

Joint submission on views on the elements of decision FCCC/CP/2022/L.4 establishing the Sharm el-Sheikh Joint Work on Implementation of Climate Action on Agriculture and Food Security

Submitted by CGIAR on behalf of (in alphabetical order): Agroecology Coalition, Alliance of Bioversity International and CIAT, Biovision Foundation, C40, CARE, Clim-Eat, Consumers International, EAT, Environmental Defense Fund (EDF), Food and Land Use Coalition (FOLU), Food Systems for the Future, Global Alliance for the Future of Food (GAFF), Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition (GAIN), Global Panel on Agriculture and Food Systems for Nutrition, International Centre for Climate Change and Development (ICCCAD), Pan African Climate Justice Alliance, Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN), World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF), YOUNGO, YPARD, “4 per 1000” Initiative.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This submission presents a set of recommendations on the elements of the Sharm el-Sheikh Joint Work on Implementation of Climate Action on Agriculture and Food Security – hereinafter SSJW - related to:

1. IMPLEMENTATION

We recommend that the SSJW holds at the earliest convenience an intersessional workshop aimed at drafting an action plan, with well-defined objectives and milestones, to guide the implementation of the recommendations formulated by the Koronivia Joint Work on Agriculture (KJWA) and monitor progress. We are ready to facilitate this process and provide advice on context-specific innovations and approaches for accelerating implementation.

We recommend that in the next few months the SSJW focuses on increasing access to existing funds for climate action in agriculture and food systems, by collaborating with observers and existing financial mechanisms within UNFCCC, as well as IFIs, regional banks, and the private sector. We stand ready to support the SSJW with identification of existing financial resources to step up implementation of the proposed action plan, and to backstop the formulation of project proposals aimed at implementing the recommendations of the KJWA.

2. GOVERNANCE

Given the SSJW mandate of ensuring implementation of the KJWA recommendations, its current governance may not be fit for purpose, and as such we recommend that Parties reassess the Joint Work model in the coming month. We also recommend better linking the IPCC to the SSJW, to provide the group with independent scientific expertise and advice, as well as knowledge and evidence to inform the Joint Work’s discussions.

We stand ready to support the UNFCCC Secretariat and the Parties in building the Online portal, providing advice on the structure, content, and its functionalities, and sharing their experience from similar portals hosted in our respective organizations’ websites.

3. FUTURE TOPICS

We recommend that the SSJW takes into consideration the following items as future topics for discussion: a) Food systems; b) Agroecology; c) Aquatic foods production; d) Land use changes; and e) Healthy diets from sustainable food systems.

This submission presents a set of recommendations on the “Joint Work on Implementation of Climate Action on Agriculture and Food Security” - hereinafter SSJW - responding to the calls for views included in the decision FCCC/CP/2022/L.4¹. This includes recommendations on a) elements of the Joint Work referred to in paragraphs 14–15 of the decision, including views on topics for the workshops referred to in paragraph 15(b); and on 2) the operationalization of the portal referred to in paragraph 16. Recommendations are grouped into three main sections: 1) Implementation, 2) Governance, and 3) Future Topics.

1. IMPLEMENTATION

1.1 Agreeing on an action plan for implementation

At para 3 and 4, decision FCCC/CP/2022/L.4 recognizes that the Koronivia Joint Work on Agriculture (KJWA) has been fundamental to identify clear pathways towards the adoption of more sustainable agriculture production models, which support adaptation and mitigation throughout food value chains. At the same time, the text recognizes the need to turn these findings into concrete actions to make an impact on the ground. Para 14 of the decision, in fact, requests the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) and the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) of the UNFCCC to establish the four-year Sharm el-Sheikh Joint Work on Implementation of Climate Action on Agriculture and Food Security, to move towards the implementation of the recommendations previously elaborated by the KJWA. In doing so, the decision explicitly attributes a more action-oriented mandate to the SSJW compared to its predecessor, recognizing the need to go beyond workshops, and making it responsible to guide implementation of the KJWA recommendations. However, the text does not clarify how implementation will happen.

We recommend that the SSJW agrees to hold at the earliest convenience an intersessional workshop aimed at drafting an action plan, with well-defined objectives and milestones, to guide the implementation of the KJWA recommendations and help to monitor progress in the next four years. We recommend the intersessional workshop to be held before COP28, to encourage the adoption of the action plan during this year’s Conference of Parties (CoP). The action plan should:

- **Clearly outline the scope of work and activities of the SSJW**, in line with the topics previously discussed by the KJWA and related recommendations, especially the 2021 'no-regrets options' identified and agreed by Parties, namely: i) Soil health should be maintained or increased wherever possible; ii) Open-burning of crop residues should be avoided; iii) Animal health policies should be reinforced; iv) Plant and animal diversification practices should be reinforced; v) Efforts should be made or guidance provided towards the creation of a universal system for assessing and monitoring adaptation; and vi) Sustainable food security should be ensured. Among its activities, the action plan should also include the identification of future topics for discussion, and planning of related workshops, and integrate gender, equity, and social inclusion concerns across topics.
- **Include a section on coordination activities with other parts and mechanisms within UNFCCC**, (including NDCs, NAPs, GGA, etc.) to build synergies and stronger linkages with other existing sub-processes of the Convention and related agreements. This should include planning information sharing sessions and nominating a focal point in the SSJW for each sub-process within the UNFCCC, who can act as the go-to person and ensure alignment.
- **Include a section on coordination activities with other external processes and actors working in the environment and climate space**, i.e.: IPCC, Rio Conventions (UNCBD, UNCCD), UNFSS Coordination Hub, Committee on World Food Security (CFS), Nutrition for Growth (N4G), etc.
- **Include a section on resource mobilization targets and activities**, including activities that foster cooperation with GEF, GCF, IFIs, regional banks and private sector, such as regular meetings, information sharing sessions, etc.

¹ For more information, please consult the final text of [decision FCCC/CP/2022/L.4](#)

- **Allow for a “multi-speed” implementation approach**, by setting a minimum threshold for implementation of the action plan, based on the KJWA recommendations and 2021 no-regret options, and ensuring that Parties who feel ready to accelerate implementation can feel free to do so. In fact, looking at the countries that contributed to the KJWA, there are many who have been championing bold actions towards climate adaptation and mitigation in agriculture, which may not be agreeable by all Parties of the newly created SSJW at this stage. Trying to reach consensus on some of the pending issues inside the Joint Work (i.e.: adaptation vs mitigation, agriculture vs food systems, etc.) might require time, and it is not advisable to link implementation of the KJWA recommendations to reaching a consensus on these, as this would slow down action and progress.

We, the undersigned organizations, are ready to facilitate dialogue among Parties and make available our knowledge and capacities to support the drafting of the proposed SSJW action plan. This includes helping to translate the action plan into country level plans adapted to the local needs, by supporting contextualization of actions and resource mobilization for implementation, as well as sharing best practices and information on existing successful initiatives that can be replicated/upscaled on the ground.

We are also ready to support countries in the implementation of a “multi-speed” approach, providing context-specific innovations, technologies and approaches for more adaptation and mitigation in food and agriculture that advance equity, justice, and communities’ empowerment. This includes producing evidence on opportunities for increased adaptation with mitigation co-benefits, as well as solutions that favor mitigation with adaptation co-benefits, while supporting socio-economic development, food and nutrition security, equitable access to resources, and resilient livelihoods for rural people. These solutions should be co-created with farmers, fisherfolks, and their communities, given their crucial role in tackling climate change.

1.2 Leveraging existing finance

At para 6, decision FCCC/CP/2022/L.4 acknowledges the need to identify modalities for accessing existing means of implementation, including finance. Paras 2(r) and 2(u) explicitly refer to the importance of providing more and better access to financial resources for climate action in agriculture, given current trends of rising adaptation costs. These are likely to range between USD 140 and 300 billion per year by 2030 and could hit USD 500 billion per year by 2050.² As the hardest hit by climate change effects, adaptation costs in developing countries are projected to rise to \$340 billion annually by 2030 and to \$565 billion by 2050. The gap in financial resources devoted to mitigation is even greater, and it is estimated at USD 850 billion annually by 2030.³

We recommend that in the next few months the SSJW focuses on increasing access to existing funds for climate action in agriculture and food systems. This includes collaborating with observers and existing financial mechanisms within UNFCCC, especially GEF and GCF, as well as IFIs, regional banks, institutions such as the World Bank, to repurpose existing public funds towards climate action in food and agriculture. It also includes working with food and agriculture companies, the finance sector, and philanthropists, to mobilize resources for nature-positive and climate-resilient agriculture and help to align business, procurement, and sustainability strategies to current global commitments on climate, nature, and people.

We stand ready to support the SSJW in identifying existing untapped financial resources for stepping up implementation of the proposed action plan. This includes providing advice on how to streamline processes for accessing available funds, making procedures easier and more efficient, in line with para 2 (n) on the “need to improve the enabling environment for mobilizing resources for implementing action at the local, national and international level”. It also includes exploring how current funding streams within UNFCCC can help to address climate action in food and agriculture, for example how to leverage the recently established Loss and Damage Fund, given that much of the losses and damages related to climate change affect the agri-food sector. Beyond this, in the longer term, it will be crucial to work with governments to redirect public investment (e.g.: incentives and subsidies) towards nature-positive production models that ensure that food systems can fulfill their wider economic, social, and environmental role, such as agroecological and other innovative approaches.

² UNFCCC (2019). [25 Years of Adaptation under the UNFCCC Report by the Adaptation Committee](#).

³ IFAD (2022). [Why climate finance matters: Your questions answered](#).

We are also ready to support the SSJW stakeholders in the formulation of project proposals aimed at implementing the recommendations of the KJWA, and that target small-scale farmers, pastoralists, fisherfolks and their organizations as direct recipients of funding. This includes providing recommendations on possible bankable project ideas, based on local, territorial, or country context, as well as high-level analysis and evidence for large-scale program and proposal development. Beyond supporting the ideation, formulation, and submission of the proposals, we are also ready to provide capacity building to the SSJW to formulate large-scale programme and project proposals aimed at implementing the KJWA recommendations.

Finally, we are ready to facilitate knowledge exchange and sharing of experience among countries in line with para 2(s) on “the need to scale up the implementation of best practices, innovations and technologies that increase resilience and sustainable production in agricultural systems according to national circumstances in an inclusive and participatory way that includes farmers, pastoralists, fisherfolk, Indigenous peoples, local and vulnerable communities, women and youth and is informed by scientific, local, and indigenous knowledge”.

2. GOVERNANCE

2.1 Improving governance for better coordination

In establishing the four-year Sharm el-Sheikh Joint Work on Implementation of Climate Action on Agriculture and Food Security, decision FCCC/CP/2022/L.4 keeps using the expression Joint Work, limiting the SSJW to being just an agenda item of the Subsidiary Bodies (SBs). **However, given the ambitious mandate attributed to the Joint Work, which is to ensure implementation of the recommendations elaborated by the KJWA, this type of governance may not be fit for purpose.**

We recommend that the Parties reassess this model in the coming months. Coordinating and monitoring implementation effectively will require establishing a stronger dedicated team external to the group of negotiators, based in the UNFCCC Secretariat, that can support the Parties in their endeavor. This is crucial not only to facilitate the work of the negotiators, during SBs, COPs and in between sessions, but also to: i) improve coordination between the group and other UNFCCC-related processes (i.e.: NDCs, NAPs, etc.), as well as with external policy processes (UNFSS stocktaking moment, CFS, N4G etc.); ii) leverage the knowledge and technical expertise held by other UN bodies (i.e.: FAO, IFAD, IPCC, etc.) and Conventions (i.e.: UNCBD and UNCCD) to support implementation; and iii) to measure the implementation of the action plan.

2.2 Leveraging IPCC’s expertise and process to support the Joint Work

Paragraph 14 letter (d) of decision FCCC/CP/2022/L.4 highlights that the SSJW is responsible for “Providing support and technical advice to Parties, constituted bodies and the operating entities of the Financial Mechanism on climate action to address issues related to agriculture and food security, respecting the Party-driven approach and in accordance with their respective procedures and mandates”. However, this may be a challenging task for the negotiators who by mandate need to represent the interests and positions of their countries and regions.

In this context, we recommend better linking the IPCC to the SSJW, to provide the group with independent scientific expertise, advice, knowledge, and evidence to inform the Joint Work’s discussions. For example, IPCC could sit in the SSJW meetings, and could include a Special Report on Food Systems and Climate Change as part of the Assessment Report 7 cycle which starts in 2023. Many other global processes have already adopted a similar model, for example the High-Level panel of Experts of the Committee on World Food Security (HLPE/CFS), which comprises renowned scientists drawn from academia, research institutions, the public and private sector, civil society, and other constituencies, with proven and longstanding experience in the subject matter.

2.3 Improving transparency through the Online portal

At para 14 (b), decision FCCC/CP/2022/L.4 mentions that one of the objectives of the SSJW is “Enhancing coherence, synergies, coordination, communication and interaction between Parties, constituted bodies and workstreams, the operating entities of the Financial Mechanism, the Adaptation Fund, the Least Developed Countries Fund and the Special Climate Change Fund in order to facilitate the implementation of action to address

issues related to agriculture and food security". So far this has been challenging. During the lifespan of the KJWA, the multitude of organizations working on the issue made it difficult for the Parties to understand who to reach out to, to request support. At the same time, observers found it difficult to support Parties in this complex process, as accessing the meeting calendars and agendas was difficult and many of the negotiations took place behind closed doors. This led many of the observers to rely on their personal connections with negotiator groups and Parties to gather intelligence on the process, often exposing them to fragmented information. The creation of a new Online portal provides an opportunity to improve communication and information flow both inside and outside the SSJW, ensuring transparency and inclusiveness of all stakeholders.

We stand ready to support the UNFCCC Secretariat and the Parties in building the SSJW Online portal, providing advice on the structure, content, and its functionalities, and sharing our experience with similar portals hosted in our respective organizations' websites. Better communication and information flow will facilitate not only the work of Parties but also of observers. While they do not participate directly in the decision-making processes of the Joint Work, observer play a fundamental role, supporting Parties in formulating the decisions of the CoP, with their knowledge and experience. In fact, negotiators may not always be experts on specific issues discussed by the SSJW. In addition, their appointments are often linked to the Government in charge in their country, which exposes the Joint Work to a frequent turnover of representatives. In this context, the activity of the observers is essential to support new delegates and introduce them to the work of the group.

Given these circumstances, we recommend that the Online portal includes a directory of all international and non-governmental organizations willing to offer their resources and knowledge to support the SSJW, including functionalities like a search system by areas of expertise and/or geographies. We also suggest the portal be based on the UNFCCC website and managed by the coordination team based in the Secretariat, that will support the SSJW. The portal should function as a repository of information and communications related to the activities of the SSJW, including meeting calendars, minutes, reports, and could include a forum section to encourage online discussion and exchange on topics of interest among negotiators and observers throughout the year. The portal could also make available evidence, useful tools and documents to countries and other stakeholders, facilitating exchange of knowledge and best practices for implementation. One way to easily build the portal with little funds is to simply refresh the webpage on "[Issues related to agriculture and food security](#)", including new sections and tabs related to items suggested above.

3. FUTURE TOPICS FOR CONSIDERATION

At para 15 (b), decision FCCC/CP/2022/L.4 requests "Holding in-session workshops in hybrid format, facilitating both virtual and in-person participation, on agreed topics related to agriculture and food and nutrition security at the first regular sessions of the subsidiary bodies each year and inviting representatives of the constituted bodies under the Convention, the operating entities of the Financial Mechanism, the Adaptation Fund, the Least Developed Countries Fund and the Special Climate Change Fund and observers to them". Beyond the items suggested in previous submissions⁴, **we recommend that the SSJW takes into consideration the following topics:**

a) Food systems

We recommend holding an in-session workshop on food systems as a priority topic of discussion by the SSJW. The IPCC Special report on Climate Change and Land⁵ highlights that our current food systems are both the cause and the victim of climate change. On the one hand, global food systems are responsible for about 21–37% of total greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. On the other hand, climate change is affecting food systems, disrupting yields, and affecting farmers', pastoralists', and fishers' livelihoods through higher temperatures, changing precipitation patterns, and increased frequency and severity of extreme weather events.

⁴ CIAT, CCAFS, World Bank (2018). [Submission from the CGIAR System Organization, International Centre for Tropical Agriculture and the World Bank in response to Decision 4/CP.23](#) and CIAT, CCAFS, World Bank (2021) [Submission from the International Centre for Tropical Agriculture and the World Bank These are views on Future topics not listed](#)

⁵ IPCC (2019). [Climate Change and Land: an IPCC special report on climate change, desertification, land degradation, sustainable land management, food security, and greenhouse gas fluxes in terrestrial ecosystems](#)

Decision FCCC/CP/2022/L.4 mentions the term food systems five times, which represents a recognition of the fact that it is necessary to go beyond agricultural production and embrace the broader concept of food systems to provide concrete answers to climate change. Para 14 (a) of the decision also mentions the need for “Promoting a holistic approach to addressing issues related to agriculture and food security”. This means taking into consideration not only the sustainability of production processes but also that of diets, as well as the reduction of food loss and waste and the importance of equity. In fact, combating climate change and its effects on food and nutrition security will require a transition towards healthier, more nutritious, and sustainable diets. It will also require establishing fair local, national, regional, and global agri-food supply chains which provide sufficient economic returns to producers, reduce food loss, and waste, and improve gender equality and social inclusion.

Taking into consideration that the food systems approach is not yet widely accepted by all Parties and stakeholders within the SSJW, we suggest organizing a workshop to: i) provide evidence of how taking a holistic approach that considers food systems can benefit food and nutrition security and livelihoods, while tackling the impact of climate change on nature and the environment; ii) prompt an open and honest dialogue on this approach and its implications in the context of the SSJW; and iii) offer examples of how this approach can be operationalized in different countries, recognizing the importance of different contexts and circumstances.

Given the longstanding experience that the entities co-signing this submission have on food systems and food and nutrition security, we offer to support the organization and facilitation of this proposed workshop, making available independent science, evidence and expertise on this approach and facilitating exchange of knowledge, best practices, and successful experience among countries. Please refer to the thematic submission on Food systems submitted by WWF and partners, for further details.

b) Agroecology

Decision FCCC/CP/2022/L.4 acknowledges the need to address the food and climate challenges in a holistic and inclusive manner, recognizing the linkages between “soil health and integrated water management, including the optimal use of nutrients, including organic fertilizer and enhanced manure management, as important elements of climate-resilient, sustainable food production systems that can contribute to global food security”. These and other elements mentioned in the decision are at the core of the 13 principles of agroecology defined by the High-Level Panel of Experts (HLPE) of the Committee on World Food Security (CFS), aligned with the 10 Elements of Agroecology⁶ adopted by the 197 FAO Members in December 2019. Yet, the decision does not make any reference to this.

Agroecology, including regenerative agriculture, can be a powerful approach for addressing food security and climate change challenges, providing sustainable and equitable solutions to malnutrition, poverty, gender and social inequalities, climate change, biodiversity loss, natural resources degradation, and zoonotic diseases. The 2021 IPCC report⁷ identifies agroecological approaches as effective adaptation measures with high mitigation co-benefits. Agroecological principles can be applied to all forms of sustainable agriculture and food production, including crop, livestock and pastoral systems, agroforestry, fisheries, aquaculture, etc. The application of these principles also contributes to gender equality, making agriculture more attractive for youth, creating dignified income, and living conditions and promoting to healthy diets through sustainable food systems.

We recommend that the SSJW includes agroecology as one of its priority future topics for consideration. Within this process, we suggest the organization of an in-session workshop dedicated to agroecology as one approach that can help implement transformative actions in agriculture and food systems, confirming agroecology as a core priority for the SSJW. Please refer to the thematic submission on Agroecology submitted by Biovision on behalf of Agroecology Coalition, for further details.

⁶ Wezel A, Gemmill Herren B, Bezner Kerr R, Barrios E, Gonçalves ALR and Sinclair F (2020). [Agroecological principles and elements and their implications for transitioning to sustainable food systems. A review. Agronomy for Sustainable Development 40: 40 13pp.](#)

⁷ IPCC (2022). [Climate Change 2022: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change](#)

c) Aquatic foods production

Aquatic foods are an integral and inseparable part of the food security and climate equation, as demonstrated by the social, biological, and economic evidence that has accumulated over the last several years. However, wild fisheries and the marine and terrestrial ecosystems that support them (such as coral reef systems which support the food security and livelihoods of tens of millions of people) are under stress due to climate change, which threatens their potential to continue to support food and nutrition needs. In some cases, production systems are contributing to climate change and ecosystem degradation.

We recommend that SSJW takes into consideration aquatic food production as a future topic for discussion, including both wild capture and farmed aquatic food production systems from inland lakes and rivers and marine waters. Although it is frequently forgotten, fisheries (including aquatic plants) are part of 'Agriculture'. The Constitution (Art.1.para.1.) of the UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) defines "Agriculture" and its derivatives to include fisheries and marine products.⁸ As such, within the UNFCCC, the SSJW presents the most logical and appropriate space to consider and integrate aquatic foods' role in climate change and the protection of both our food system and planetary health and biodiversity, and to address the climate/aquatic food/agriculture nexus. Please refer to the thematic submission on Aquatic foods production submitted by Environmental Science for Social Change (ESSC) and partners, for further details.

d) Land use changes

We also urge direct discussion of, and workshops to address, the critical need to halt land use changes and avoid further conversion of natural habitats such as grasslands, wetlands, peatlands, and temperate and tropical forests, as well as mangroves, marshes, and seagrass beds. All these habitats are important carbon storage and sequestration hotspots but are threatened by the expansion of agricultural activity around the globe. Drivers of this expansion are multiple and complex, but they are all related to the incomplete consideration of interconnected components of food systems - for example some policies and decisions to meet some specific goals may have unintentional and unexpected impacts on others (e.g., using food resources for creating biofuel to reduce emissions from the transportation sector may have impacts on the prices of those resources and the places and scale at which they are produced). Given its mandate on implementation of climate action on agriculture and food security, the SSJW is a crucial space to discuss the role of sustainable, climate-adapted agriculture management in addressing this topic.

e) Healthy diets from sustainable food systems

We recommend that SSJW considers healthy diets from sustainable food systems as an additional topic for discussion. This should include dedicated discussions around existing metrics and performance indicators, and national-level action to integrate climate and nutrition policy, programmes, and finance. Such work should be carried out in coordination with the Initiative on Climate Action and Nutrition (I-CAN) launched at COP27. Please refer to the thematic submission on Healthy Diets from Sustainable Food Systems submitted by GAIN and partners for further details.

CONCLUSIONS

We welcome decision FCCC/CP/2022/L.4 as a great success for ensuring that agriculture is kept as a key topic for discussion within the UNFCCC. However, there is still work to do to operationalize the decision and turn political commitment into action, to ensure alignment of climate, biodiversity, food security and nutrition goals. The proposals and recommendations highlighted in previous paragraphs aim to bolster implementation of climate action in agriculture and food security, providing a clear pathway and tools to countries. We, the undersigned organizations, are ready to step up efforts to accompany countries and other food systems stakeholders in this journey and remain available for any clarifications and requests for support.

⁸ FAO (2017). [Basic texts of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations](#).

THIS SUBMISSION IS CO-SIGNED BY:

