World Food Summit

1. The central goal in respect of food is the reduction of hunger. Production should be related to facilitating the reduction of hunger and trade to facilitating such production. This is close to turning the proposed summit structure and dynamic on its head.

2. Hunger turns primarily on the lack of livelihood. 700 to 900 million people. 60% to 70% rural - 70% net food buyers - 25% to 30% small family farmers with land. The secondary (and overlapping) factor is war which currently afflicts perhaps 100-150 million in respect to severe hunger.

3. How to enable production of what by whom and where should turn on reduction of hunger goal.

4. Literally growing food is not necessarily the optimal answer at national or at household level. Self-provisioning and earning (urban and rural wages, food processing, selling 'cash crops' whether food or other and non-agricultural production are in principle equally valid options at both levels. Contextually constraints are likely to push countries and households along varying lines.

5. Trade/trade policy should be designed to facilitate production conducive to reducing hunger. That applies domestically as well as internationally:

   a. interim tariffication allowing high protection in South should be - in part - temporarily waived with full waiver on desired food aid and on commercial imports when in their absence supply constraints (mediated by market) would enforce hunger;

   b. production policy should be designed to reduce need for such duties - at least at high levels - but should be complemented by anti-dumping duties;

   c. domestic free trade, by breaking private sector oligopsonist or single channel exploitation/rent seeking (collecting), is in many cases the crucial trade issue for hungry small farming households and rural workers. Large farm + buying + retailing + transporting + usuring (money lending) + politicking + goon employing families = hunger for small farm households. (For example, in Philippines small farmers often receive 20% or less of urban rice price but in Thailand 60% plus.)
6. Aid/International Cooperation:
   a. stress efficient use (reallocation) not unreal calls for trebling $12 to $37 billion;
   b. link to work for food (which is more efficient, developmental, domestic commerce enhancing);
   c. push grain/quantity levels of physical food aid guarantees up to recent past actuals;
   d. include measures to force combatants to allow food aid to function despite war (much more attainable than forcing them not to fight).

7. Seek broad goals with dated/articulated/progress targets (à la Child Summit) not sweeping, grandiose pronunciamentos not directly operational nor monitorable and make it somebody's business to monitor.

8. If # 7 can be done, create joint UNICEF-ILO-FAO-UNDP-WFP unit to monitor and report. Far too important to leave to FAO which has never been hunger or livelihood attuned.