a UN Charter for the Common Good of Humanity, which, alongside the Universal Declaration on Human Rights, will offer an ethical basis and legitimacy for policies aimed at common goods and universal social protection.

Opening Session

Objectives, Organization and Structure

Describing the background and objectives of the Forum in their opening statements, Ilcheong Yi of UNRISD, Lawrencia Kwark of Pax Romana, and Armando de Negri, representing the World Social Forum on Health and Social Security, emphasized the role of civil society in bringing alternative views on and development strategies into the G20 process. In particular, they suggested civil society could explore the interconnections between issues and advocate more comprehensive approaches and strategies and bring in issues and perspectives that had been left out by the current G20 agenda. Yi outlined the key themes of the Forum - the G20 process and structure, innovative financing for development, universal social protection, food security and climate change – highlighting in particular the significance of two issues not raised by the current G20 agenda: universal social protection and climate change. Policy linkages between all these agendas need to be considered in framing the discourse on the development, he argued, making the case for exploring how, for example, innovative financing and a FTT can be used to reduce aid volatility, and thereby facilitate processes of transformation towards universal social protection in developing countries.

Emphasizing the need for a more comprehensive and holistic understanding of development within the G20 agenda, de Negri suggested two questions for framing the Forum discussion:

- What is the nature of the current crises, their consequences, and the potential and limits of the answers formulated by the G20?
- What are the alternative policy options and development strategies to deal with these issues in a more holistic and comprehensive manner, in particular, paying careful consideration to the critical linkages between themes and opportunities for advocacy at national and international policy stages and forums?

All three opening speakers emphasized the importance of the Forum for knowledge sharing and strengthening the representation of civil society actors and activists in particular, those from the global South, in order to create, maintain and extend the current momentum for development within the G20 and beyond.

Session 1

The G20 Development Agenda: An Overview

Session 1 discussed the procedural and institutional dynamics and politics of the G20. Antoine Sondag of Caritas France reviewed the process involved in formulating and setting the 2011 G20 agenda. He emphasized his impression that although the final agenda was the result of negotiations among the G20 members very limited space had been created by the host country, France, for the inclusion of other voices, i.e. civil society. Other stakeholders, such as various international agencies (e.g., the WB, IMF, WTO, ILO and OECD) had been recognized as supporting bodies and some had been invited to attend the meeting, it was not clear who supports which points of the agenda and who exerts which level of influence on the final outcome document. In this respect, it is valuable to investigate why certain points were put on the summit's agenda and others were excluded, and to be aware of who is supporting which point. The three presenters in this session emphasized that both the issues and

processes of the G20 need to be transparent and should be critically assessed by academics and civil society leaders.

Roberto Bissio, of the Civil Society Reflection Group on Global Development Policies, pointed out that the development discourse within the G20 lacks a perspective on inequality within and between countries. He illustrated the importance of redistributive policies to reduce inequality by the gap between an increase in global growth as reported by the WTO since 1990, and the stagnation and even decrease in the achievement of social development, as measured by the Basic Capability Index (BCI)². By comparing environmental degradation, trade volume and economic growth, Bissio showed that data do not support the common argument that economic growth necessitates an increase in the use of natural resources and environmental degradation. Instead, he pointed out that current sustainable development strategies focus only on production without paying equally strong attention to unequal consumption patterns across and within countries. Bissio argued that solutions to sustainable economic growth can and should be explored and can be found by addressing, both production and consumption, and environmental degradation and inequality simultaneously. According to Bissio, these are the synergies that need to be explored and analysed by civil society to make the G20 development agenda more holistic.

Taking a different stance on the G20, the third speaker, Thomas Fues from the German Development Institute (DIE), discussed the potential and promise of the G20. He suggested that the evolution from the G8 to the G20 can be seen as (i) an acknowledgement of the growing impact of rising powers, especially Brazil, India and China; (ii) an opening up to large influential developing country democracies such as India and Indonesia; and (iii) a potential venue for paying greater attention to the provision of global public goods beyond national self-interest. Fues illustrated the latter point by the example of the establishment of the Working Group on Development within the G20, which could be seen as one way of implementing the Millennium Development Goal 8 (a global partnership for development).

However, Fues also pointed out that the potential promise of the G20 needs to be assessed along several dimensions, including legitimacy, in particular with regard to its representational function. Fues highlighted that large parts of the world, in particular, African countries apart from South Africa, are still not represented among the G20 member states, and that insufficient linkages have been established so far to facilitate interaction between the G20 and more inclusive global governance bodies, such as the United Nations.

In the final presentation of this session, Samuel Pommeret of the Comité Catholique contre la Faim et pour le Développement (CCFD-Terre Solidaire) critiqued the G20 on three points. First, he argued the G20 continues to frame development in terms of economic growth without addressing the more comprehensive range of citizens' needs; second, the G20 and its working groups lack transparency; and, third, the objectives, interests and powers of the G20 and its individual members are not clear. As examples illustrating these points, Pommeret pointed to the tendency of G20 member countries to regard non-members, and specifically developing countries, merely as potential markets for exports without paying much attention to the political and institutional dimensions of these countries' development needs. This, in Pommeret's view, is also reflected by the way the G20 legitimizes its representational function by stating that its members account for 90% of global GDP. Due to these problems, Pommeret suggested that civil society should focus more on strengthening advocacy at the

² A composite index of access to primary education and under-five mortality, summarizing basic levels of human dignity at global level.

national and local policy levels instead of paying too much attention to the G20. And if the G20 was to be targeted directly, he recommended doing so via national governments and member states.

Session 2

Innovative Development Strategy I:

Innovative Financing and a Financial Transaction Tax

The second session dealt with five aspects of the Financial Transaction Tax (FTT), one of the main G20 agenda points set by the French Presidency: redistribution, feasibility, potential volumes of revenue for development, administration and management, and expenditure of potential revenues. The chair of the session, Heikki Patomaki of the University of Helsinki and chair of Attac Finland, used his opening remarks to draw special attention to the link between a FTT (and other alternative financing mechanisms) and social development. Highlighting the lack of discussion on the use of revenues, he argued that the FTT should be used to fund the alleviation of poverty, development and other global public goods. In this respect, he raised his concern about the European Commission's recent initiative proposal to introduce an FTT and allocate revenues to EU resource needs, rather than to global/development concerns.

Stephen Spratt, lecturer at the Institute for Development Studies (IDS), reviewed the ups and downs in the history of campaigning for an FTT. Despite the euphoria that accompanied France's strong support for an FTT, he saw the prospects for an FTT being adopted at the summit as rather pessimistic. Spratt explained that a FTT had not received wide-ranging endorsement and was likely to be rejected in the 2011 G20 mainly because of the US dissenting vote. He pointed out that the feasibility of and the potential for revenue through an FTT are no longer questioned. Instead, the debate is currently focused on regulatory and market-distortion notions rather than questions regarding how and for which purposes revenues should be used. Returning to the question raised by Patomaki regarding the allocation of revenues, Spratt highlighted the proposal³ by the European Commission as the most comprehensive one to date. This is because, closely related to Stephen Schulmeister's global FTT⁴, the EC's proposal entails wide coverage of foreign exchange and derivatives markets. Spratt concluded that while current crises have opened a window of opportunity for an FTT, an organized effort is required to seize this momentum. Implementation of an FTT at the EU level was seen by Spratt as the most promising advocacy route to eventually realize a global FTT.

Francine Mestrum of the Global Justice Movement focused her presentation on the spending and revenue allocation component of an FTT. She posited an FTT not only as a means in itself, but as an essential precondition for the effective design and implementation of universal social protection and other alternative development approaches in developing countries, where, currently, financial constraints and aid dependency severely limit the establishment and expansion of such systems. Citing a range of examples of social security systems in a number of developing countries, Mestrum underlined the need for FTT advocates to go

³ Council Directive on a Common System of Financial Transaction Tax and amending Directive 2008/7/EC, 28, September, 2011.

⁴ Stephan Schulmeister (2009). A General Financial Transaction Tax: A Short Cut of the Pros, the Cons and a Proposal, WIFO Working Papers, WIFO, Wien.

beyond the technical discussion about revenue generation and focus on spending and resource allocation. She highlighted the importance of developing convincing arguments and proposals for the use of revenues in support of development objectives, rather than bailouts of financial institutions.

In discussing the role of an FTT in regulating speculative trade, Markus Henn of World Economy, Ecology and Development (WEED) and Attac Germany argued that an FTT should contribute to controlling the high-frequency trading that is most harmful to market stability and developing countries. With regard to the prospects for adopting a global FTT at the G20, Henn acknowledged the current support for a European FTT but voiced strong concerns about the extent to which the revenues generated were likely to be used for development. Based on this concern, Henn suggested that advocacy efforts should focus on national trade tax schemes rather than for a consolidated regional or global level tax, such as EU-level trade tax sources, because the first could more easily be earmarked as revenues for development, in terms of ODA contributions.

The presentations and discussions of this session articulated several policy messages. One key message was that potential revenue and spending plans for an FTT should not be separated from the design of an FTT; redistributive and developmental purposes should be incorporated into the design of an FTT from the very beginning. Given the constraints faced by developing countries, an FTT that involves a redistributive and developmental purpose, similar to a Robin Hood tax, was positioned as an innovative way to finance universal social protection at the global level. The European Commission's recent proposal for an FTT at the European level was seen as positive progress. Yet, the lack of attention paid to the question of how to gain broader support at the global level and how spend revenues were persistent.

Session 3

Innovative Development Strategy II: A Universal Social Protection System

Interest in universal social security and assistance has re-emerged, particularly in developing countries, since the beginning of the economic crisis in 2008. Debates on the future direction of social policy within a development context have received impetus from a wide range of initiatives and ideas by international organizations, in particular in countries under demographic transition and those facing increasing inequality under economic growth. These initiatives include UNCTAD's New International Development Architecture, and the UN's system-wide Social Protection Floor led by the ILO and the WHO. Within this debate, demands to transform fragmented and inequality-generating welfare systems into comprehensive and universal ones have attracted a great deal of attention. This session discussed the institutional drivers of these processes of universalization of social protection systems. Particular attention was paid to the transformative role of social policy in these processes in different country and cross-country contexts.

Bob Deacon, Emeritus Professor of International Social Policy at the University of Sheffield and UNESCO-UNU Chair in Regional Integration, Migration and Free Movement, UNU CRIS, opened the session by laying out a broad range of currently existing initiatives and social protection systems at national and international levels, from Brazil's Bolsa Familia to the ILO Social Protection Floor. He also raised questions regarding the potential for common understandings and synergies in the provision of social protection. First, despite advances in

discussions about the role of social protection in a development context in recent years, important questions remain about how social protection is defined in terms of the level, policy components, and various modes of provision by national governments and international agencies; and how synergies can be created and utilized, such as between and across national and international level efforts, to advance transformative processes worldwide.

Christina Behrendt of the ILO explained the concept of the Social Protection Floor, and the policy processes behind it. Social protection is defined by the ILO by two components: (i) access to basic services; and (ii) and a basic set of social transfers. Transformation towards universal social protection systems is conceptualized in two dimensions: (i) broadening access; and (ii) increasing quality from social assistance to social security. Behrendt concluded her presentation by highlighting the importance of support for national governments in order to ensure that these transformational processes actually take place and do remain stuck at minimal levels of social assistance.

Kate Carroll of ActionAid International (AAI) presented social protection programmes designed and implemented under the framework of ActionAid's National Development Strategy (NDS) Programme. The notion of transformation has been placed at the core of ActionAid's approach by linking social protection to an inherently rights-based approach to development. Carroll emphasized the need to focus advocacy on national-level policy design and implementation, and to support these processes by building and exchanging knowledge on transformative social policies across national experiences and policy contexts. She shared Behrendt's concern that exclusive reliance on social assistance programmes may stigmatize recipient groups rather than include and empower them. As a positive example of a programme that follows a rights-based transformative approach, Carroll presented the case of the Right to Education Programme, and emphasized that embedding a rights-based approach in national education strategies can fulfil both the objectives of access to and quality of social provisions.

Thelma Narayan, from the People's Health Movement (PHM) India, described her organization's understanding and approach to social protection and transformative social policies, which follows a bottom-up community-led approach to health protection and services in India as well as a critical constructive engagement with the WHO. The PHM approach, which entails consultative village process with a strong participatory principle, was presented as an alternative development strategy. Several issues of concern, such as capture by elites and the dominance of professional over people's knowledge, were raised as future challenges that need to be tackled by village committees to transform existing health care systems into equity-based health communities.

Armando de Negri of the World Social Forum on Health and Social Security emphasized the need to address political rather than technical challenges to bring about universal social protection systems. Social rights must become political rights in all national contexts and globally, with no country specificity and no differences in social protection floors. Focusing on the plurality of rights, argued de Negri, provides excuses for the lowest level of social assistance in low-income countries due to the large costs perceived for the expansion of universal provision, and this generates reluctance among citizens to fight to establish a social contract that aims for the maximum provision possible. To enable the currently fragmented social movement landscape to unite and fight for this latter goal, de Negri emphasized the need to create public policy spaces in which alternative ideas of universal protection can be developed.

Tina Ebro of the Asia Europe People's Forum (AEPF) suggested that current social mobilizations, such as the Occupy Movement in the United States and around the world, have the potential to unify people with various grievances but need to be brought to the next level of creating and formulating alternative development strategies and pathways. As an example, Ebro cited the Network for Transformative Social Protection that spans across various Asian national policy contexts with the objective of creating a space for learning across borders and for developing deeper knowledge on specific policy issues that can be applied nationally, regionally and globally.

The discussion focused on two issues, the current lack of a clear/broad definition of social protection and on the question of the suitability of the G20 as a space for advocacy for social protection. With regard to the first point, the majority of participants agreed that the current diversity of definitions and concepts leads to the perception that social protection means everything and nothing. For the purpose of effective advocacy, a strong demand was voiced by civil society for a unified definition of social protection, beyond the frameworks and policy targets of specific institutions. With regard to the suitability of the G20 as a space for advocacy, there was consensus that effective advocacy for and implementation of social protection requires targeting both global and national development strategies. The G20 was seen as one space that can be targeted in a global advocacy strategy.

Session 4

Innovative Development Strategy III

Social Policy Responses to Climate Change

The question of how social policy can be used to respond to uncertainties created by climate change has not been widely researched. The social dimension has yet to be mainstreamed in the climate change debate, despite strong evidence regarding the negative impact of climate change on livelihoods, in particular, of poor communities, and for inequality and various forms of deprivation. Studies on the effects of education on people's preparedness and capacities to cope with disasters, and on the impacts of various social policies on production and consumption patterns⁵, show a significant potential role for social policy in responding to climate change risks in terms of both mitigation and adaptation. Session 4 addressed this potential role of social policy in responding to climate change risks.

Farouk Braimah, of the People's Dialogue on Human Settlements and Shack/Slum Dwellers International gave a critical assessment of his organization's experience with international climate change programmes. He noted a discrepancy between the wealth of already existing knowledge within communities about how to strengthen their adaptability, develop coping mechanisms, and devise strategies to mitigate the negative impacts of climate change, and the policy responses of the government and the international aid community. As climate impacts increase, the people most affected engage with alternative livelihood activities. International agencies' policies, however, were not seen as responsive to these activities. Braimah argued for proactively exploring and utilizing local knowledge through establishing mechanisms for its translation into policy resources.

⁵ See the research on education and disaster risk reduction and papers from UNRISD 2011 conference on Social Dimensions of Green Economy and Sustainable Development.

Aurelie Ceinos of CARE France highlighted the need for gender-sensitive programmes and a focus on women and children through programmes for small loans and cash-transfers to households implementing climate-sensitive mitigation schemes. Ceinos presented CARE's Where the Rain Falls project as an example of a programme that aims to facilitate adaptation efforts for people and communities displaced by climate change through providing appropriate infrastructure, and education and training programmes. She emphasized that empowering, i.e., women in the household through education on the management of savings, diversifying income sources, and strengthening their voices has been shown, in CARE's experience, empowers the most vulnerable in the community.

Ben Powless of the Indigenous Environmental Network positioned indigenous populations at the core of the debate on the social consequences of climate change because of their geographical and socio-political vulnerability. Indigenous knowledge was seen as the basis for indigenous people's adaptation strategies to climate change, but this knowledge is often neglected and ignored in the adaptation and mitigation strategies of international organizations, the aid community, and the state. As a result, Powless saw indigenous peoples' trust in aid organisations and national governments as low. Instead, indigenous groups have engaged more with global civil society movements and with bodies such as the UNPFII (United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues), the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People and International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs. Powless positioned these spaces as critical for indigenous groups to bring attention to their knowledge of alternative mitigation and adaptation strategies.

Hindou Oumarou of the Association des Femmes Peules Autochtones du Tchad (AFPAT) presented several mechanisms to translate local knowledge into policy resources that effectively address climate change mitigation and adaptation in different regions where nomadic tribes migrate in Chad and surrounding countries. AFPAT's strategies are based on mapping the geographical areas, crops and fauna through which indigenous people try to ensure their survival, and bringing their indigenous knowledge to the attention of national and international policy-making bodies. Oumarou showed how traditional knowledge has been translated into policy resources through the use of technology, such as GPS, by making migration routes visible electronically and coordinating them among tribes and along strategic points of local food and livestock markets.

All of the presentations during this session pointed out the limited effectiveness of the approaches adopted by governments and international development agencies, and the need to directly involve local communities and grassroots organizations in designing and implementing adequate policy measures to address climate change. The discussion centred on the questions of whether new frameworks and programmes need to be developed to properly address the issue of climate change, or whether climate change needs to be integrated into broader existing frameworks. In favour of integration, de Negri suggested that new climate-change-specific frameworks and actions would only further increase a fragmentation of civil society and artificially separate groups, for example indigenous peoples groups, from other poor and marginalized populations. However, representatives of indigenous peoples groups tended to argue against integration based on their historically marginalized position in the political economy of their countries and in the international scheme, for example not being acknowledged as citizens in the countries they inhabit. Participants agreed that there is a need to integrate the issue of climate change into frameworks which aim at securing economic, social and cultural rights in order to generate more comprehensive policy responses.

Session 5

Innovative Development Strategy IV

A Rights-Based Approach to Food

According to the FAO estimates in 2009, over one billion people around the world are suffering from chronic hunger. Although food prices have fallen from their peak in 2008, they remain high and the international community is far off track on meeting its commitments to securing the right of all persons to food, and the achievement of MDG 1 of eradicating extreme poverty and hunger by 2015.

Lawrencia Kwark of Pax Romana, chair of this session and member of the Association of World Council of Churches Related Development Organisations in Europe (APRODEV) and Coopération Internationale pour le Développement et la Solidarité (CIDSE), two alliances of faith-based development organizations, introduced the current situation as follows:

There have been numerous political declarations as well as institutional and financial initiatives since the explosion of food riots in 2008. Yet, all professing commitment to alleviating the immediate impacts on affected communities, and to finding long-term solutions to the crisis have produced disappointing results. Despite a number of positive developments identified over the course of the political debate, there is yet a lack of recognition of the fact that the food price crisis was not the result of one or two isolated policy failures, but of the promotion over the past two decades of a broad set of policies inspired by a solely market-driven approach to food and agriculture that did not and could never ensure global food security. This approach left millions of rural poor in developing countries in a state of chronic hunger for years, long before the effects of the price hike of 2008 hit, and has contributed to severe environmental degradation which has been undermining the long-term agricultural productive capacity.⁶

The session dealt with three issues: the right to food, bio-diverse agricultural ecosystems, and ways to build global governance for food security including fighting price volatility. The focus was on the linkage between the food security policy framework and various methods of financing for development, such as ODA and FTT, and the reshaping of the Common Agricultural Policy of the European Union.

Zeremariam Fre of the Pastoral and Environmental Network of the Horn of Africa (PENHA) explained the situation of multiple-citizenship nomads and the significant role of pastoralism as part of food production systems that sustain local livelihoods. Two issues were pointed out as currently threatening pastoralist communities: land grabbing and conflicts. Drought and climate change, which are currently receiving a lot of attention at the international level, are in fact perpetual concerns of people at the grassroots. These issues were seen as a means to re-frame concerns about marginalization and the worsening situation with regard to the decrease in access to and right to use land for self-subsistence.

Bereket Tesfa, of the Pastoral and Environmental Network of the Horn of Africa (PENHA) introduced the changing conditions and alternative adaptation strategies by nomads in the Horn of Africa, such as an increasing urbanization, the need for income diversification and increased nomad activity in local governance, advocacy related to land-rights, improved communication systems, and change in gender roles. One alternative development strategy illustrated was the establishment of local livestock markets among communities, which circumvent the costly use of middlemen and make market access much easier for pastoral

⁶ Kwark's introductory remarks were quoting a Joint Briefing Paper and Recommendations by the Association of World Council of Churches Related Development Organisations in Europe (APRODEV) and Coopération Internationale pour le Développement et la Solidarité (CIDSE) to the EU for the World Food Summit (16–18 November 2009).

local communities. In particular, access to local markets was seen as an alternative to increased commodification of land and industrialization of agriculture. In the light of recent large-scale land purchase or leasing by external actors, multinational companies and foreign governments, local livestock markets were seen as preferable for trading the products of pastoral communities but also as essential to their and the regions food security.

Saoudata Aboubacrine of the Comité de coordination des Peuples Autochtones d’Afrique presented the Tuareg People’s efforts towards food production and the measures they have taken to establish and maintain their food security. Echoing Tefsa’s presentation, Aboubacrine highlighted the importance of the organization of exchange and trade among nomad groups and with settled communities and urban centres. She also emphasized the need to build upon and strengthen indigenous strategies as alternatives to more top-down strategies developed by international development agencies.

Tommy Pratama from the Institute for Crisis Studies and Alternative Development in Indonesia argued that food shortages and the lack of affordability of food from local farmers to sustain the livelihoods of local communities are due to dysfunctional markets: for example, imported seeds and processed food items are available at a cheaper price than locally produced seeds and food. He argued that this dysfunctionality, combined with the lack of opportunities for local farmers and peasants to work in wage labour in their locality, and the prevalence of credit, have resulted in the severe economic and social deterioration of farmers and farming communities. In particular, smallholder farmers suffer from a long chain of distribution and consumption and increased debt until raw materials are sold and food can be purchased. Alternative development strategies, such as land reforms and micro-lending schemes during cultivation times, receive support from the development community. However, farmers benefit little from these actions due to the low income yield potential from farming in competition with low-cost food and seed imports. As a result, farmers leave their land to work as seasonal migrant labour. Pratama posited larger cooperatives between farmers and smallholders to gather information and strengthen their political power as the most valid alternative to large-scale agriculture development.

The discussion for Session 5 focused on examples of successful agrarian reform and food security strategies employed by different groups in different regions, and on the more fundamental question of how to preserve indigenous, smallholder and pastoralist community livelihoods in times of large-scale agricultural development. De Negri described an example from Brazil when the existing Ministry of Agriculture was split into two separate ministries, one for family production and one for large-scale agribusiness. With regard to the more fundamental question of whether over the longer term the livelihoods and cultures of pastoralist and indigenous communities can be preserved, Oumarou suggested to focus advocacy at the international-level rather than the national policy level, because currently national debates too often focus on increasing GDP rather than preserving the cultures and livelihoods of population groups.

Sessions 6 and 7

Summary and Conclusions

The final sessions stimulated dialogue among all participants on and across the thematic sessions, and identified linkages between the different issues raised in order to formulate cross-cutting and comprehensive policy recommendations. Some policy conflicts were identified, as were opportunities for policy synergies.

For example, opinions diverged between proponents and opponents of programmes that define and implement minimum social protection standards across countries. Proponents argued that the issue has been neglected for too long already, and the definition and implementation of a set of minimum criteria was a big step forward. Opponents argued that unless such programmes, including for example the ILO social protection floor, pay equally strong attention to mechanisms that support countries in continuously improving and expanding these standards, a race to the bottom instead of a transformation towards universalism through continuous improvements would occur. It was acknowledged that both approaches are important, and that civil society has important roles to play: in advocating for high standards, supporting governments and international institutions in their efforts; and monitoring implementation of agreed provisions. Participants agreed on the value and usefulness of forums that facilitate knowledge and practice sharing among civil society organizations and movements in and across different country contexts.

Francine Mestrum and Tina Ebro presented a draft civil society declaration and received feedback from the participants. The key demands raised by the declaration were:

- A new financial architecture and FTT for use for development purposes
- Universal social protection, health care, education and other public services
- Work in dignity and regular and decent jobs
- Food security and universal access to water
- A rights-based approach to climate change

The declaration was discussed and finalized with input from all participants. On 2 November 2011 Father Antoine Sondag of Caritas-France submitted the declaration to French President Nicolas Sarkozy as Chair of the G20, on behalf of the Forum.

Finally, participants discussed possibilities for future collaboration, including three initiatives for establishing forums for knowledge and practice sharing and mobilizing civil society: the Asian Network for Transformative Social Protection, the NDS programme of ActionAid International, and a Transformative Social Policy Knowledge and Practice Network (TSPKPN) involving ActionAid, IPAID, and the Asian Network for Transformative Social Protection.

Maris de la Cruz briefly introduced the Asian Network for Transformative Social Protection. The purpose and objectives of the network are to unify and strengthen Asian civil society in their efforts towards advocacy for and cumulative knowledge building on transformative social policy. Jesper Lauridsen, NDS Programme Director at ActionAid, briefly explained the NDS Programme, which aims to foster civil society influence on national development strategies, such as in the issue area of social protection. Annkathrin Ellersiek outlined the proposed TSPKPN, an online forum to facilitate the exchange of knowledge and practices between civil society and other stakeholders on transformative social policies, in and across different country contexts.

The potential linkages and synergies between these programmes and initiatives were discussed, particularly as they relate to preparing and implementing strategies towards the 2012 G20 Summit in Mexico, Rio+20 in Brazil, and the MDG+ agenda.

Programme

Day 1: Monday, 24 October 2011

Opening Addresses

Armando De Negri, World Social Forum on Health and Social Security
Lawrencia Kwark, Pax Romana
Ilcheong Yi, UNRISD

Session 1—The G20 Development Agenda: An Overview

Chair: Fr. Antoine Sondag, Secours Catholique; Caritas France

Speakers and Discussants:

Roberto Bissio, Civil Society Reflection Group on Global Development Policies
Thomas Fues, German Development Institute (DIE)
Samuel Pommeret, CCFD-Terre Solidaire

Session 2—Innovative Development Strategy I: Innovative Financing and Financial Transaction Tax

Chair: Prof. Heikki Patomaki, University of Helsinki

Speakers and Discussants:

Dr. Steven Spratt, Institute of Development Studies (IDS)
Dr. Francine Mestrum, Global Justice Movement
Mr. Markus Henn, WEED

Session 3—Innovative Development Strategy II: A Universal Social Protection System

Chair: Bob Deacon, Emeritus Professor of International Social Policy, University of Sheffield; UNESCO-UNU Chair in Regional Integration, Migration and Free Movement, UNU-CRIS

Speakers and Discussants:

Tina Ebro, Asia Europe People's Forum (AEPF)
Kate Carroll, ActionAid International
Christina Behrendt, ILO
Thelma Narayan, People's Health Movement India
Armando Negri, World Social Forum on Health and Social Security
Ilcheong Yi, UNRISD

Session 4—Innovative Development Strategy III: Social Policy Responses to Climate Change

Chair: Dr. François Gemenne, IDDRI

Speakers and Discussants:

Ben Powless, Indigenous Environmental Network

Farouk Braimah, People's Dialogue on Human Settlements and Shack/Slum Dwellers International

Aurélie Ceinos, CARE France

Hindou Oumarou, AFPAT

Day 2: Tuesday, 25 October 2011

Session 5—Innovative Development Strategy IV: A Rights-Based Approach to Food

Chair: Lawrencia Kwark, Pax Romana

Speakers and Discussants:

Saoudata Aboubacrine, Comité de coordination des Peuples Autochtones d'Afrique

Zeremariam Fre and Mr. Bereket Tesfa, The Pastoral and Environmental Network in the Horn of Africa (PENHA)

Tommy Pratama, Institute for Crisis Studies and Alternative Development

Session 6: Summary and Conclusions

Chairs: Ilcheong Yi, UNRISD and Lawrencia Kwark, Pax Romana

Speakers and Discussants: Roundtable with panellists and rapporteurs from each session

Session 7: Advocacy and Implementation: Future Collaboration

Chairs: Anne Ellersiek and Olive Cocoman, UNRISD

Speakers and Discussants:

Phelisa Nkomo, GCAP South Africa

Maris De La Cruz, Network for Transformative Social Protection

Armando de Negri, World Social Forum on Health and Social Security

Tommy Pratama and Mr. Anwar Ma'fur, Institute for Crisis Studies and Alternative Development