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MSI : Multi Stakeholder Initiatives

• Many positive aspects of MSI in literature (learning process, new possibilities of dialogues, etc.)

• But here, with a short time presentation, I will focus on difficulties raised in MSI
Some critics in literature

• Classical critics about MSI:
  Difficulties for North NGO to represent “vulnerable groups”, because deal with “global issue”, and far from them (indirect links)
  No clarification on rules for participating

• New critics on “Participation”
  – Procedural rationality => depoliticisation
  – Difficulty to take into account “real persons” and their life
  – People who are not prepared to public deliberation can be disqualified
RT: Who participates? Who is (legitimized) participant?

- RT Objectives: "open", "transparent", "multi-stakeholder" (=legitimacy)

- What about Participants?
  - Participant invites himself (voluntary)
  - He is able to defend/represent an interest group (stakeholder/Balance of interests)
    "If you are an individual you are invisible"
  - Play a role: negotiation, lobbying
  - Be: pro active (no "victim", no "passive")
  - Able to deliver a "broad"/"global" vision ("no local"/specific)
Consequences : keep local persons (local communities, some smallholder) out of « legitimate » participants

• Put at a disadvantage those who are :
  – not well informed, not in the “good” networks, not organized in visible groups, too “local”.

• Disqualification.
  Their representation is frequently taken by other stakeholders (consultants, national bodies, industry of palm oil, etc.) even if their interests differ…
International NGO-Industries: convergences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>International NGOs, Industries</th>
<th>Local communities /smallholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biology, Biodiversity, Agronomy</td>
<td>Local and practical knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal detachment</td>
<td>Personal, affective attachments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tensions

=> Capacity of the device to recognize « affected » people?
Pragmatism Vs Principles ?

“Urgency” conception (=rhythm of deforestation = imposed by Industry)

“Pragmatism”

“Justice” (right, fair, just)

Existing solutions Vs “debate”, common comprehension
Pragmatism

• « We take as a fact that soy is needed »

• « We just produce what is demanded. Production is a reality and you should work with the reality ». 

• « I have my heart. But we are in a hurry. So I do not have time to wait all people to be educated and understand the problem, and bla bla bla bla. And there are solutions”.

• « It’s not ideal but we have to move ».
Stress on differences / take on board Industry / threat of breakup which is real:

- Political arbitration (exclusion of participants / political ideas), ex: Fetraf-Sul
- “RT Language (style)”
  - Avoiding difficulties with political issues (land issues, etc), cautious formulations
  - Technical Rationality to implement P&C
Opposition RTRS / FETRAF
A difficult compromise which conducted Fetraf Sul to dismiss in 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Dominant” Model</th>
<th>Fetraf-Sul :</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agro-Business</td>
<td>Diversification : Risk security + Food security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensification</td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monoculture</td>
<td>No OGM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OGM or conventional</td>
<td>Change markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change distribution of wealth (added value) / solidarity-equity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Technical rationality : PCI and what is sustainability

• Difficulties to debate on what is sustainability, common good, on values, on future.
  – "What is sustainability : you will disagree. It is too long. Nobody has the same vision"

• PCI : separation of the 3 pillars (what about potential antagonism ?)

• Possibility to talk about “horizontal” questions ?

• Consequence : disqualification of local communities in plenary (RT6) when introducing those questions (land issues, …).