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This Annual Report documents the work of the CSM during the period August 2014 to August 2015, and aims to be an essential tool for the internal and external communication and accountability process.

The Report 2014-2015 consists of the following parts:
- Summary of CSM engagement with the CFS (2014-2015)
- Civil Society Contributions to, and Assessment of CFS 41 (2014)
- Civil Society contributions to CFS Processes in 2015 (towards CFS 42)
- Operational information on the CSM during the reporting period

In October 2015, the CSM Coordination Committee (CC) elected for 2013-2015 handed over the steering responsibility of the space to the new CC, elected for the period 2015-2017. This report shows the substantial collective work carried out by a huge number of extremely diverse civil society organizations that aim to articulate joint positions towards all complex policy processes in the CFS.

The outgoing CC has shown extraordinary commitment and strong leadership to guide the CSM and all its entities in a permanently changing environment. The work of the CC has been greatly appreciated by participating organizations, but also by CFS members and other CFS participants. This is the moment to express the collective gratitude for the energy, lifetime and wisdom they have put into the CSM processes! Thank you!

Martin Wolpold-Bosien
CSM Secretariat Coordinator
November 2015
The Civil Society Mechanism (CSM) for relations with the CFS is the largest international space of civil society organizations (CSOs) working to eradicate food insecurity and malnutrition. The purpose of the CSM is to autonomously facilitate civil society participation in policy processes of the CFS.

During the reporting period, the CSM has facilitated civil society participation to all processes on the agenda of CFS, including:

a) 10 Years Right to Food Guidelines
b) Fisheries for Food Security and Nutrition
c) Food Losses and Waste
d) Principles on Responsible Agricultural Investment;
e) Food Security in Protracted Crisis
f) Monitoring
g) CFS Multi-Year Program of Work
h) High-Level Forum on Connecting Smallholders to Markets
i) Water for Food Security and Nutrition
j) Discussion on CFS engagement with Nutrition

The specific contributions of the CSM to these processes consisted of the following type of activities:

a) creation and continued work of CSM Working Groups for all CFS workstreams;
b) articulation of written contributions of these CSM Working Groups to CFS OEWG or Task Team meetings and drafts;
c) in-person presence of CSM members to OEWG and the Annual Plenary meetings to the extent that is possible through limited CSM funding and self-funded participation;
d) in-person presence of CSM members to the CFS Advisory Group (CFS AG) during its Joint Meetings with the CFS Bureau, including the submission of written contributions each of the meetings;
e) elaboration and presentations of more comprehensive analysis, proposals and publications on CFS topics.

The CSM, as a Constituency of the CFS AG, consists itself of 11 constituencies. All participating organizations in the CSM belong to one of the following 11 constituencies: smallholder farmers, pastoralists, fisherfolks, indigenous peoples, agricultural and food workers, landless, women, youth, consumers, urban food insecure, and NGOs. These constituencies are the main articulation spaces within the CSM.

The CSM as a space does not represent the organizations that participate in it. They represent themselves and articulate positions together with others in the CSM. The participating organizations, particularly those who organize small-scale food producers and consumers, have more than 300 millions affiliated members from all continents.

The steering body of the CSM is the Coordination Committee (CC) that is elected by 11 global constituencies and 17 sub-regions. The Coordination Committee for the period 2013-2015 was composed by 20 women and 18 men. The Coordination Committee elects the CSM Members to the CFS Advisory Group, establishes the CSM Working Groups that articulate civil society input into the CFS processes, and selects and supervises the CSM Secretariat Coordinator.

The key articulation instruments for constituency involvement in CFS processes are certainly the CSM Working Groups (open to all CSOs, they include from 35 to over 100 participating organizations each), the annual CSM Forum, the CC members as the facilitators for two-way communication with constituencies and sub-regions, and the CSM Members to the AG as the interface with the Bureau.

---

1_Contribution of the CSM to the CFS Reporting Exercise of Members to the CFS Advisory Group
The internal and external communications in the CSM is based on the following pillars:

a) the continued information sharing about CFS processes, events and meetings, and the permanent invitation to participating organization to contribute with their experiences and proposals to the work of the CSM CC, CSM Working Groups and CSM participation in the Advisory Group; this information is provided through the CSM Website, the monthly CSM Update that is available to all CSM Participating Organizations and includes also the most relevant information on ongoing specific processes;

b) the assessment of CFS results from a civil society perspective that is produced by the CSM Working Groups and shared with all CFS members and participants; an example of this kind of information is the CSM Publication “Civil Society at CFS 41” that documents CSM contributions to and assessments of CFS 41 results;

c) the sharing of documents on the CSM with all CFS members and participants, including on self-reflection, external evaluation, annual planning and budget; examples of this kind of information is the CSM Information Event organized in March 2015 in which the CSM evaluation 2014 and the workplan and budget for 2015 were explained;

d) sharing of civil society perspectives on CFS processes through CSM organized events, open to all CFS members and participants, as convened in January 2015 on protracted crisis and in April 2015 on the Civil Society proposals for CFS monitoring.

In principle, the linkages and working relations between the CSM and the Committee are well established in the CFS Reform Document and the Committee’s full acknowledgement of the CSM founding document and its character as essential and autonomous part of the reformed CFS. However, there are two proposals for further improvement that also address some concerns of the CSM on some recent CFS developments:

a) Measures to increase mutual understanding in the CFS should be strengthened. Several tensions and conflicts of the past year could have been avoided when the mutual understanding and the related communication and dialogue mechanisms would have worked better. From the CSM perspective, we agreed to adopt a pro-active and explanatory approach to it, including through CSO organized events during the inter-sessional period and a special attention to regular bilateral dialogues with the Chair, Bureau members, OEWG Chairs, AG members and Secretariat;

b) Clear signals are needed from CFS members and participants that the space of civil society in the CFS will not be reduced. The fact that the CFS Reform opened the Committee to the organizations of the most affected by hunger and malnutrition, particularly the small-scale food producers as well as urban food insecure, is a fundamental element of the CFS as a still unique and innovative model for inclusive global governance on food security and nutrition within the UN.
Civil Society Contribution to, and Assessment of CFS 41(2014)²

A) Assessment of the CFS, 5 Years after the reform

The CSM Forum 2014 started off by assessing the achievements and shortcomings of the CFS, 5 years after its reform. Different perspectives and opinions were expressed on these issues during a panel discussion. One main point was that after many years of struggles by social movements and civil society at different levels, the reform of the CFS in 2009 created a lot of expectations on the part of civil society.

Today, the CFS is the most important and inclusive platform where to discuss and address food security and nutrition issues at the global level. It represents a unique space with unique rules, an unprecedented experience within the UN system. The principle: “nothing about us without us”, and its application in a global governance body is a positive step forward for the constituencies of the most affected by hunger and malnutrition who have been traditionally excluded from political decision making at all levels. It is a substantial achievement in itself that global, regional and national organizations of farmers, smallholders, pastoralists, fisherfolks, indigenous peoples, agricultural and food workers, landless, women, youth, consumers, urban food insecure and NGOs are now truly engaged with the CFS through the CSM. As a result most of these constituencies perceive that their strong participation has led to valuable outcomes.

On balance the assessment of the 5 years is positive when considering most of the CFS processes and decisions. Particular examples are the Tenure Guidelines on Responsible Governance of Land, Fisheries and Forests, and the Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition, both of which have become references for governments when framing food security and nutrition policies.

When it comes to the initiative on rai (responsible agricultural investment), the CSO assessment is less positive when analyzing the final outcome (see chapter 3.e) of this report. It should be recalled that the process started with a decision to not simply legitimize the principles that had been drafted by some international institutions without civil society participation. The fact that the CFS took up the responsibility for a new and participatory process on rai was an important achievement in itself.

Key challenges for the future of the CFS that were identified by the panel:

// The need to implement and monitor CFS decisions: taking into account the struggle of power in the international context, there is a risk for the CFS to be marginalized from policy making processes on the national, regional and global level. The challenge for the CFS is to ensure that the implementation of its decisions is monitored and that those responsible for their implementation are held accountable. An innovative monitoring system is required to ensure that CFS decisions are relevant for policy decisions at all levels and that they make a real difference for people affected by hunger and malnutrition. This will also lead to CFS authority being globally recognized and strengthened.

// The CFS, as the most important and most inclusive international forum to promote convergence, coherence and coordination on food security and nutrition issues, is continuously challenged by other global processes that follow different dynamics. A concrete example of sidelining the CFS was the process towards ICN2. Why was the CFS not involved in its preparation? The same can be said on the post 2015 agenda, with respect to food and nutrition. What is, or should have been, the specific role of the CFS in this context? The CFS did not play a relevant role in the formulation of the objectives on food security and nutrition, nor was the Global Strategic Framework used as a key reference in that process. Consequently, the CFS future role is still not defined.

// The policy coherence imperative is certainly among the most challenging for the CFS. Yet, there has been strong reluctance by some governments to tackle within the CFS one of the key topics for food security policy coherence: the impact of trade policies on food security and nutrition. Not only do trade policies and WTO agreements challenge significantly this coherence, they also increasingly influence CFS processes, as in the case of rai. So, why should the CFS not discuss the coherence between trade policies and the right to adequate food when the latter is at the heart of the CFS’ mandate?

// Civil society organizations also perceive a persistent resistance of some governments to entertain debates in the CFS on a number of themes. Social movements and civil society...
organizations around the globe are working on the promotion of an alternative model of food production and consumption, based on peasant agriculture and local food systems. CSO have identified, through a comprehensive consultation process within the CSM, as priority issues to be discussed by the CFS: food sovereignty, agro-ecology and genetic resources. However, none of these themes have been taken up by the CFS or in HLPE reports.

Potentials and limitations of the multi-stakeholder approach are becoming another challenging topic for the CFS. Although it is considered important to have all relevant actors at the same table, there is an increasing concern about the role of the private and corporate sectors when shaping public policies and their participation in processes that set UN standards. Some of the key issues are: (a) the urgent need for regulatory frameworks to make international corporations accountable for negative impacts on the right to adequate food, human rights and the environment; (b) the imperative to clearly distinguish between public interest and private interest, and (c) the related conflicts of interest when private sector companies and foundations get involved in Public-Private Partnerships and UN-sponsored programmes, driven by profit motives and self interests.

Finally, an increasing concern by civil society involves the way in which the consensus building process is sometimes being conducted in the CFS. The impression is that some CFS members use the consensus concept to actually oblige others to accept a common but low-level denominator in taking decisions, or to prevent a debate on a sensitive issue. Such attitudes present a real risk to the potential of the CFS as the space where innovative and substantial decisions need to be taken for policy transformations towards the progressive realization of the right to adequate food.

B) 10 Years Right to Food Guidelines

Following the World Food Summit in 1996 and its Plan of Action, substantial progress in understanding and implementing the Right to Adequate Food has been achieved through two major instruments: the General Comment 12 of the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, adopted in May 1999, and the Voluntary Guidelines to Support the Progressive Realization of the Right to Adequate Food in the Context of National Food Security (in short: RIAF Guidelines), adopted after two years of negotiation in November 2004 by the FAO Council. Since then, the right to adequate food has made enormous progress, in some aspects, and is, at the same time, still probably the most violated human right on the planet.

The CFS Reform of 2009 put the Right to Adequate Food at the center: it is the vision of the CFS “strive for a world free from hunger where countries implement the voluntary guidelines for the progressive realization of the right to adequate food in the context of national food security”. The UN Special Rapporteur on the right to adequate food proposed to the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) in 2012, to hold a special session on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the adoption of the RIAF Guidelines. The plenary of the CFS welcomed the proposal and decided to include it in the CFS 41 Session Agenda.

A comprehensive assessment was conducted by civil society organizations that participate in the CSM, most of them being members of the Global Network for the Right to Food and Nutrition as well. The aim was to generate a renewed commitment of governments, UN and civil society to advance the implementation of the Right to Adequate Food, particularly by strengthening human rights accountability and coherence on all policy levels that affect food security and nutrition.
Key CSO messages to the CFS Session on 10 Years Right to Food Guidelines

1/ The defense and the struggle for the realization of the Right to Adequate Food are the core activities of the CSM. For social movements and civil society organizations, the Right to Adequate Food is one of the major reasons that accounts for the presence of civil society at the CFS, to promote policies that are coherent with human rights principles, with government being held accountable for human rights violations, and policies that are developed for the progressive realization of the right to adequate food. CSO are working and fighting for the right to adequate food and for all human rights in communities and at country level, and have fought for these rights as well in the CFS.

2/ The statements in the decision box cannot lower the standards set by the Right to Food Guidelines themselves and as expressed in the Annotated Agenda. Nevertheless, CSO expressed their appreciation of the renewed commitment approved as a global consensus. This is particularly noteworthy as some member countries of the CFS had openly questioned the agreement to have a decision box on the Right to Adequate Food at all, and also attempted to weaken its content with regard to the recognition of human rights approaches.

3/ Social movements and civil society organizations undertook a major effort to analyze and widely consult on the progress, shortcomings and challenges ahead, after 10 years of the Right to Food Guidelines. As the result, the CSO Synthesis paper was prepared for the purpose of being presented at the CFS 41, as a general assessment of the Right to Food was foreseen in the Annotated Agenda. Nevertheless, CSO were blocked in presenting this paper to the plenary, as some governments did not want to have a comprehensive assessment of the Right to Food Guidelines in this particular session.

4/ Promoting the progressive realization of the Right to Adequate Food is central to the mandate of the CFS itself. It is an essential part of the CFS Reform Document, of the CFS Vision Statement and of many of its decisions since then, including the Global Strategic Framework and the Tenure Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Land, Fisheries and Forests. Consequently, any attempt to weaken the Right to Adequate Food is an attempt to weaken the CFS.

5/ The fundamental role of rights holders must be underlined, especially of those most affected by violations of the right to adequate food, particularly small scale food producers, pastoralists, fisherfolks, peasants, landless, indigenous peoples, agricultural and food workers, urban food insecure, women, youth. These actors cannot be equated with actors in the corporate sector by calling them “non-governmental actors”.

6/ The Process towards formulating the decision box was problematic. Already in July, the decision box was presented only to the Bureau, not to the Advisory Group (AG). Only upon protest, a process for comments was opened. The process in September was equally problematic: after a discussion in the Joint Meeting of the Bureau and the AG, no consensus was reached. A Friends of the Chair Group was created by the Bureau, without AG participation and hence no participation by civil society. Such a proceeding is essentially exclusive and not in line with the established practice in the reformed CFS.

Assessing the CFS 41 outcome on the RtAF

In spite of a complicated process of formulating the decision box and after an intense Friends of the Chair meeting during the CFS 41, a positive decision box was approved by the CFS 41. From a civil society perspective, the following substantial commitments should be highlighted:

The CFS 41:

// reaffirmed governments’ commitment for implementation of the right to adequate food
// encouraged all CFS stakeholders to ensure policy coherence in line with the Voluntary Guidelines for the Progressive Realization of the Right to Adequate Food.
// reaffirmed the importance of respecting, protecting, promoting and facilitating human rights when developing and implementing policies and programmes related to food security and nutrition.
// committed to strengthen mechanisms that facilitate informed, participatory, and transparent decision-making in food security and nutrition policy processes including effective monitoring and accountability.
// urged all stakeholders to afford the highest priority to the most vulnerable, food insecure and malnourished people and groups when designing and implementing food security and nutrition policies and programmes.
// urged all stakeholders to integrate gender equality and women’s empowerment in the design and implementation of food security and nutrition policies and programmes.

CSO expressed their appreciation of the renewed commitment approved as a global consensus. This is particularly noteworthy as some member countries of the CFS had openly questioned the agreement to have a decision box on the Right to Adequate Food at all, and also attempted to weaken its content with regard to the recognition of human rights approaches.

CSO demanded stronger wording or more specific commitments on several points, particularly on the recognition of women’s rights, the role of rights holders, human rights coherence and follow-up. However, these proposals were not accepted due to the opposition of few influential governments.

C) Fisheries and Fisherfolk at the CFS

Participants at the CFS 41 were asked to engage in an “open and substantive debate to contribute to concrete policy recommendations for consideration by the CFS” on the role of sustainable fisheries and aquaculture to food security and nutrition.

This was the first time in its 40-year history that the CFS had given importance to the contribution of fisheries to food security.
The main CSO messages

Securing adequate food and nutrition for all is not just about producing enough food. Rather it is about the way food is produced, where it is produced, and who produces it. People do not go hungry because there is a lack of food in the world; they go hungry because nutritious food is not accessible to them. The problem is a lack of access to land and water to produce food, or a lack of means to purchase food. In the case of fisheries, this is in part due to the privatization of coastal areas and water bodies and to the degradation of the aquatic environment by both fishery and non-fishery activity. Ensuring food security and adequate nutrition for all requires that the brute force of industrial fisheries and aquaculture are reined in, and that activities that privatize and degrade the aquatic environment are halted. It also requires giving small-scale fisheries and small-scale aquaculture producers the priority, means and recognition they deserve.

Fisheries and aquaculture have a central role to play in providing solutions to meeting food and nutrition needs today and in the future, but only if developed in a regulated and sensitive manner that is both environmentally and socially responsible. The CSO participating in the CFS 41 advocated that this must involve addressing the imbalances in power in the food system and throughout the fishery value chain. They called for effective support to be provided to the struggles of small-scale fishworkers to sustain their livelihoods and to feed their families and their communities. The Voluntary Guidelines on Securing Sustainable Small-scale Fisheries in the context of food security and poverty eradication (SSF Guidelines), if implemented in an appropriate manner, are a vital tool in this regard.

Women play a particularly important though largely unrecognized and poorly rewarded role in the fisheries sector. They comprise at least 50% of the workforce, are engaged in productive activities throughout the value chain, and are largely responsible for putting food on the table. This is why the CSO called on the CFS to give high priority to supporting women in fisheries and aquaculture through affirmative action, adequate planning, legislation, recognition of rights, allocation of resources, and the promotion of their contribution to food security and nutrition.

Much of the fish on our plates comes at a high social cost. Small-scale fisheries and aquaculture produce most of the fish we eat, as much as 60%, and employ at least 90% of the workforce engaged in fisheries and aquaculture activities. Yet poverty and underdevelopment plague small-scale fishing communities, rendering them vulnerable to natural and manmade disasters, to the predatory activities of industrial interests, and isolating them socially and economically from the mainstream.

The achievement of food security and nutritional wellbeing should not be at the cost of the human rights of the world’s fishery and aquaculture workers and the fishing communities whose livelihoods, incomes, wellbeing and future prospects depend on living aquatic resources. Meeting nutritional goals must go hand in hand with a human rights-based approach to food production. This includes meeting the development goals set out in the outcome document of the Rio + 20 Conference – “The Future We Want”, and in establishing the conditions for decent work as laid out in ILO conventions, including the Work in Fishing Convention (C.188), in the fisheries and aquaculture sectors.

The CFS 41 therefore provided a historic opportunity to address these issues, and for the CSO to put forth their views and recommendations.

What is in the decision box? Achievements and weaknesses

In preparation for the CFS 41 a Task Team was set up to draft recommendations for discussion to complement the recommendations from the High Level Panel of Experts’ Report on “Sustainable Fisheries and Aquaculture for Food Security and Nutrition” (HLPE Report). The Task Team included inputs from the World Forum of Fish Harvesters and Fishworkers (WFF), the World Forum of Fisher Peoples (WFFP) and the International Planning Committee on Food Sovereignty (IPC).

From a civil society perspective, the following specific commitments can be appreciated:
The CFS 41 agreed to

// Recognize the contribution of small-scale fisheries
// Recognize the specific contribution of small-scale fisheries to food security and nutrition
// Promote and support the implementation of the ‘Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries in the Context of Food Security and Poverty Eradication’ (SSF Guidelines), with respect to food security and nutrition
// Take into account the requirements of small-scale fisheries in the design and implementation of national and international policies and programmes related to fisheries, including investment plans, as appropriate
// Support local organizations to foster the integration of small-scale fisheries into the decision-making processes
// Enhance fish markets and trade’s contribution to food security and nutrition
// Promote the inclusion of food security and nutrition in the objectives of policies and mechanisms related to fish trade
// Seek to avoid trade measures that may disadvantage small-scale fisheries and small-scale aquaculture
// Promote a fair return along the fish value chain and encourage direct trade linkages between fish producers and consumers with due consideration to food safety
// Improve social protection and labour rights
// Strive to improve the working conditions of the fisheries and aquaculture sectors, including safety at sea, promoting decent work, eliminating forced and child labour and developing social protection systems
// Fully address the gender dimension of the fisheries and aquaculture sector
// Give high priority to the support of women in fisheries and aquaculture through adequate planning, legislation, recognition or allocation of rights and resources, and the promotion of their contribution to food security and nutrition
// Promote gender equality and women’s empowerment in fisheries and aquaculture, promoting their engagement and access to policies, investments, projects, and fishing and access rights systems
// Recognize the work and contribution of fisher women involved in inshore and inland harvesting, and secure the protection of their rights in this context
// Integrate food security and nutrition concerns into fisheries and aquaculture-related policies and programmes
// Promote the implementation of the ‘Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security (VGGT), recognizing the particular relevance of article 8.3 on collectively used and managed land, fisheries and forests
// Promote the participation of fishing communities and fish workers in all decisions that impact their livelihoods and enjoyment of the right to adequate food as defined by national laws
// Promote the protection of existing rights and ongoing tenure over sites for food-insecure people, fishing communities and indigenous and tribal peoples, taking into account the VGGT

However, from a CSO perspective the Decision Box falls short in the following areas:

// Aquaculture has received much attention as a food production system capable of filling the gap in fish supplies to meet the needs of a growing world population, projected to reach 9 billion by 2050. However, the production model receiving most attention is industrial, and based on high, intensive and unsustainable levels of feed inputs, pharmaceuticals and other chemicals, using as limited range of species, often carnivorous and exotic, and providing products to consumers through large scale agro-industrial systems. Alternative production models need to be developed, based on species low in the food chain, using non-intensive systems that can be integrated into other food production activities owned and controlled by small scale producers, and which deliver nutritious fish products to local markets.
// The rapid and unregulated spread of aquaculture is a contributing cause of land and ocean grabbing. These phenomena transfer resources, wealth and publicly owned lands and waters into private hands. Fishermen face increasing competition for aquatic and land spaces from other interests as well, including energy production, oil and gas exploration and extraction, mass tourism, and real estate speculation. Such land and ocean grabbing by powerful interests is increasingly supported by banks and global capital funds, often under the guise of conservation.
// Stronger wording on women’s rights, human rights and monitoring was suggested by civil society during the negotiations, but rejected due to the opposition of a few influential governments.
D) Food Losses and Waste

As in the case of Fisheries, the discussion during the CFS 41 was preceded by an HLPE report on the issue of food losses and waste (FLW).

The main CSO messages

Civil society brought a rich analysis, questions and recommendations to the table. This included a broad and incredibly diverse range of voices of millions of people, both producers and consumers, who are most affected by, and most engaged in direct struggles to change the food system. They are at the center of building sustainable food systems – in agriculture, fisheries, pastoralism, food gathering and based on indigenous knowledge – that offer the kind of diversity, innovation and resilience to combating and reducing food losses and waste.

Civil society underlined the need to promote public, farmer-led responsible research, data collection, formulation of common protocols, implementation of good practices and generation of FLW information by governments in partnership with regional governments, local authorities, other actors and relevant bodies. Civil Society also pointed out the multitude of sustainable agricultural practice of those that work with the land, with ecosystems, and with biodiversity – in other words agroecology, and also those of traditional modes of consumption that are not wasteful.

The whole process was long, painstaking and complex, with several late-night sessions, but CSO did succeed in getting almost all of their key “asks” incorporated in the text of the Decision Box that was then unanimously approved by CFS41 on the final day.

Assessing the CFS 41 outcome on Food Waste and Losses

Voted unanimously in the plenary, the final text of the Decision Box contains several wins and actionable items that are relevant to both food sovereignty and solidarity economy movements, and can be used in the daily and political practice of social movements and civil society organizations:

// Recognition of the fundamental role and decision making at the local authority level. This emphasis allows social movements and networks to use this document in their work at local and community level;
// The continued use of the comprehensive food systems concept in relation to food loss and waste is important in terms of the interconnectedness of all its aspects at local level and a food sovereignty-based approach;
// Emphasis on the need for small-scale producer-led participatory research for producers and small-scale processing units is also very important in fighting industrial agriculture’s stranglehold on local sustainable food systems;
// The recognition of the importance of multi-actor governance bodies is a useful reference for the promotion and the strengthening of Food Policy Council on the local, district or national levels;
// The reference to opening public tenders for school meals to groups of small-scale producers that can also be used at local level.
// Agreement to examine how short food chains and Community Supported Agriculture can contribute to reducing food waste and losses.

On the other hand, the following shortcomings of the decision box were identified:

// An overspill of the policy document on responsible agricultural investment;
// All mention of agroecology was blocked, unless associated with elements considered unacceptable to civil society, such as ‘climate-smart agriculture’ or ‘sustainable intensification’.
// Civil Society tried to include the alternative dynamics practiced by citizens, food producers, small-scale businesses, students, in terms of changing the system in the way in which how they grow their food by keeping it local, by reaching out to other sectors, and by changing consumption practices in the discussions. But only a few of these aspects were actually included in the final text.
// There was a notable absence of governments from the South during the negotiations, as many delegates were engaged in parallel discussions. Ideas and voices of some important actors were not carried forward. It was therefore left to civil society to carry forward some issues that have widespread support, but that do not always translate into a powerful presence in late night meeting sessions.

One major challenge for the future are the important questions linked to how to integrate the food losses/waste agenda into the work of the CFS, and to find adequate funding across the broader UN system to move this work forward. In this sense, civil society organizations urged the CFS to prioritize working with the Rome-based UN agencies and Member States to plan an agenda for action on food losses and waste in CFS42.
E) Principles on responsible agricultural investment
The CSO process on the topic 2011-2014

The principles on responsible agricultural investment (rai) are the outcome of an almost four-year process with important achievements. In 2010, the CFS agreed that agricultural investment should be addressed within the inclusive space of the CFS instead of adopting the controversial PRAI developed by the World Bank. Following this, the CFS recognized that small-scale producers, many of whom are women, play a central role in producing most of the food consumed locally in many developing regions and are the primary investors in agriculture in many developing countries. The CSM agricultural investment-working group, established at the Coordination Committee meeting in Cordova in May 2011, defined two overarching objectives in the context of the CFS for civil society work on agricultural investment:

1. achieve more support and opportunities for small-scale food producers and their models of production through enabling public policies, support programmes and research; remunerative prices; access to domestic markets through appropriate infrastructure and credit; value addition through small-scale processing, cooperative enterprises.

2. protect small-scale food producers from corporate take-over by resisting land grabbing and value chain/contract farming approaches, opposing initiatives to stimulate adoption of GMOs and public-private partnerships promoting these corporate strategies the guise of conservation.

During the policy discussions on “How to Increase Food Security and Smallholder Investment in Agriculture” at CFS 37 in October 2011, the main CS objective was to redirect attention from ensuring an environment for profitable outside investments and towards responding to small-scale producers’ stated needs and proposals.

This objective was attained to a large degree. The decisions approved by the CFS recognize the primacy of small-scale sustainable food production and the fact that small-scale producers are the major investors in agriculture. They recommend that member governments and other CFS stakeholders “ensure that agricultural policies and public investment give priority to food production and nutrition and increase the resilience of local and traditional food systems and biodiversity”.

A further step was taken with the HLPE Report and the policy decisions on “Investing in Smallholder Agriculture” by CFS 40 (2013), contributing to a promising process towards a different framing of the discourse in the CFS about agricultural investments.

However, the domination of international trade regulations over food security concerns continued to hold sway, although it was recognized that the constraints of smallholders in relation to sanitary and phyto-sanitary regulations need to be taken into account.

The negotiation of the “rai” principles

Against this background, civil society organizations then engaged intensively, and in a constructive spirit, in the negotiations on the Principles for Responsible Investment in Agriculture and Food Systems (Principles).

Civil society developed its positions on responsible agricultural investment through extensive consultations in the CSM constituencies and regions during 2013 and 2014, as well as through participation in the formal CFS consultations. Before the start of the actual negotiations, civil society outlined its position in the following six points, which were shared with the Open-Ended Working Group in April 2014. CSO stressed that responsible investment in agriculture must:

1. Be anchored in a rights-based framework.
2. Clearly recognise small-scale producers and workers as the main investors in agriculture.
3. Include a commitment to create decent work and respect workers’ rights, and to overcome discrimination against women.
4. Support peasant-based agroecological production systems, and local food systems and markets as well as the defence of peoples’ access to and control over land, forest, water, seeds and fisheries.
5. Prioritise effective public policies and investment that support and defend small-scale producers, workers and local food systems.
6. Include a strong role for States to monitor the Principles in an inclusive way.

At all occasions and in all meetings, CSO underscored that responsible investment cannot be part of, or support, initiatives that lead to grabbing of resources. Land and water grabbing should be condemned, and the Principles should be a key instrument to stop the ongoing natural resources grabbing.

Assessing the negotiated principles on rai

At the annual CSM Forum ahead of CFS41, civil society reviewed the final negotiated document in terms of how far it meets the six key points listed above.
CSO welcomed that the Principles include the following positive provisions:

- respect for decent work and worker's rights,
- elimination of discrimination against women,
- governance and accountability,
- the important roles of small-scale producers and workers in agricultural investment,
- the recognition of the importance of progressive realization of the right to adequate food.

Sadly, the Principles fall short of clear commitments and consistent recommendations in the following ways:

- References to human rights are undermined by repeated references that seek to subordinate human rights to trade agreements and rules.
- The qualifier related to Free Prior and Informed Consent lowers the universally recognized standard on the rights of indigenous peoples.
- Recognition of the vital role of small-scale producers in investment and food security is nominal and the rest of the document emphasises facilitating large-scale investment.
- The Principles do not acknowledge that different production systems have different environmental impacts, a silence that will allow damaging farming practices to continue under the banner of responsible investment.
- The issues of land, water and resource grabbing were a driving impetus behind the Principles, but the document refuses to name these, and offers no protection for struggles against grabbing on the ground.
- The Principles do not prioritise public policy at all and consistently downplay States' responsibilities.
- The Principles reduce national level monitoring to measuring without actually doing anything about the problems.

Furthermore, unlike the Tenure Guidelines, which set out principles of implementation that have to be respected by all stakeholders, the Principles allow stakeholders to pick and choose what suits them. Civil Society critique is available on the CSM website at www.csm4cfs.org/cfs_41-14/rai_principles-51/

The main problem, however, is that the document places the interests of big business over those of small-scale producers, agricultural workers and those most vulnerable to hunger. It will thus be ineffective in stopping land and water grabbing. At the core of CS concerns is the repeated subordination throughout the document of human rights to trade interests.

Challenges for the future:

Civil society organizations will continue their engagement in the use of the Principles by monitoring how they are applied and by documenting both successes and challenges to bring these to the attention of CFS actors. The completion of negotiations and adoption by the CFS of the document are important stages in the struggle and commitment to establish appropriate public policies and regulations that enable the sustainable investments of small-scale producers and workers, and discipline abuses by mid to large investors.
Civil Society Contribution to CFS process in 2015: towards CFS 42

A) Framework for Action for Food Security in Protracted Crisis

The CSM Protracted Crises Working Group had been deeply involved in the CFS Protracted Crises 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, OEWG meetings and Global Consultation in Ethiopia, the CSM Working Group managed to greatly contribute to the preparation process of the Agenda for Action for Addressing Insecurity in Protracted Crises (CFS-A4A), bringing on board the experiences, opinions, convictions and needs of communities vulnerable to protracted crises.

While the CFS-A4A was meant to be endorsed in CFS 41, the lengthy discussions in the July 2014 negotiations made it impossible for the A4A to be finalized in 2014. A revised draft of the now called CFS Framework for Action for Addressing Food Insecurity in Protracted Crises (CFS-FFA) was made available in December 2014.

The CSM Coordination Committee meeting in October 2014 defined protracted crises as a priority work stream for the CSM for 2015 and asserted that full support should be given for the Protracted Crises Working Group during this last period of the negotiation process. For this purpose, a series of activities were carried out in the first months of 2015, including a strategy workshop of the CSM Working Group and a CSM organized public event with civil society voices from protracted crises countries, well attended by CFS members and participants; participation to the OEWG meetings on FFA; written submissions to the new drafts; bilateral meetings with CFS actors; preparation and participation in the final negotiations from 7-8 and 18-22 May 2015.

The FFA was adopted at the 42nd session of the CFS, from 12-16 October 2015.

Key aspects. CSO assessment of the FFA:

The CSM Working Group was a highly committed and active actor in the three years of elaboration and negotiation of the CFS Framework for Action for Food Security and Nutrition in Protracted Crises. Throughout the process, the CSO delegation successfully negotiated with states, specialized Rome-based UN agencies, private sector and other stakeholders, making great strides in a three-year effort to define more-appropriate standards for concerted actions in the field and the bureaus for all parties involved in ongoing—and likely future—protracted crises.

The CSM WG welcomes that many fundamental concerns and substantial proposals from civil society were accepted after sometimes-long debates and included into the text. In this regard, the CSM WG highlights the following achievements as enshrined in the different chapters of the final draft of a framework document dealing specifically with the issues of food insecurity in protracted crises. The CSM Working Group also flags the shortcomings of the document, and stresses the challenges for the future.

The Character of the Document:

- The FFA departs from a holistic and a comprehensive understanding and examination of root and underlying causes of food insecurity and under-nutrition, without narrowing the scope to resilience only.
- The FFA is based on a human rights approach that shall lead all action taken to address food insecurity and nutrition in Protracted crisis, and shall complement the developmental and humanitarian approaches.
- The concept of Prevention is now well-established throughout the document, as CSM delegates insisted to integrate it in the relevant parts.

Introduction

- Inclusion of foreign occupation as a root cause for food insecurity and undernutrition in crises areas and as a situation that needs particular attention when ensuring safe and unimpeded access to humanitarian and food aid
- Inclusion of climate change as an underlying cause of food insecurity and undernutrition
- Clear identification of the main reasons behind the failure of policies and programs in protracted crises situations including the undermining of local capacities, institutions and priorities by externally driven interventions; a lack of commitment to support small-scale food producers, and vested commercial, political and institutional interest.

Stakeholders

- Ensuring that all relevant stakeholders are clearly listed in the FFA
- Addition of the words “or impacting” to the chapeau: “The Framework is intended for all stakeholders who may have a role in improving or impacting food security and nutrition in protracted crises...”
- Recognition of the central role of smallholders, although state delegations resisted adding “landless” to its definition in the relevant footnote.
Achievements in the principles of the FFA

Principle 1
// Integration of policies that foster local food systems as a main component of supporting resilience including through local procurement and building food reserve
// Removing an article that encourages sustainable adaptation for people's displacement and including one that supports durable solutions in general, including return to place of origin if possible

Principle 2
// CSM managed to include stress on the importance of food safety regulations, as well as the need to strengthen the capacity and participation of local food producer and consumer organizations to improve food safety in protracted crises.

Principle 3
// Integration of the principles of consistency with international human rights law, the prohibition to use food as a tool for political or economic pressure, and the obligation to refrain from adopting unilateral actions incompatible with international law, including the UN Charter, which endanger nutrition and food security, as stated by the 1996 Rome Declaration

Principle 4
// The full recognition that States shall fully observe their human rights obligations under international law in order to achieve the progressive realization of the right to adequate food in the context of national food security
// The obligation to respect, and to ensure respect to International Humanitarian Law
// States, parties involved in conflict, and other stakeholders should consider how their policies and actions could impact food security and nutrition in other regions and countries affected by protracted crises and consider relevant appropriate actions
// The recognition of the special protection of indigenous peoples affected by, or at risk of protracted crises

Principle 5
// The obligation to ensure gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls in support of food security and nutrition in protracted crisis situations, as recognised by relevant international legal instruments, in particular the UN Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW)

Principle 6
// The recognition of the need to analyse and examine the underlying determinants of food insecurity and malnutrition and the need for analyses to be country owned

Principle 7
// The recognition of the need for affected countries to own programs and oblige cooperation partners to work through country institutions to avoid undermining them or creating parallel systems.

Principle 8
// The recognition of the need of debt reduction and relief as a key measure to ensure food security and nutrition in protracted crises

Principle 9
// The importance of the link between peacebuilding and tenure rights: “Taking steps by all stakeholders, and in all types of protracted crises, to respect the existing rights under international law of members of affected and at risk populations, and their ability to access and use their natural resources”

Principle 10
// Reinstating the reference to the CFS Guidelines on Responsible Governance of Tenure, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security (Tenure Guidelines), and the the FAO Guidelines on Sustainable Small-scale Fisheries, emphasizing the respect to the legitimate tenure rights of individuals, farmers, smallholders, small-scale food producers, indigenous peoples and members of affected and at risk populations

Challenges and Omissions

// The original Action Plan was replaced with another, shorter, diluted section titled “Dissemination, Use and Learning.” The terms application and implementation are used in other parts of the document, but not in the last one.

// Although the commitment for monitoring is recognized in other parts of the document, there was a strong unwillingness by governments to add monitoring to this section. There is no section on roles and responsibilities, as in previous CFS major decisions ogovernance of tenure and responsible agricultural investment. Reference to “extraterritorial obligations” was not possible to include explicitly; however the following statement was included in principle 4: “states, parties involved in conflict, and other stakeholders should consider how their policies and actions could impact food security and nutrition in regions and countries affected by protracted crises and consider relevant appropriate actions.”

// Reference to the “do no harm” principle was equally not possible to include as such. However, a statement was included in principle 9: “Working to ensure that food security and nutrition related interventions do not exacerbate tensions or conflict”

// No references to the concepts of agroecology and transitional justice were included, due to strong opposition of some delegations. No reference to the Universal Health Coverage and the World Health Assembly nutrition targets was included, due to the opposition of several delegations.

In spite of these shortcomings, the CSM WG considers the FFA and all the essential elements listed above as an extraordinary achievement. The main challenge is the path ahead.

The path ahead

The CSM WG on protracted crisis suggest to focus energy and discussions now on the necessary steps to ensure implementation, use and monitoring of the FFA at the national, regional and international levels. This includes the following challenges and tasks:

// Defining the roles, responsibilities and key actions that should be taken by stakeholders in different contexts, stressing the importance of putting communities in crises at the centre of planning and implementation mechanisms.

// Discussing how the FFA can be used to guide more effective policies and actions at national and regional levels

// Defining the roles, responsibilities and key actions that should be taken by stakeholders in different contexts, stressing the importance of putting communities in crises at the centre of planning and implementation mechanisms.

// Establishing a process for monitoring, evaluation and review of the application and impact of the FFA.
B) Monitoring CFS Decisions

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

The CSM working group has been contributing to the CFS Open Ended Working Group on Monitoring, for the past few years, trying to ensure that the CFS complies with its mandate as set out in the 2009 reform document regarding monitoring and accountability. This mandate was reaffirmed by the CFS 41 Decision on Monitoring.

In November 2014, the CSM Working Group on Monitoring held a workshop to elaborate specific proposals for implementing the Decision of the CFS 41. After this workshop, a Preliminary Proposal for Monitoring CFS Decisions and Recommendations was elaborated by the CSM Working group and presented in a public meeting open to CFS members and participants on 30 April, as well to the OEWG on Monitoring that day. A revised version of this civil society proposal was presented and discussed by the OEWG on June 1. For the following meeting, Brazil and CSM submitted a joint proposal for the draft decision box by including key elements for the building of a meaningful monitoring framework of CFS decisions and recommendations, by including those issues to which support was expressed in the previous meeting of the OEWG.

Essentially, the proposal demands:

1// A clear commitment to continue developing innovative mechanisms to monitor progress towards objectives and actions agreed upon by the CFS

2// A participatory approach to the voluntary in-depth country level assessments of CFS effectiveness, which requests that the terms of reference and methodology for the pilot countries should be worked out in consultation with those countries that express their interest to volunteer.

3// To carry out annual global monitoring events within CFS sessions, within available resources, starting in 2016 with a thematic event during CFS 43 to report on experiences and lessons learned and assess progress in the use and application of CFS major outputs, beginning with the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests during CFS 43.

4// To encourage CFS actors to hold monitoring events on the national and regional levels to assess progress in the use and application of CFS policy recommendations and to request the OEWG on Monitoring to develop, with support of the CFS Secretariat, basic terms of reference for the organization of events for this purpose at regional and national levels.

Unfortunately, in the following meeting of the OEWG on July 7, these proposals found strong objections from some delegations. The CSM expressed its dissatisfaction with this and made it clear during the OEWG meeting, as well as in the subsequent Joint Meeting of the CFS Bureau and Advisory Group, that civil society will not back a decision box on monitoring that will further delay the development of a CFS monitoring mechanism.

After three years of intense engagement, the CSM Working Group on monitoring notes with great concern that the CFS has practically taken no substantial steps towards developing a monitoring mechanism for its decisions and recommendations. 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.

C) High-Level Forum on Connecting Smallholders to Markets

The 40th Session of the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) decided to hold a High-Level Forum on Connecting smallholders to market in 2015 constituting an opportunity to bring together a wide range of concerned stakeholders to enhance coordination, coherence and convergence among initiatives and programmes while ensuring links with previous CFS work, such as the 2013 HLPE report on Investing in smallholder agriculture for food security and related CFS decisions. The issue of markets had been identified by the CSM as particularly important and contentious and meriting further work in the CFS.

In September 2014 the CFS secretariat prepared TORs for the process, and a technical task team (TT) was established, composed of members of the CFS Secretariat and focal points from the relevant technical units in FAO, IFAD and WFP. During the September 2014 Bureau/Advisory group meeting, the CSM AG members questioned the TORs, which failed in particular to provide for effective involvement of smallholder organizations in the framing and preparation of the Forum and foresaw a very short preparatory period. They called on the Bureau to correct this situation by immediately opening up the technical TT to AG members, including CSOs, with special attention to representatives from smallholder organizations.

After several CSM interventions, the Bureau finally decided by end of November 2014 to open up the TT to include one representative for the CSM and one for the PSM. At that point work had already advanced in the TT on the four key documents: the calendar of the preparation process, the outline of the background document, the draft agenda and the draft list of possible panelists. The CSM AG members requested the CFS Chair and the AG/Bureau to revise the timeline in order to give smallholder organizations and other civil society groups the possibility of meaningful participation. The timeline was slightly revised but without changing the date of the 25 June for the High-Level Forum.
A CSM delegate participated in the Technical Task Team, which prepared the background document and proposals for the agenda and methodology of the HLF. CSM input contributed to the framing of the background document, accenting the important of local, “invisible” markets and of public policies like public procurement, and to the selection of case studies featured both in the document and at the HLF. These proposals were presented to several Joint Meetings of the CFS Bureau and Advisory Group, to which the CSM Advisory Group members as well contributed with comments and suggestions.

On June 24th, a CSM Preparatory Workshop was conducted attended by more than 40 civil society organizations. After a full day of information sharing and discussions, participants agreed to the following key civil society messages to the CFS High Level Forum on Connecting Smallholders to Markets, held on 25 June 2015 in FAO HQ:


// Smallholders are the one organizing the bulk of the market. 70% of the world’s food feeding is produced by them and reaches the 5 billion people who consume it through the markets controlled by smallholders. Corporate value chains and supermarkets account for a minimum share of food flows.

// There is a lack of data and statistics on “invisible” markets, although they are the most important way of food providing. It is essential that they be made visible and that they are organized as constituting the basis for food security.

// There is a lack of solid assessment of the impacts on smallholders, food security and the right to food of the dominant approaches to value chains and the effectiveness of instruments like PPSs and contract farming has to be remedied.

// The CFS is the space for promoting food security, not economic growth per se.

// Public policies need to respond to people’s needs: guarantee stable, remunerative and fair prices; defend the vulnerable against the increasing risks deriving from food price volatility and climate change through instruments like public grain reserves and procurement policies; promote investments in small-scale agroecological farming, small scale processing and sales that are under the control of the small-scale producers themselves.

// The CFS 41 Report makes a number of suggestions regarding public policies, which should not be forgotten.

// Smallholders are not farmer entrepreneurs, are social, cultural actors not only economic actors driven by profit motive alone. So the logic of the markets managed is also different.

// Promoting local food systems as the basis for food sovereignty. There are multiple positive examples of people-controlled markets at local level. It is important working with local authorities and supporting rural-urban linkages.

// Markets are not only about exchange of money. Local/Indigenous markets are linked to the land, identity, spirituality, culture and territory, among other aspects.

// Women suffer multiple forms of discrimination and they are often cut off or marginalized in the existing market for several reasons. Women are also disproportionately burdened by unpaid care work. Women need specific targeted interventions and policies to get the space for their participation in the market to ensure their economic, social and political empowerment.

// Young farmers need to be involved through specific policies that incentivize their access to the agricultural sector.

The work on this crucial topic will be continued and further developed by the CFS as foreseen in the Multi-annual year of program of work (MYPoW). The Task Team will continue to collect more data on the issue on the basis, as well, of the CFS HLF’s outcome. An ad-hoc Open Ended Working Group (OEWG) will be held in 2016, for two days around June, to substantially discuss the policy recommendations to be approved by the CFS 43 in October 2016.
D) Water for Food Security and Nutrition
The CSM Water Working Group was established in April 2015 with the specific task to articulate the civil society positions into the CFS policy formulation process that started after the presentation of the HLPE Report on “Water and Food Security and Nutrition” mid May 2015. Since then the Working Group has drafted and presented positions and comments on the first and second draft of the Decision Box on this topic that will be discussed, negotiated and approve by CFS 42. The basis for the draft decision box was the set of recommendations of the HLPE report. In general, CSOs welcomed the HLPE Water report and its recommendations as a very positive and comprehensive effort that will be discussed, negotiated and approved by CFS 42. However, the discussions of the past months show that key concerns and demands from civil society organizations find strong opposition of some delegations. The key concerns of the CSM Working group on Water are:

Human right to water
There is a strong tendency among governments to reduce the right to water to the right to drinking water and sanitation. Civil society has demanded that the CFS decision should reflect a broader understanding of the right to water and the indivisibility of human rights. The realization of the right to water is essential to the realization of many other human rights as the human right to water has many dimensions and linkages to other rights and issues. The authoritative interpretation of the right to water in General Comment No. 15 of the UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights stresses these linkages, particularly to the rights to food, health and the access to land and other natural resources. There is a general need to harmonize the language in the Decision Box with the human rights framework. In any case, Civil Society cannot accept language on Human Rights that is below the standards already agreed upon by the UN.

Interests of users
When we discuss the „interest of users“ we must be clear about who we are prioritizing, and that we are discussing “rights” not interests. Not all users are at the same level. It is essential that we better underscore that the document targets and prioritizes vulnerable and marginalized communities.

Territorial approaches vs. Landscape approaches
Territory is a concept that comes from the experiences of indigenous peoples, and is increasingly being used elsewhere. Territorial approaches to governance is less about a technical perspective, but rather holistic, non-sectorial planning and resource management with a clear human element - it also is a concept that transcends national boundaries.

Public policies and investments
When discussing investments - there are different kinds of investments that we should differentiate between, and here it is important that we discuss and put emphasis on public investments. Water is a public good, and the most marginalized must be protected by good public policies in place, as opposed to private investments which follow a different, profit-driven paradigm.

Public-private partnerships (PPPs)
The text implies that PPPs are some sort of best practice, but there is not any body of evidence for such an assumption. In fact we have a lot of evidence that highlights to negative impacts on communities, so there is no clear benefit to include this.

Agricultural workers and the right to water in the workplace
The access to clean drinking water in the workplace is fundamental for agricultural workers. Unfortunately, the reality is that this access is not ensured for millions of workers, particularly on plantations.

Resilience, water and agroecology
The role of local food systems, small-scale producers and agroecological approaches is instrumental to strengthen resilience.

Water as a tool of economic and social pressure
CSOs have recognized already in previous documents that food should not be used as a tool for economic and social pressure. This is also absolutely true for water, and extremely relevant for food security and nutrition.

Participatory governance
In any discussion on governance and consultation human rights standards must also be applied and mentioned in the document, and particularly the principle of Free and Prior Informed Consent of Indigenous Peoples.

Water pricing
We strongly oppose any kind of water pricing or ration for communities; this could block the access to water for the most marginalized. We share the view that water has a value and that there should be measures to ensure that big water users such as companies contribute to the real cost of their water extraction.

The word “price” reduces the value of water to its economic value only, ignoring its social, cultural and spiritual value.

Follow up on water in the CFS
Even though the CFS is not an implementing body, the issue of water should be kept inside the CFS given its importance for FSN. The decision box should be stronger on this than is the case in the current draft. The CFS should at least encourage members to implement the decision and provide further guidance.
E) CFS Multi-Year Program of Work (MYPOW) 2016-2017

The CFS OEWG on MYPOW started in February a consultation of all CFS constituencies regarding the prioritization of topics for the CFS in the biennium for 2016-2017. The CSM also did launch a broad consultation with all constituencies and sub-regions through the Coordination Committee as the facilitating body.

The result was that the CSM agreed to:

- Reaffirm the priorities that were already defined in the consultation process in 2012/23 but unfortunately not taken up by the CFS: agroecology and genetic resources. As additional themes, the CSM consultation suggested: to continue the work on connecting smallholders to markets; the engagement of the CSM with nutrition; and the engagement of the CFS with the Sustainable Development Goals.

These proposals were submitted to the CFS MYPOW exercise, and as in the previous cycle, the proposals for agroecology and genetic resources did not find a significant support from the regional groups of governments and other Advisory Group members. If civil society wants to get these controversial themes into the CFS agenda, a very challenging strategy is needed which would allow to deal with the strong and continued opposition of some countries against the CFS dealing with these issues. Certainly, this will be a task for the CC in the period 2015-2017.

The other proposals were included into the new MYPOW, and good part of the discussions were then dedicated to the approach how these topics would be framed. Importantly, the civil society demand for a second HLPE report in 2017 on nutrition was finally accepted.

The envisaged work plan of the CFS for 2016-2017 that is submitted for approval by CFS 42 foresees the following elements:

**CFS Workstreams:**
- CFS role and contribution to nutrition – 2016-2017
- CFS engagement with Sustainable Development Goals – 2016-2017
- Follow-up to the High-Level Forum on Connecting Smallholders to Markets – 2016
- CFS Forum on Women’s empowerment in the context of food security and nutrition – 2017
- CFS Forum on Urbanization, rural transformation and implications for food security and nutrition – 2016-2017
- Periodic Update Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition (GSF) – 2016-2017
- Monitoring – 2016-2017
- Evaluation of CFS effectiveness – 2016
- CFS Outreach and linkages, including communication

**HLPE REPORTS**
- Sustainable agricultural development for food security and nutrition, including the role of livestock 2016
- Sustainable forestry for food security and nutrition – 2017
- Nutrition and food systems – 2017
Operative Information about CSM in 2014/2015

A) The CSM as an open and autonomous space related to the CFS

The Civil Society Mechanism (CSM) for relations with the United Nations Committee on World Food Security (CFS) is the largest international space of civil society organizations (CSOs) working to eradicate food insecurity and malnutrition. The CSM was founded in 2010, as an essential and autonomous part of the reformed CFS. The purpose of the CSM is to facilitate civil society participation and articulation into the policy processes of the CFS.

The CSM in the reformed CFS

The CSM is an open space and hence does not have formal members, but participating organizations. Every organization that belongs to civil society and works on food security and nutrition can join and participate. During the past years, several hundred national, regional or global organizations have participated in the CSM. All participating organizations in the CSM belong to one of the following 11 constituencies: smallholder farmers, pastoralists, fisher folks, indigenous peoples, agricultural and food workers, landless, women, youth, consumers, urban food insecure and NGOs.

The CSM as a space does not represent the organizations that participate in it. They represent themselves and articulate positions together with others in the CSM. The participating organizations, particularly those who organize small-scale food producers and consumers, have more than 300 millions affiliated members from all continents.
B) The CSM Working Structure
2014/2015

// Constituencies: the global and sub-regional units

The CSM is based on 11 Constituencies: Smallholders Farmers, Pastoralists/Herders, Fisherfolks, Indigenous Peoples, Consumers, Urban Food Insecure, Agricultural and Food Workers, Women, Youth, Landless, NGOs.

Participation of civil society organizations is articulated through global and sub-regional units. The global units bring together the global and continental organizations and networks of each sector, while the sub-regional units bring together civil society organizations that have work on food security in the specific sub-region. This articulation aims to ensure inclusiveness and active involvement of all national, regional and global levels.

The CSM sub-regions are the following: North America, Central America and Caribbean, Andean Region, Southern Cone, West Europe, East Europe, North Africa, Central Africa, East Africa, West Africa, South Africa, South Asia, Southeast Asia, Central Asia, West Asia, Australasia and Pacific.

// The Coordination Committee (CC)

The CC is the governing body of the CSM; this means that all relevant political decisions within the CSM, on internal and external issues, are taken by the CC by consensus, if possible, and by vote if a consensus is not possible. The Members of the CSM Coordination Committee are elected by the 11 constituencies and 17 sub-regions (5 sub-regions in Africa, 4 sub-regions in the Americas, 6 sub-regions in Asia and 2 sub-regions in Europe). The Coordination Committee in the period 2014-2015 was composed by 20 women and 18 men. Gender and geographic balance within its composition is always ensured. See the CC composition for the reporting period 2014-2015 in the following chart:
The Working Groups
The Policy Working Groups (WG) are a fundamental part of the CSM work. The Working Group is the space where political inputs to CFS Processes are articulated, debated, constructed, analyzed and confronted. The aim, starting from the pluralities of expertise, knowledge and point of views, is to build a civil society common position to be brought to CFS inter-sessional and plenary decision-making and policy debate activities. Working Groups are established in relation to the CFS processes approved in the biannual Multi-Year Programme of Work. Working Groups are open to all participating organizations of the CSM and ideally comprise organizations from all global constituencies and sub-regions. Each of the WG is led by one or two coordinators who are members of the CC and is usually supported by technical facilitators and resource persons. For information on the different CSM Working Groups, please consult the following link in the CSM Webpage: http://www.csm4cfs.org/policy_issues-6/

The CSM Advisory Group
The CSM Advisory Group is elected by and within the Coordination Committee every two years. The CSM has 4 seats within the CFS Advisory Group. The CSM appoints 8 members of the CSM AG who then attend CFS AG meetings on a rotational basis. As its name suggests, the CSM Advisory Group advises both the CFS Bureau on its policy decision making processes by consolidating, facilitating and sharing the CSOs common positions on CFS policy issues, and the CSM CC by informing its policy debate, being the direct link with the CFS Bureau and Advisory Group during the inter-sessional period. The CSM Advisory Group meets for a face-to-face meeting prior to each Joint CFS AG/Bureau Meeting, in order to articulate CSM common contributions on each topic of the CFS AG/ Bureau meeting agenda.

The CSM Annual Forum
Each year the CSM holds its Annual Forum prior to the CFS Plenary Session and it is open to all interested civil society participants of the CSM. This two-days forum is a fundamental moment and space for the CSM. At the Forum, CSOs are able to debate, consolidate, articulate and finalise their positions that will be shared and brought to the CFS Plenary Session. Prior to the Annual Forum the CSM CC holds its annual meeting. The Forum is as well a space for accountability, where CC members report to all participating CSOs about their work, performance and activities. Finally the CSM forum is the space to assess the past processes, to consolidate the common positions for the present and to identify the key challenges and steps forward for the future.

The Secretariat
The Secretariat guarantees CSM daily functioning. It offers a technical support to the work of the Coordination Committee, Advisory Group and Working Groups by facilitating the communication flow, ensuring the effective coordination of all CSM bodies and respecting of CSM organizing principles and internal functioning guidelines and by administrating the financial resources and logistics arrangements necessary. A Coordinator, a Financial/ Administrative Officer and a Programme/Communication Officer compose the Secretariat. The office is based in Rome and is hosted within FAO Headquarters. The Secretariat reports directly to the Coordination Committee. A professional and long-term collaborating team of interpreters and translators supports the daily work of the Secretariat, by enabling the translation of all CFS documents and CSM messages and the interpretation of all meetings in Spanish, French and English.
C) Financial report 2014/2015

// Remarks on the CSM 2014 Financial report
In 2014 the overall expenses of the CSM amounted to 582,892 Euro. The resources that helped to cover these expenses were provided mostly (85%) by governments, development cooperation agencies and international institutions. The other 15% of funds were provided by NGOs. Only 65% of the planned annual budget could be covered in 2014. This affected in particularly the activities aimed at strengthening the internal interaction within the CSM space, more specifically the constituency and regional consultations.
Preliminary remarks on the CSM Financial report 2015 (January to September):

From January to September the resources raised by the CSM have been 549,475 Euro. The contribution provided by governments, Development cooperation agencies and international institutions has not increased, but slightly decreased to 79% of the overall resources. NGOs/CSOs contributions continue to play a key role in ensuring the work of the CSM, by providing more than 20% of the funds in 2015.

This happened in spite of several efforts to make clear that the CSM, as essential but autonomous part of the CFS, should be funded by public funds only.

However, it should be noted that the funding gap not only affects the CSM, but also severely affects the CFS as a whole. The CFS budget depends to a high degree on voluntary contributions of CFS members. Even in November 2015, the CFS budget for 2016-2017 faces a huge gap, which puts at risk the full implementation of the Multi-Year Program of Work as adopted by the CFS 42.

Although the CSM planned budget 2015 was significantly lower than the year before, only 75% of it could be ensured so far, and we do not expect further contributions before the end of the year. This has considerably affected the implementation of the CSM 2015 Work Plan.

When planning for 2016, the existing constraints need to be taken into account.
**LIST OF ACRONYMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A4A</td>
<td>AGENDA FOR ACTION FOR ADDRESSING FOOD INSECURITY IN PROTRACTED CRISES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG</td>
<td>ADVISORY GROUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>COORDINATION COMMITTEE (CSM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFS</td>
<td>COMMITTEE ON WORLD FOOD SECURITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>CIVIL SOCIETY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANISATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANISATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFA</td>
<td>FRAMEWORK FOR ACTION FOR FOOD SECURITY AND NUTRITION IN PROTRACTED CRISES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLN</td>
<td>FOOD LOSSES AND WASTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMOS</td>
<td>GENETIC MODIFIED ORGANISM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSF</td>
<td>GLOBAL STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK FOR FOOD SECURITY AND NUTRITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLF</td>
<td>HIGH LEVEL FORUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLPE</td>
<td>HIGH LEVEL PANEL OF EXPERTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ</td>
<td>HEADQUARTERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICN2</td>
<td>SECOND INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON NUTRITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFAD</td>
<td>INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR AGRICULTURE DEVELOPMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYPOW</td>
<td>MULTI-YEAR PROGRAM OF WORK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANISATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEWG</td>
<td>OPEN-ENDED WORKING GROUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS</td>
<td>PRIVATE-PUBLIC PARTNERSHIPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAI</td>
<td>RESPONSIBLE AGRICULTURAL INVESTMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTAF</td>
<td>RIGHT TO ADEQUATE FOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG</td>
<td>SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSSF</td>
<td>SMALL-SCALE FISHERIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT</td>
<td>TECHNICAL TASK TEAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TORS</td>
<td>TERMS OF REFERENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VGGT</td>
<td>VOLUNTARY GUIDELINES ON THE RESPONSIBLE GOVERNANCE OF TERNURE OF LAND, FISHERIES AND FORESTS IN THE CONTEXT OF NATIONAL FOOD SECURITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>UNITED NATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>WORLD FOOD PROGRAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>WORLD HEALTH ORGANISATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTO</td>
<td>WORLD TRADE ORGANISATION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>