

## **Annex 1: meetings with govt. delegations**

On Wednesday 15, Govt delegations were encouraged to meet in regions and among them. CSO met some of the delegations, e.g. USA and Canada, EU, GRULAC, Egypt and Algeria and Zimbabwe.

### *Meeting with USA and Canada*

The USA Gov wants the VGs to succeed, both to send a strong signal to Gov and to strengthen the CFS thanks to the adoption of the VGs.

There are some issues that are controversial for USA, the first is the human rights approach.

The other is the issue of language. Between “states may”, “shall” or “should” is seen as compromise that leaves room for disagreement to adjust.

Two issues are internally debated, the first is the role of state in implementation and to what degree the non-state actors should play one. Here the issue of language becomes crucial between should, must, shall, and may. When using “states may consider” they want to highlight the importance of the issue but want to give space to opponents to have debate.

The second controversial issue is at what extent to include land, water and other natural resources, because adding water changes profile to the VGs. They agree on language that recognize relationship and make linkages, but not lay out guidelines for water management. It is also because manage shared water resources raise a lot of transboundary issues with intergovernmental implications.

What USA disagree in substance:

The issue of redistribution of land and human rights approach versus economic approach.

In their view poverty reduction doesn't come without economic growth, so they agree on pro poor approach but need to focus on market as well since investments benefit. They defend property rights of all, so the property rights of companies for instance have to be protected while from CSO using the right to food perspective, rights of poor come before, and poor and landless people are entitled to rights to land to gain their livelihood. In the USA view the right to food doesn't give any right to a piece of land or a particular asset. So they refuse redistribution policies and prefer policies to facilitate access to land and market based distribution of land. They agree on finding a correct language to find how to avoid that states go and expropriate land. They agree on the “due process” as a mean to guarantee legitimate rights, and on illegitimate land titles prefer to speak of restitution.

*The meeting with the EU and GRULAC* focused rather on methodology and preparation process for the negotiation. Contentious issues were not discussed due to the fact that CSO perceived an important degree of convergence with these two blocks in key fields. Both groups sympathised with the proposal of requesting the Office of the High Commissioner of Human Rights to revise the first draft and make suggestions on how to bring it up to already agreed language in relation with the human rights treaties.

*The meeting with Egypt and Algeria* was to get to know the views of the Arab group on the Guidelines. They highlighted their importance and commitment to the process as the first CFS outcome but complaint about proceedings (they were not prepared to present alternative wording, the meeting overlapped with other important meetings in Rome) and the overall format of the current text (not user friendly, too detailed, too long). The Egyptian representative strongly highlighted that the link between land tenure and food security is too weak in the current draft. In her view, land tenure is first and foremost a development issue.

The meeting with the Zimbabwean representative focused on the extremely weak presence of African delegations to the meeting. She replied that it is not because of lack of interest but because of too many things going on at the same time. She shares the views of the Egyptian representative on the missing link between the tenure issues and food security and development. She expressed willingness in helping to mobilize African countries to participate in the July meeting.