



2015

**CIVIL SOCIETY
STATEMENTS TO CFS 42**



Impressum

Secretariat of the Civil Society Mechanism (CSM)
for relations with the UN Committee on World Food Security (CFS)
FAO Headquarter,
Rome/Italy
cso4cfs@gmail.com
www.csm4cfs.org

Print | DIGIGRAPH

Layout | Luca Tommasini

Photo ©FAO | Giuseppe Carotenuto / Giulio Napolitano

Photo | ©Teresa Maisano

Cover Photo | ©Luca Tommasini

With the contribution of the Swiss Development Cooperation Agency

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

05 // **Summary assessment of CFS 42**

06 // **CSM Plenary Statements contributions**

06 // State of Food Insecurity in the World (SOFI)

06 // CFS and the SDG Challenge

07 // Water for Food Security and Nutrition

09 // Framework for Action for Food Security and Nutrition in Protracted Crises

10 // CFS and its role in advancing Nutrition

12 // Global Strategic Framework

12 // Outcomes of the High Level Forum on Connecting Smallholders to Markets

13 // Monitoring of CFS Decisions

13 // Multi-Year Programme of Work (MYPOW)

14 // Special Event on Building Knowledge, Skills and talent development of Youth

14 // Special Event on Resilience building for sustainable Food Security and Nutrition

17 // Welcoming message to the new CFS Chair

18 // **LIST OF ACRONYMS**



INTRODUCTION

This publication collects contributions and key messages of civil society as delivered during the 42nd Plenary Session of the Committee on Food Security (CFS), which took place at FAO Headquarters in Rome from the 12 to the 15 of October 2015.

The contributions to this publication are the outcome of a year of passionate and thorough work of the CSM policy working groups on the different workstreams of the CFS. Some outstanding decisions were adopted during this last CFS Plenary Session, such as the Framework for Action for Food Security and Nutrition in Protracted Crises and the Policy recommendations on Water and Food Security and Nutrition, while other topics are about to become standing issues within the CFS in the years to come, such as Nutrition.

The elaboration of the civil society contributions to the annual CFS meeting departs from the intense work of the CSM Policy Working Groups during the inter-sessional period and passes finally through the CSM Forum that took place on 10 and 11 of October 2015, where these civil society positions and key messages were consolidated.

This recollection aims to be a tool for sharing information among civil society organizations and with other CFS actors and underlines the commitment of social movements and civil society organizations to the CFS and to progressively achieve the full realization of the human right to adequate food for all.

November 2015



SUMMARY ASSESSMENT OF CFS 42

The preliminary assessment of the process of the CFS 42 is quite positive, as the CSM statement to the final plenary highlighted: the meetings and processes conducted during CFS 42 did respect the principles of inclusiveness and participation of social movements and civil society organizations. This was particularly important in the long negotiations of the Water decision box, but also applicable to all the other items on the agenda of the session.

Regarding outcomes of CFS 42: the CSM expressed support for all decisions taken by the CFS members during CFS 42, particularly the adoption of the Framework for Action for Food Security and Nutrition in Protracted Crisis, the Water Decision Box, the amended Monitoring Decision Box, the MYPOW, and the more procedural decisions on GSF and Smallholders to Markets.

Regarding the items for discussion during CFS 42, the session gave an overview of the diversity of positions regarding the upcoming CFS workstreams on nutrition and SDGs, as well as on the continuation of the workstream on smallholder to markets. The views on how to foster youth participation in the CFS were quite divergent, particularly when considering the role of youth organizations and not only individuals. Regarding the way forward, the most immediate challenges are: the funding of the CFS and its MYPOW, which in our view is more a political than a financial issue; the application and implementation of CFS decisions which is now of utmost importance for the Framework for Ac-

tion on Protracted Crisis. And monitoring and accountability, on which the CFS did agree on a substantial step ahead with a monitoring session on the Tenure Guidelines during CFS 43. In addition to the immediate challenges, a more strategic vision for the CFS is needed. The CSM and its own strategic planning process will have to play a critical role in this process, by defending and strengthening the space for civil society participation, by further assessing the development of the CFS within the context of the overarching global trends, and by articulating a civil society vision for the CFS that would allow it to fully comply with its mandate as the foremost inclusive international and intergovernmental platform on food security and nutrition committed to the progressive realization of the human right to adequate food.

To see the CSM Final Statement at CFS 42 visit these links:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jpczRjp1Rp4>

To read CFS 42 Final Report visit this link:

<http://www.fao.org/3/a-mo960e.pdf>





CSM PLENARY STATEMENTS

State of Food Insecurity in the World (SOFI)

The SOFI is widely used as the most authoritative report on the status of hunger and food insecurity worldwide. We were pleased to note that the SOFI 2015 improved over previous reports by explicitly comparing trends in stunting with trends in the Prevalence of Undernourishment, and by emphasizing that economic growth must be inclusive and achieved through the right policies and incentives.

However, we want to point out problems with the framing and summaries of issues in this year's SOFI:

- // The severity of the problems of food insecurity and malnutrition were understated.
- // There was an over-emphasis on partial solutions, and incomplete analysis of the drivers of change.
- // In particular, the discussion of agriculture was unbalanced, with too much attention given to agricultural productivity and productivism and too little to agroecological practices.
- // Similarly, the discussion of trade was unbalanced, with virtual absence of discussion on improving domestic markets and policies that can enhance domestic access to food from a rights-based perspective.

The shortcomings of the Prevalence of Undernourishment metric, which has been the primary metric of hunger and food insecurity to date, are well known and do not need to be reiterated here. With the adoption of the SDGs, there is an opportunity to adopt better measures that are more nuanced and congruent with the FAO definition of "food security". These should include:

- // Rights-based indicators.
- // A combination of long-term cumulative impacts, such as childhood stunting, and short-term impacts due to price volatility and natural or man-made disasters.
- // Metrics aligned with availability, access, consumption and stability of food supplies.
- // Experience-based indicators that capture deficiencies in dietary quality, cultural appropriateness of foods available, and short-term gaps as well as long-term severe caloric deficiencies.

In addition, we hope that future SOFIs include disaggregated data to show differential impacts on different groups (such as men vs. women, infants vs. children vs. other age groups) and indicators of overnutrition, especially excess consumption of ultra-processed foods that lead to non-communicable diseases. Finally, participation by civil society in preparation of the SOFI reports will help ensure that framing is accurate and reflects the experience of people who experience hunger and malnutrition.

To read the SOFI 2015 visit this link:

<http://www.fao.org/3/a-i4646e.pdf>

To see the CSM video contribution at CFS 42 on this topic visit this link:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=X8-5CUI4H8s>

CFS and SDG Challenge

The CSM acknowledges the recently approved 2030 Sustainable Development agenda and welcomes the ambitious goal to eradicate hunger and all forms of malnutrition, and the other goals that would be crucial for food security and nutrition. As CSM we'll commit in the process that will discuss and design the role that the CFS could play in the way forward for the SDGs agenda.

In this context the CSM would like to underline the following key issues that are crucial when the role of the CFS in the implementation of food related SDGs will be discussed:

- 1// In order to achieve the vision of eradicating hunger, we need ambitious action and more coherent policies of governments and international organizations. The CFS is the most unique and foremost inclusive UN global governance platform to discuss food security and nutrition. The CFS has the mandate to promote coordination and monitor actions on food security and nutrition, and support countries on the implementation of its own decisions and recommendations, such as the Global Strategic Framework, and the VGGTs, as well as the Voluntary Guidelines on the progressive realization of the right to adequate food and nutrition. Without a strong CFS that play a very strong role in term of improving policy coherence, coordination and accountability at all levels we will not achieve zero



hunger. This requires also increasing resources from Governments for the CFS to deliver its expectations.

2// The SDGs are meant to be grounded in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, however the SDGs are not centred on a human rights based approach, and the right to food is not mentioned under the Goal 2. Thus for CSOs it is clear that the overarching approach for fully achieving the eradication of hunger, must be based on the right to food and nutrition, promoting the model of governance where right-holders are at the front, and not sidelined within a vaguely defined concept of stakeholders. We are deeply concerned with recent trends to promote “multi-stakeholder” approaches in which corporations are given an equal voice with States and in which fundamental differences between public and private interests are blurred.

3// Furthermore, the emphasis given to data focused indicators could lead to another technocratic shift that rely on statistics instead of a monitoring and accountability centred on the direct engagement of those primarily affected by development challenges. The CFS is expected to develop an innovative monitoring mechanism to promote monitoring and accountability, as one of its core functions,. The CFS cannot play any role in the SDGs implementation without having a mechanism in place for ensuring monitoring and accountability of its main decisions and recommendations, based on the direct participation of those most affected.

4// Implementation of SDGs should ensure that the critical role of marginalized smallholders, the major investors in agriculture and those that produce the majority of our food, are put at the center and supported with adequate policies and investments, The implementation of the SDGs risks promoting a conventional model of development, where smallholders are conceived as an unproductive category, and without addressing the structural causes of hunger and malnutrition. As a comprehensive development framework for the 21st century, the efforts towards the implementation of the FSN related Goals should be inclusive, dynamic, transformative and grounded in the reality of local communities which through

agroecology can feed the world population and save our planet from climate change.

5// The implementation of the SDGs agenda relies too much in the growing influence of the corporate sector at the expenses of the participation of the most affected. This further undermines the responsibilities of the Governments from the primary duty to provide norms, policies and resources. The new agenda is framed in favour of implementation modalities centred on the corporate sector, where increased privatization of investment and public services and the promotion of PPPs are promoted as the best solution to hunger and Food insecurity. In the efforts towards implementation, it is paramount to redirect the currently unsustainable business model and address issues of conflict of interest and adequately ensure accountability within public policy spaces. Furthermore, it is of utmost importance to review the current trade regime, which increases the dominant power of agribusiness and doesn't allow Governments to protect their smallholder food producers.

To see the CSM video contribution at CFS 42 visit these links:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iPYVPq2xwAo>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qtxjfSnIBxY>

Adoption of the Policy Recommendation on Water for Food Security and Nutrition:

Civil society would like to deliver three core points:

First, we would like to welcome and commend the HLPE report “Water for Food Security and Nutrition”, and the CFS for taking up this critical issue. This is the first time that the CFS systematically looked at water and the linkages between the realization of the right to food and the right to water, and the implications for other indivisible human rights obligations. The report highlights the value of water as common public wealth, as well as its centrality in ecosystem functions and territories.

The report adopts a human rights framing, prioritizing the rights and needs of the most vulnerable and marginalized populations,



including special emphasis on small-scale food producers and workers. Given the transboundary nature of water, the report also raises the necessity of recognizing extraterritorial human rights obligations of states.

Second, Civil society thanks the rapporteur, government delegates and other colleagues for the inclusive and transparent decision-making process towards the decision box recommendations. We are happy to see many important commitments by all actors reflected in the final decision box text.

The decision box reaffirms commitments to the progressive realization of the right to adequate food as a central component to the work and mandate of the CFS, and puts forward the human right to water as a core aspect of the realization of the right to adequate food, recognizing the multiple dimensions and uses of water.

The decision box affirms the role of regulation to safeguard public interests and recognizes the ecosystem functions of water. There is a clear prioritization of vulnerable and marginalized populations, with specific recommendations for protecting women and girls, as well as access to drinking water in the workplace.

The reformed CFS is a unique and dynamic space that has been home to discussions and deliberations that are vital to the achievement of FSN and the realization of the Right to Adequate Food. The numerous constituencies of civil society have actively participated in all of these processes, here in Rome as well as in their respective countries and territories.

Although we are pleased with the outcomes of this decision box, however we perceive a diminishing of the sense of inspiration and creativity that the reform process brought to the CFS.

This brings us to our third point, as the CFS, we have spent significant time and resources negotiating and agreeing on language, which we now use as basis for derogation rather than a basis to build stronger, more coherent policy towards food security and nutrition.

We are concerned with what seems to be a lack of institutional memory in CFS policy making. International human rights obligations, and specifically the rights of women and the rights of indigenous peoples have been recognized within the UN system, and reaffirmed in countless CFS policy documents- including most recently the Global Strategic Framework adopted in yesterday's plenary session.

We regret that we have to frequently remind CFS members of commitments made in other spaces, and which have been reaffirmed in the CFS as having direct bearing on the mandate of this body.

Finally, Civil society is committed to continue working with all members to help the CFS achieve its very important mandate - and our expectation is that our government policy makers will do their utmost to collaborate with us in achieving this mandate and building on the recommendations of the HLPE report on water and the decision box.

Once again, we would like to welcome the HLPE report and the decision box and thank Mr. Lamaddelena for leading us through a long and complex negotiation process with tremendous patience, a sense of humor, and healthy cooperative spirit.

To see the CSM video contribution at CFS 42 visit these links: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MxEIAeAvbNU>





<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OtPfwiyocJo>
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Z8fXIQbAkzU>
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mGFCjoxPgJA>

Adoption of Framework for Action for Food Security and Nutrition in Protracted Crisis

The CSM is very happy to support the endorsement of the Framework for Action for Food Security and Nutrition in Protracted Crises. The CSM Working Group on Protracted Crises had been deeply involved in the CFS Process since its materialization in 2012. Through its membership in the CFS Steering Committee and Technical Support team and its participation in the e-consultations, Open Ended Working Group meetings and Global Consultation in Ethiopia, the CSM Working Group managed to greatly contribute to the preparation process of the Framework for Action for Food Security and Nutrition in Protracted Crises, bringing on board the experiences, opinions, convictions and needs of communities in protracted crises.

The CSM will support the endorsement of the Framework for Action on Food Insecurity and Nutrition but will stress that there is a urgent need to ensure that its principles are implemented both fully and effectively.

We have to take pride in the FFA, as it goes beyond the conventional understanding of resilience, and adopts a holistic and comprehensive understanding and examination of root and underlying causes of food insecurity and under-nutrition. In promoting implementation, we must ensure that the focus on underlying causes is not lost, and that we assist communities in protracted crises not only in coping, but with preventing and resolving food insecurity.

The framework identifies eleven principles for action, each of which is essential in addressing food insecurity and malnutrition, and each of which requires the commitment of all actors. Building on this framework for action, our approach should be to work not only in crises, but on crises.

Mobilizing political commitment must be the first step. All stakeholders should disseminate the FFA and promote its use in the development, implementation, and monitoring at global, regional, national, local and institutional levels. The CFS should urgently develop a strong communication strategy that advocates the revision of current policies and actions to ensure that they fall in line with the FFA.

Monitoring is another key step in ensuring the proper implementation of the FFA. The use and application of the FFA at the national, regional and global level should be monitored by the CFS.

The CFS should attend to its commitment to developing the innovative mechanism to monitor progress toward objective and actions agreed by CFS including FFA. A participatory community based approach is essential.

In the implementation of the FFA there are important roles to be played by a multitude of actors. To ensure that the specific roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders are clearly identified, the CFS could convene a multi actor workshop where the different roles and commitments can be discussed and agreed upon.

UN specialized organizations, particularly but not limited to Rome-based organizations (FAO, IFAD, WFP), should support voluntary efforts to implement and use the FFA. This includes the provision of policy advice, technical guidance, operational tools and financial assistance to the organs of the state, local authorities and community-based organizations in the planning, implementation and monitoring of the FFA.

We are happy to know that the Rome-Based Agencies are strengthening their cooperation around the issue of protracted crises, and we hope that they build a partnership with civil society and communities in crises in their planning and implementation. The entire UN Human Rights System, including the Secretary General, should act as an advocate and catalyst in order to address food security and nutrition in protracted crisis situations; promote the implementation of the FFA through the review and strengthening of policies and actions into broader global and regional initiatives; as well as contribute to monitoring and evaluation of progress.

Regional bodies, through their existing processes, should integrate the FFA into their work streams given their greater influence on the regions suffering from protracted crisis, and can help affected countries with the provisions of financial technical guidance and operational tools.

As stated in the FFA national governments and regional entities should facilitate and institutionalize multi-stakeholder processes to review, develop, implement, monitor and harmonize policies and actions for addressing food insecurity and malnutrition in protracted crises. Such platforms ensure that both policies and processes are owned and supported by a range of stakeholders, and that information flows between grassroots and policy makers.

On the global level, the CFS could oversee the establishment and work of a multi-stakeholder technical working group to provide and facilitate demand-led support to regions and countries to develop, implement and monitor policies and actions, and to



collate and disseminate lessons learnt.

In line with the FFA stakeholders should facilitate the framework “access to, and understanding by, the communities and organizations of protracted crisis affected populations.” The CFS should commit to supporting civil society in producing simplified guidelines on the principles in the FFA, to ensure the free, prior, and informed consent of affected communities.

CSOs have a vital role to play in the promotion and application of the FFA by helping to shape policies, design and implement projects, build institutional and human capacity, and facilitating knowledge and technology transfer. Finally, we, as civil society, celebrate with you here today the endorsement of this courageous and progressive framework which reflects the international commitment to respond to communities living in protracted crises.

To see the CSM video contribution at CFS 42 visit these links:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WpfOmaV2vdw>

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YGvAEh_MMVc

CFS and its role in advancing Nutrition

It is now widely acknowledged that small-scale peasant farmers, fishers, pastoralists, hunters and gatherers, and indigenous peoples feed 70% of our planet’s human beings. Most use agroecological methods that are affordable, diverse and adapted to local conditions, and produce foods with the highest levels of micro and macronutrients. Good nutrition is intimately linked to the consequent fertility of their land and seascapes and to the diversity and nutritional quality of the food they sustain. Small-holder food producers must, therefore, be at the heart of any strategy to address our planet’s unacceptable levels of malnutrition and increasing vulnerability to climate extremes. They are also the ones most in need of marketing and distribution systems that will both ensure their consumption of these nutritious foods and make healthy whole foods available to the most food insecure consumers, such as women and children, food workers, the urban poor, landless peoples, indigenous peoples and other marginalized populations who are often most at risk of suffering from diet-related chronic diseases.

Role

The CFS is the premier food policy body with respect to food security and nutrition, unique in its inclusive structure and in the



level of required policy coordination, coherence, and collaborative engagement. The CFS’s grounding of its work in a holistic and rights-based approach to enhancing food security has also been championed as the most promising way forward. The CFS is thus uniquely positioned to complement the normative functions of the FAO and WHO by serving as the umbrella coordinating body for the advancement of policy and measures that keeps nutrition at the core of the CFS’ mandate. The CFS’s adoption of strong accountability mechanisms, and its embrace of civil society and social movements with first-hand knowledge of healthy and sustainable farming systems, also make it best suited to advise on the policy framework and regulatory mechanisms that favour the rights of food producers and consumers over corporate interests and profit margins. Since nutrition is a multidimensional domain that requires an inter-sectoral approach, linking food, diet, and health, the CFS agenda requires the collaborative engagement of a wide-range of actors.

Key Steps

Following the call of ICN2 to the CFS to adopt a leading role on nutrition, CFS’s capacity in nutrition needs to be strengthened. In this respect, we suggest enhancing the role of WHO in the CFS Advisory Group. To ensure active linkages with the health outcomes that are under its guidance, WHO must have a clear and visible role in the CFS. CFS capacity building must also entail the addition of nutrition focal points/representatives within the country delegations to the annual CFS Session. We also recommend training on the full spectrum of nutrition issues among the regular CFS delegates. Finally, we would like to remind the member States here present of the ICN2’s outcome documents that call for an International Decade of Action on Nutrition.



Concerns related to the promotion of “multi-stakeholder” initiatives in nutrition and the need for adequate safeguards

The CSM welcomes the decision by the CFS to make nutrition a priority in its work and live up to its mandate as the global harmonising body for food security and nutrition in the context of the right to adequate food and nutrition. We will speak more comprehensively about how we expect the CFS to deal with nutrition in session VII. For now, we would like to draw attention to the risks involved in so-called “partnerships” with the private – and more specifically the corporate – sector in nutrition and emphasis the need to put into place effective regulatory mechanisms to protect the CFS from undue corporate influence.

We are highly concerned about the recent trend to promote “multi-stakeholder” approaches to tackle hunger and malnutrition in which corporations are given an equal voice with States. General terms such as “stakeholders” and “non-State actors” blur the fundamental differences between public interest and private interest actors. It is however essential that their different roles are recognized and that they are not afforded equal standing and legitimacy. States have an obligation to guarantee social participation and take the perspectives of civil society and in particular the groups most affected by hunger and malnutrition (the rights-holders) into account; States clearly do not have such obligation with respect to the corporate sector.

In light of the above concerns, we would like to remind CFS member States that:

- 1// They carry a responsibility to ensure that decisions taken within the CFS – including recommendations issued in relation to the promotion of nutrition at regional and national levels – are compliant with their human rights obligations and do not undermine the right to adequate food and nutrition in their own and other countries.
- 2// They must ensure that interactions with the private sector and philanthropic foundations at the CFS level, as well as in the context of initiatives at regional and national levels that are promoted by the CFS, do not interfere with the primary purpose of the CFS, which is to promote food security and nutrition in the context of the right to adequate food and nutrition.
- 3// They are mandated by their people and must therefore act in the public interest, with a special emphasis on the needs and rights of groups most affected by hunger and malnutrition.

- 4// States must cooperate with each other – including in the context of the CFS – to create an international environment that is conducive to the realization of human rights, as mandated by the UN Charter and subsequent human rights instruments. This implies that policy choices made and promoted within/by the CFS must contribute to the realization of human rights for all.

We therefore urge member States to:

- 5// Ensure that decisions about the design, implementation and monitoring of interventions and policies aimed at improving food security and nutrition remain in the hands of States. While States may consult the private sector or engage them for specific purposes, it is fundamental that public policy making remain the exclusive domain of States and be geared towards the needs and rights of those most affected by hunger and malnutrition – not the interests of corporations.
- 6// Protect the CFS against undue corporate influence, inter alia, by putting in place robust safeguards against conflicts of interest – as recommended by the ICN2 Framework for Action Recommendation 3 – to prevent and deal with potential conflicts of interest arising from engagement with the corporate sector and/or other organisations promoting corporate sector interests. Conflict of interest policies and ex-ante criteria for exclusion must be present throughout the CFS to ensure that its actions and outputs remain free of interests that jeopardize nutrition and food security.
- 7// Carry out impact assessments - prior and continuous - of projects involving the corporate sector to ensure that they do not have a potential negative impact on the right to adequate food and nutrition and other human rights, or unduly favour





private rather than public interests.

8// Evaluate whether policies, initiatives and approaches promoted by the CFS that involve the corporate sector are congruent with human rights and address the root causes, not just consequences, of food insecurity and malnutrition. In doing so, the perspectives and experiences of groups most affected by malnutrition should be the guiding standard. They need to be given the space to articulate the problems they are facing and propose solutions to policy makers.

9// Introduce effective regulatory mechanisms, both at domestic and international level, to prevent and hold corporations accountable for actions and omissions that negatively affect the promotion of healthy and sustainable diets and food systems and the enjoyment of human rights. This includes the strict regulation of corporate marketing practices.

We appreciate the space provided to share our concerns and recommendations and hope that these will be taken up and further discussed among CFS member States with a view to protecting the integrity of the CFS and ensuring its decisions and recommendations are centered on the rights and needs of those affected by hunger and malnutrition – and not the interests of private corporations.

To see the CSM video contribution at CFS 42 visit these links:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dFso6rZenAY>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nlxps1T5RWk>

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-gnR_9doTwo

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZwilkeJPoGQ>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6Tvozpnrz2IE>

Global Strategic Framework

// GSF is the overarching framework and the only living document of the CFS. However, the GSF has not been sufficiently disseminated and we propose that this should be seen as a priority for the outreach and communication strategy of the CFS.

// The importance as the overarching framework and comprehensive reference of the CFS for policies on food security and nutrition on national, regional and global level should be highlighted.

// We would like to remind the governments, that the GSF is also the basis and main reference for a comprehensive monitoring of the use and application of CFS decisions. This has also to be taken into account when we discuss monitoring.

// Regarding the upcoming updating process of the CFS, the periodic update should be done in a coherent way without re-negotiating the adopted text. We will not accept any loss in substance of the GSF and will make sure that consistency and coherence with the existing human rights based GSF is ensured.

To see the CSM video contribution at CFS 42 visit these links:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6ussDYe9_R8

Outcomes of the High Level Forum on Connecting Smallholders to Markets

Since the 40th CFS Plenary Session the civil society has highlighted the need to further analyse the linkages between smallholders and markets. The background document prepared during this year is good but very incoherent. This feature helps to better understand the plurality of concepts such as markets. As peasants, indigenous peoples, fisherfolks we are the bigger community of researchers in the world and the most innovative one, as we continue to produce new ways to access and handle markets.

The High Level Forum was extremely interesting and reflected the profound nature of the CFS itself. Nevertheless the Chair's Summary gives an impression of consensus and balance among the different ideas and approaches presented at the HLF rather than acknowledging the deep divergences that exist within the CFS. Smallholders are already connected to markets, and are those markets that channel the 70% of the food consumed worldwide, yet they are "invisible" because there is no data on them.

Civil society is pleased to have an additional year of work ahead of us. This time has to be used to good advantage if we want to be able to agree on policy recommendations to go to CFS43. This requires the following :





// The Task Team needs to continue to incorporate additional data and analysis (particularly on “invisible” markets) in order to prepare a discussion document for the OEWG. This document should adequately acknowledge divergent views and address the open questions posed in the HLF background document that will need to be discussed in the OEWG, in which governments will participate actively (which was not the case in the HLF):(1) what are the key issues regarding the relation between smallholder, markets and food security on which further research and policy debate are needed? (2) How to measure the benefits to smallholders and the real impact on food security of different approaches to linking smallholders and markets?

// A full two days of debate and discussion in the OEWG will be required.

// Civil society is mobilizing to document and share our extensive experience with markets that serve people.

To see the CSM video contribution at CFS 42 visit these links:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ka0VEytfFeK4>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IQt4XGV5PVI>

Monitoring of CFS Decisions

The CSM thanks the OEWG and its Chair for the hard work done in the last year. CSM acknowledges also the efforts made to conduct the Survey on CFS effectiveness, to which civil society has contributed, although we also see the limitations of its scope and relevance

The Committee for World Food Security (CFS) reform document defines the promotion of accountability, particularly through an innovative monitoring mechanism, as one of the six key functions of the CFS. Six years after the CFS reform, the establishment of such a monitoring mechanism is still pending.

The CSM believes it is imperative for the CFS to make progress in the development of an innovative monitoring mechanism. Without this the CFS is unable to truly fulfill its mandate. We need an innovative mechanism which allows for reflection, discussion and assessment of the progress made in the coordination of actions by all actors at different levels. That same innovative mechanism is required to ensure policy convergence, in order to guarantee the realization of the right to adequate food. Without this mechanism how we will know that the CFS is achieving its goals?



Without this innovative mechanism the CFS will remain truncated and will fail to fulfill the great expectations behind its reform.

The CSOs explained in detail that the proposal as presented to CFS 42 was insufficient.

For this reason, we proposed to make critical additions to the draft decision box.

We welcome that the CFS 42 decided to amend the decision box in this sense and to adopt substantial steps towards a comprehensive monitoring mechanism, including through the promotion of national, regional and global monitoring events and particularly a global monitoring session on the implementation of the Voluntary Guidelines on Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests during CFS 43.

To see the CSM video contribution at CFS 42 visit these links:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3pUXK_9bRu8

Multi-Year Programme of Work (MYPow)

The CSM welcomes the draft MYPow and we congratulate the Working Group Chair for facilitating it. We are committed to working to produce together the most effective outcomes from the CFS work program.

As the voice of small food producers and those most affected by food insecurity and malnutrition, the CSM had proposed two issues critical for sustainable food systems for inclusion in this MYPow- agroecology and genetic resources. These were not taken up on the grounds that they are contentious topics.

This is strange, given the very purpose of the CFS is to bring all the ideas that can help to end food insecurity and malnutrition



into one inclusive forum, and work together to identify the best. For that to happen, all ideas must be heard and explored, including those where there is a diversity of views. The CSM therefore remains committed to advocating for constructive discussion on agroecology and genetic resources within the CFS.

As confirmed after the 2008 global food crisis, the CFS is the foremost inclusive, international platform for collaboration to achieve our shared vision of food security and nutrition for the people of the world. Our collective presence in this room reflects its unquestionable importance.

We remain concerned about the funding situation of the CFS. In our statements we have said that this is more a political than a financial issue, and that the current funding gap could be easily met by member states if they wished. CFS must remain publicly funded, to guarantee the integrity of the entire workplan adopted by CFS, rather than states picking and choosing which aspects of the work they want to support. We therefore ask for full, core funding to CFS to carry out its ambitious but highly pertinent program of work.

To see the CSM video contribution at CFS 42 visit these links:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nhGvFuRLc3U>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rHtibeVNfK>

Special Event on Building Knowledge, Skills and Talent Development of Youth

It is important to acknowledge that when we talk about youth and food security, we are not only talking about farmers, but about smallholders farmers, fisherfolks, consumers, pastoralists and the traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples. It is worrying to assess the poor participation of member states during this special event today, while this room has been full for the entire week.

Youth are not part of the problem, are the solution. There is the need for public policies that can prevent the forced migration that many youth smallholders are obliged to undertake because of the lack of access to the land and the ongoing land grabbing going on in many regions of the world. There is the urgent need to include youth in the decision-making processes in a participatory way. Youth is an essential part of the present time for a better future.



We, as youth, are the agent of our own development, that is why is so important to strengthen our organizational capacities and our skills. The access to high quality education is fundamental. This education should and must acknowledge the profound plurality coexisting under the word youth. There are many types of youth, with different skills, capacities, traditions and knowledges. And they must empower their human potential in order to have a more just world.

To see the CSM video contribution at CFS 42 visit these links:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uCNe7CNFpak>

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Nj_xHRtYPvM

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Tkn9Fx3JT6I>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VNpzB9aT-iU>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GgC3KepOZWQ>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=22rhAbR4Wx4>

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=47c93_IQu2E

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dyKmouZyqIk>

Special Event on Resilience building for sustainable Food Security and Nutrition

Introduction

First, we agreed to recognize that the concept of resilience is not a new one. Communities have always developed their own mechanisms of coping, resisting, absorbing, or overcoming vulnerabilities, crises, or their manifestations regardless of under which package or label these are framed.

The new focus on resilience has attracted many donors and development practitioners.

However the level of the value and effectiveness of this approach



for communities depends on

- 1// how resilience is defined, and
- 2// to which policies and actions it is applied.

This calls for a comprehensive approach. Here we identify four essential requirements for building resilience to achieve sustainable food security and nutrition:

- 1// *Address the underlying causes of vulnerabilities and follow a human rights based approach*

Building resilience must include policies and actions which not only assist communities in coping with or absorbing “vulnerabilities” and “crises” but which act to resolve, resist and prevent them and their manifestations from reoccurring. A comprehensive resilience approach must therefore include:

- // Focus on the immediate, underlying and structural causes of vulnerability in general and crises in particular
- // Rigorous context analysis given the wide variety of causes, including an analysis of power dynamics, inequality, livelihoods, markets, and others factors that may affect vulnerability
- // Recognition that hunger and malnutrition often result from deliberate actions by parties. Methods to erode local food and farming systems forcing populations into relationships of dependency include: the usurping or the destruction of natural resource, the violent targeting of food producers, the enforcement of sieges (which is more damaging to the communities than any other stakeholder), asymmetric food trade relationships, and using food or water as coercive tools against populations
- // Pathways to realize people’s human rights in cases where they are being violated as well as ways to survive or cope with the manifestations of those violations
- // Adherence to do no harm principles by partner organizations, and avoidance of creating competing parallel systems that may heighten the risk of division and conflict
- // The wrong response to a crisis can put rights at risk as well. For example, biofuels or agrofuels have been promoted as a more climate-friendly fuel source while the expansion of biofuels has been found to put food security and particularly land rights at risk, as well as risking ecosystems.
- // Challenges to the social, economic, and political institutions that sustain societal inequality, which may lead to further vulnerability or crises (particularly conflict), and which result in the unequal distribution of burden – most often falling on the

marginalized. Unequal distribution of risk is particularly true in the case of climate change. Around 50 per cent of global carbon emissions are generated by just 11 per cent of people. But those who suffer the most from climate change have the least hand in causing it: it is estimated that by 2100 the impact on poor countries will be GDP losses of 12–23 per cent, whereas in the richest countries, the impact will be in the range of 0.1 per cent loss to a benefit of 0.9 per cent of GDP. [1] Another example is food speculation: when wealthy investors gamble staple food prices, it is the poorest populations which are often not able to withstand the volatility in food prices this results in.

Clearly, causes vary significantly between contexts. However, commonly occurring drivers of food and nutrition insecurity in protracted crises, such as political and economic conditions, must be identified and addressed. Hence, policy reform and political action are necessary. We need:

- // governance which is based on rights and participatory decision-making
- // to guarantee appropriate accountability mechanisms for all stakeholders
- // to promote the compliance with human rights and international humanitarian law for all actors
- // to raise the awareness and capacity of local communities

- 2// *Link humanitarian and long term development programmes*

If we want to achieve long term resilience within communities we must break down the barriers between humanitarian and development institutions, funding, and programmes. This means bringing together humanitarian and economic responses.

Such initiatives should include:

- // strengthening diversified local food production as well as national and local markets; supporting small producers, particularly through access to productive resources, in order to make communities less vulnerable to food crises, conflict, sieges, and the absence of safe borders among other factors
- // prioritizing local procurement in humanitarian response, including the use of cash transfers and vouchers
- // establishing and scaling up local, national and regional food reserves
- // alternative methods of resource management alternatives such as water harvesting, seed banks, urban agriculture
- // comprehensive social protection systems



- // mainstreaming risk analysis through DRR approaches and prevention, (including early warning systems, disaster risk management, surge capacity, and climate change projection). The involvement of local institutions in DRR is necessary. Measuring and modeling resilience is especially helpful when investing in resilience to know both the cost and relative impact of different initiatives.
- // Funding streams need to be adapted to be flexible, long term and predictable

Humanitarian responses must lay the ground work for and build towards long term development programs. Additionally, long term development programs should also have elements designed to prevent the reoccurrence of the issue.

3// *Combine local knowledge, priorities, and initiatives with research, science and technology*

Affected communities should be in the center of planning and implementation. In order to support these communities, there is a need to:

- // raise the capacities of local institutions
- // focus on mapping and supporting local initiatives and reducing negative strategies that increase future vulnerability
- // focus on marginalized populations, including women, youth, small scale producers, indigenous peoples, and those living under occupation.

There are a number of successful local initiatives already striving to increase the resilience of their populations to different obstacles:

- // In Palestine, thousands of acres of Palestinian agricultural lands have been razed and trees uprooted by the Israeli occupation, and many farmers' lands are vulnerable to threat of confiscation. The Million Tree Campaign organized by the Arab Group for the Protection of Nature supports the resilience of farmers whose livelihood has been affected by the occupation through the replanting of tree seedlings on damaged land or on lands where the ownership is threatened by the encroachment of illegal Israeli settlements or by the separation wall.
- // In Bangladesh, the local grassroots organization Nabolok [2] is helping farmers build resilience to climate change with three important interlinked strategies:
 - // first, they support programming to improve practical knowledge and application in communities to limit the impacts of

climate change;

- // second, they conduct action research on how the changing climate is impacting different communities within the country
- // third, they advocate to enhance justice for climate vulnerable people in Bangladesh through knowledge dissemination and strengthening civic engagement in political processes

// Agricultural co-operatives are community-driven business models created as a form of resilience to both economic and environmental shocks. In San Agustín, Bolivia, quinoa farmers participate in farmers' co-ops as a local response to global food system processes ensuring that crops are sold locally to support domestic food security in spite of the growth in foreign demand for quinoa, and so that farmers receive fair profits for their crops by circumventing intermediaries [3].

4// *Advance socio-ecological systems and sustainability*

Resilience cannot be achieved without environmental sustainability and the sustainable development of communities and economies. This requires an integrative approach between social and ecological systems ensuring that they interact regularly in a resilient, sustained manner. This should include:

- // regular feedbacks between the ecological and social systems
- // supporting healthy ecosystems through the preservation and sustainable use of natural resources
- // a focus on integrating traditional knowledge and practices into sustainability initiatives
- // promoting adaptive governance of communities and ecosystems

The new attention to resilience has been an important opportunity in cases where producers value resilience in the face of risks over and above maximizing production. In some cases, there is a trade-off between productionist approaches to agriculture rather than more resilient strategies. More vulnerable producers and communities often choose more diverse, more ecologically-oriented, and more robust farming strategies in order to reduce risk and to anticipate shocks.

To see the CSM video contribution at CFS 42 visit these links:

- <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tgHCSpH17k4>
- <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=T8LGnQ4o1NI>
- <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2ID1x4YyZVs>
- <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Q04aDgkrdFI>
- <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4-oLlf7PtJY>



[1] Robert Mendelsohn et al (2006). The distributional impact of climate change on rich and poor countries. *Environment and Development Economics* 11: 159–178.

[2] <http://nabolokbd.org/ongoing-projects/>

[3] Andrew Ofstehage (2012). The construction of an alternative quinoa economy: balancing solidarity, household needs, and profit in San Agustín, Bolivia. *Agriculture and Human Values*, 29: 441–454.

Welcoming message to the new CFS Chair

We warmly welcome the new Chair and Bureau and look forward to working with you in the coming two years.

To our incoming Chair Ambassador Gornass, we expect that you will put the voices of those most affected by food insecurity and malnutrition, and those who are actually feeding the world, at the centre of CFS decision-making: Small scale farmers, fishers, indigenous people, landless, agricultural workers, urban food insecure, women, and youth. We recall the spirit of the CFS reform, and we underscore its way of working, to place the most excluded from decision making at the centre of the discussion. Since its reform, CFS is an international and intergovernmental platform for food security and nutrition, founded on the principles of inclusiveness and participation. We expect that the Chair and the Bureau will work with us to uphold and apply these principles consistently in all future processes and working structures, such as Open Ended Working Groups, Advisory Group and task teams.

Our understanding is that inclusiveness refers not simply to working with a general set of stakeholders, but rather engaging and recognizing the specific roles of different actors. In this regard, we prefer the language of multi-actors, which recognizes the central places of rights holders, that is, those who hold human rights; and duty bearers, that is, governments; as well as third parties. Decisions at CFS should first and foremost reflect those who are most excluded from decision making.

Madam Chair, we are fully committed to engaging in all CFS processes and to collaborating with CFS members and participants.

*To see the CSM video contribution at CFS 42 visit these links:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rzC5zkQl44>*





LIST OF ACRONYMS

A4A // AGENDA FOR ACTION FOR ADDRESSING FOOD INSECURITY IN PROTRACTED CRISES

AG // ADVISORY GROUP

CC // COORDINATION COMMITTEE (CSM)

CFS // COMMITTEE ON WORLD FOOD SECURITY

CS // CIVIL SOCIETY

CSO // CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANISATION

FAO // FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANISATION

FFA // FRAMEWORK FOR ACTION FOR FOOD SECURITY AND NUTRITION IN PROTRACTED CRISES

FLW // FOOD LOSSES AND WASTE

GMOS // GENETIC MODIFIED ORGANISM

GSF // GLOBAL STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK FOR FOOD SECURITY AND NUTRITION

HLF // HIGH LEVEL FORUM

HLPE // HIGH LEVEL PANEL OF EXPERTS

HQ // HEAD QUARTERS

ICN2 // SECOND INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON NUTRITION

IFAD // INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR AGRICULTURE DEVELOPMENT

MYPOW // MULTI-YEAR PROGRAM OF WORK

NGO // NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANISATION

OEWG // OPEN-ENDED WORKING GROUP

PPS // PRIVATE-PUBLIC PARTNERSHIPS

RAI // RESPONSIBLE AGRICULTURAL INVESTMENT

RTAF // RIGHT TO ADEQUATE FOOD

SDG // SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS

SSF // SMALL-SCALE FISHERIES

TT // TECHNICAL TASK TEAM

TORS // TERMS OF REFERENCE

VGGT // VOLUNTARY GUIDELINES ON THE RESPONSIBLE GOVERNANCE
OF TENURE OF LAND, FISHERIES AND FORESTS IN THE CONTEXT
OF NATIONAL FOOD SECURITY

UN // UNITED NATIONS

WFP // WORLD FOOD PROGRAM

WHO // WORLD HEALTH ORGANISATION

WTO // WORLD TRADE ORGANISATION





INTERNATIONAL

CSM

FOOD SECURITY & NUTRITION
CIVIL SOCIETY MECHANISM