

ANNUAL INTERNATIONAL FOOD SECURITY & NUTRITION CIVIL SOCIETY MECHANISM FORUM [FINAL REPORT]

*CIVIL SOCIETY MEETING IN PREPARATION FOR THE 39TH SESSION OF THE
COMMITTEE ON WORLD FOOD SECURITY (CFS), 13 - 14 OCTOBER, 2012 -
FAO, ROME*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	1
Parallel Working Groups	2
<i>Climate Change</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>Social Protection.....</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Responsible agricultural investment.....</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>Global Strategic Framework (already in fr and es).....</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>Protracted crises (already translated into FR and ES).....</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>Food Security & Nutrition Terminology.....</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>Monitoring & Accountability (already in FR and ES).....</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>Policy Gaps & Emerging Issues (already in fr and es).....</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>Global & Regional Coordination and Linkages with the CFS.....</i>	<i>14</i>
Annexes.....	15
<i>Annex 1: CSO Evaluation of the CFS 39 Outcomes and Recommendations</i>	<i>15</i>

INTRODUCTION

Over 150 civil society organisations and social movements, representing farmers, fisherfolk, Indigenous Peoples, pastoralists, agricultural workers, youth and those most affected by food insecurity and malnutrition gathered in Rome for the **2012 Annual Civil Society Forum**.

In preparation for the 39th Session of the Committee on World Food Security, the two-day Forum was held to assist in the development and endorsement of common civil society positions and strategies in relation to the CFS agenda.¹

The Forum was held after two intense days of meetings between members of the Coordination Committee (CC) – the governing body of the CSM. The Forum provided the space for Coordination Committee members to report back to the broader membership of the CSM. A separate report with the outcomes and decisions taken by the CC is available here: ____

The Forum is a space where CSOs can finalise cohesive and strong policy positions, which have been developed through the CSM working groups during the intersessional process. The CSM Forum is open to all interested civil society participants working in the field of food security and nutrition with emphasis on the broad and inclusive participation of social movement representatives. Although the Forum is divided into two formats, Plenary and Working Group, the working group sessions is where most of the preparation takes place and specific strategies are formed.

Hosted by the Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations, the opening ceremony of the Forum set a constructive tone for the weekend, calling all participants to keep in mind the 870 million people in the world who still suffer from chronic undernourishment, and the daily struggles and political attacks social movements and their leaders face on a daily basis. While also recalling the tremendous impact civil society has had throughout the reform process of the CFS and the global governance of food and agriculture as a whole.

Welcome addresses were given by two civil society panelists and members of the Coordination Committee, Sarojeni Rengam and Ibrahim Coulibaly; CFS Chair, Ambassador Yaya Olaniran; and FAO representative, Marcela Villareal from the Office for Communications, Partnerships and Advocacy.

Before splitting into working groups, the morning Plenary sessions focused on introducing new-coming civil society participants to the ways of working within the CFS and CSM, provided an introduction to the agenda of the 39th Session of the CFS, presented the Annual report from the Coordination Committee to the CSM Forum, and finally, CSM working group coordinators gave brief presentations on the policy issues of the CFS 39 agenda – what is at stake, and what are the controversial issues?

¹ http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/47/annotated_agenda_en.pdf

The final agenda for the Forum can be found here:

http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/Pagine/27/en_final_csm_forum_provisional_programme_en.pdf

PARALLEL WORKING GROUPS

Based on this year's CFS agenda, participants broke out into 9 separate working groups. Given the high number of issues on the agenda, the 9 working groups were further categorized into 3 different parallel sessions. This allowed participants to focus their expertise on a specific issue, while providing the opportunity to cover more topics over the 2 days:

BREAKOUT SESSION 1

1. CLIMATE CHANGE
2. SOCIAL PROTECTION
3. RESPONSIBLE AGRICULTURAL INVESTMENT

BREAKOUT SESSION 2

4. GSF
5. PROTRACTED CRISES
6. FOOD SECURITY & NUTRITION TERMINOLOGY

BREAKOUT SESSION 3

7. MONITORING & ACCOUNTABILITY
8. POLICY GAPS & EMERGING ISSUES
9. GLOBAL & REGIONAL COORDINATION AND LINKAGES WITH CFS

The purpose of these sessions were to:

- Identify controversial issues
- Finalization of common positions
- Identify spokespersons for CFS plenary
- Develop lobby strategies and ways of working during CFS 39

The following texts, some of which are direct interventions were developed and finalised as a result of the working group discussions and the months of preparation in the lead up to the Forum:

CLIMATE CHANGE

- **Climate change** is an issue that is becoming increasingly urgent on a day-by-day basis. It is already a threat to food security. Countries are facing drought, floods, erratic rain and weather patterns that are devastating local communities and affecting their ability to produce food. We are currently on a path of 4 degrees or more of global warming this century that will devastate food systems worldwide. Climate change fundamentally threatens the right to food, livelihoods and lives. We need to consider what climate change means for small-scale food producers, artisanal fishers, pastoralists, the landless, forest dwellers, indigenous peoples, consumers, agricultural workers, urban poor, and

particularly women, children and youth and take urgent action. Climate change disproportionately impacts pastoralists and other mobile Indigenous peoples who rely on the availability of natural resources (i.e. water and grasses) to feed not only themselves but also their animals. Climate change is currently impacting their food security, the health of their animals and is leading to changes to their migration patterns leads to social problems, including conflicts. Climate change undermines both food sovereignty and the right to food. Agriculture includes a strong social, cultural and spiritual dimension related to planet earth, which should not just be considered in terms of resources. As CSOs we defend and must continue to defend all small-scale food producers against any international measures or trends that are an obstacle to meeting the needs of small-scale family farmers that are key to make sure that all humans has enough to eat today and in the future.

- **CFS action is needed. The core issue is the right to food.** The CFS must fill this gap and ensure we set a path toward more sustainable and resilient local food systems. The CFS should concentrate on its mandate to ensure that hunger is eliminated. This requires the CFS to make clear commitments and actions on climate change this week. In order to achieve food security, the CFS should ensure coherence of policies that have direct and indirect impacts on hunger and malnutrition. The CFS cannot and should not avoid tackling climate change issues that are related to its mandate. Should it fail to do so, it will all fail to achieve the core objective of a world without hunger.
- **We need to stop talking and start acting!** The Committee on World Food Security has a unique mandate to provide the global leadership necessary to catalyze the urgent actions needed to ensure food security and food sovereignty in the face of climate change. The CFS should send out a strong signal this week to governments to take immediate and bold action to address climate change through clear commitments and actions by supporting a shift towards agriculture that is more sustainable and resilient, prioritizing small-scale food producers and women, more sustainable local production and consumption patterns, and short distribution circuits. We urgently require increased policy coherence that tackles climate change and food insecurity, while also securing the full realization of the Right to Food. Supporting adaptation for small-scale food producers is critical to achieving food security. Small-scale food producers should not have to bear the burden of mitigation. **Certain areas /regions are more vulnerable than others, and action is most urgent to build the resilience of small-scale food producers in these regions.**
- **We call on the CFS to:** 1) ensure that all CFS actions, policies and programs aimed at tackling the climate crisis ensure the right to food and the rights of indigenous people and food sovereignty; 2) Support agro-ecological practice that strengthens biodiversity and resilience to the impacts of climate change , 3) place a strong focus on the adaptation needs of small-scale food producers be they farmers, artisanal fishers or pastoralists 4) Governments and international organizations must facilitate the broader access to, and use of, genetic resources so as to maximize their contribution to adaptation for small-scale food producers. These are issues that effectively fall under the mandate of the CFS. 5) The participation of CSOs in both consultations and decisions is crucial.

The time is right for the CFS to take up the responsibility and global leadership role to protect the right to food of increasingly vulnerable communities and small-scale food producers, and ensure global food security and food sovereignty in the face of climate change

Social Protection is a Human Right. This is the key message and understanding behind all the interventions we will make in this Roundtable. We want to ensure that the 80% of the world's poor currently excluded from comprehensive social protection are brought within the scope of social protection.

Poverty has a direct correlation with women, men and children's ability to access a nutritionally appropriate diet and be free from hunger now, and in the future and social protection is crucial to poverty elimination.

We are concerned that the response of some Governments in the current financial crisis is to cut social protection at a time when it is most needed. We believe that this crisis cannot be resolved by lowering Human Rights norms and standards but by ensuring their implementation.

The CFS is a bridging forum to ensure coherence between various policies including trade, food assistance and climate change. Therefore we dispute the suggestion that Human Rights should not be discussed in the CFS – it is crucial that they are discussed to ensure the CFS achieves its mandate on coherence and that Governments deliver results.

In the context we are particularly concerned that there is no specific reference to breastfeeding. Breast feeding is a human right and this should be recognized in the decision box. In line with the 2012 World Health Assembly resolution 65-5 on Maternal, Infant and Young Child Nutrition, governments should ensure nutritious food, access to health care and maternity protection for women in the workplace and for the promotion of adequate breastfeeding practices.

We call on Governments to fulfill their existing Human Rights obligations and to ensure the progressive building of higher levels of protection and rights for all.

In particular Governments should move swiftly to implement the **Social Protection Floor** proposed by the ILO in Recommendation 202 and the Right to Food.

Let us recall that National Social Protection policies must be rooted in the human rights framework. It is therefore critical that the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of social protection measures is carried out by ensuring effective inclusion and participation of women and men deprived from rights and affected by crises. They should be informed about their right to SP and supported to access and claim these rights as well as hold the duty bearers to account in case their right to SP is denied. Strongly organized civil society groups that represent chronically poor and those vulnerable to food & nutrition INsecurity are the foundation of resilient communities. Governments should support the formation and strengthening of such civil society groups through an enabling policy environment and legal framework. This is extremely important in light of the fact that a large majority of the poor individuals and communities remain excluded from their right to social protection.

2. Social Protection rooted in local and national food systems

Resilience of small food producers including farmers, fisherfolks, pastoralists, landless, agricultural workers, indigenous peoples is a cornerstone to ensure sustainable food systems, where access to nutritionally adequate diet is being ensured through either by

producing it, or through purchase from local and domestic markets. Therefore when considering food security and social protection, it is important to link it with local and national food systems that are resilient and do deliver.

Social protection in particular should play a pivotal role in building and enhancing the resilience of poor women, men and children to (i) cope with the impacts of chronic poverty and (ii) face shocks that either affect individuals or larger populations or both such as ill health, extreme weather or food price crises etc. This is particularly true with measures targeted at concurrent improvements to support equity, production, sustainability and resilience of smallholder food systems .

Social protection should be consistent with efforts to address the root causes of chronic poverty and vulnerability to food & nutrition insecurity. In light of this, Social Protection policies, programmes and instruments should be seen as part of a more comprehensive policy to (i) eradicate poverty and ensure the right to food to all; (ii) be consistent with policies that strengthen small-scale, sustainable food production; (iii) therefore support small-scale food producers, and secure their access and control over productive resources, (iv) prioritize and reinforce local and national food markets and address food price volatility, including through food reserves; (v) ensure transfers that promote social justice ; (vi) provide income security and decent work, with special attention to women who face challenges that require specific policy and programme support.

3. Providing the means to achieve social protection

We hope that today we can not only agree to a broad support to social protection. This is not the main issue as states do have the duty to realize, protect and promote the right to social protection and the right to food. Today the debate is more about the political will to achieve it.

Needless to recall the unacceptable scandal of 870 million people deprived from the basic right to food. We are confronted with recurrent crises, and shocks (prices, climatic, environmental, even social unrest) that are becoming inherent part of our food systems. Consequences on the most vulnerable are often dramatic.

We cannot allow our deliberations to end into a new declaration of intention for social protection. This has already been done since many decades. The question today is - Do we have the political will to implement the right to food and the right to social protection, and Do we commit ourselves to provide the means to realize, protect and promote these rights.

80% of the world's poor do not have comprehensive social protection. States have the obligation to put in place and strengthen comprehensive, nationally-owned, context-specific social protection systems for a world free of hunger, malnutrition and poverty.

This means that national governments must commit to allocate their maximum available resources to establishing social protection and ensure that all people in need are aware of and can claim these provisions. We call all countries to improve the mobilisation of their domestic resources, by building fair and progressive tax systems.

Lastly, all states have the duty to international assistance and cooperation in support of the realization of human rights, including the right of social protection. In the light of this, we do support the proposal to create a global fund for social protection to ensure that States have viable social protection responding to 1) structural poverty and 2) ensure social protection systems can be protected against shocks and scaled up at times of crisis.

Intervention #1 – What Investment means for us

Members of Civil Society, facilitated by the Civil Society mechanism participated actively in the meetings of the open ended working group on responsible agricultural investment. We would like to stress how important the issue of “agricultural investment” is for us and what “investment in agriculture” means for us. For us, “agricultural investments” are not primarily large-scale corporate investments, and are not just capital investments. The reality is that small-scale food producers, are the very first ones to invest in our own development, and we invest in many various ways to do so, including through labor, knowledge and ecosystem regeneration and community development. We maintain and build soil fertility, select and reproduce seeds, nurture our lands and water sources, build production and storage infrastructure often in a multi-generational context. For us, “investment in agriculture” is not an object of study. It is what we ourselves do every day of our lives. It is what we benefit from when our governments get priorities, policies and regulations straight. It is what we suffer from when it is lacking or, increasingly, when it alienates us from the land, water and other natural resources on which we depend, and attacks our resilient food systems. The investment by and for smallholder producers is the most important investment for food security and though we are supportive of the Terms of Reference, we regret that there is not a more explicit prioritization of small-scale food producers within the document.

Intervention #2 – Developing the Terms of Reference – our take on the process

Through the process to build these terms of reference, civil society organizations participated regularly in the open ended working group. We would like to express our gratitude to the Chair of this group as well as the CFS secretariat for the effort they have put into hearing the concerns of all stakeholders in this process. While the Terms of Reference represent a compromise between parties, we realize that their adoption is a critical next step in the development of the final product. We are supportive of many elements of the Terms of Reference in particular the fact that they will be developed by an open and inclusive consultation process and be built on important existing frameworks such as the Guidelines on Responsible Governance of Tenure and the Guidelines on the Right to Food. We endorse the decision of the open ended working group to follow a 2-year process to develop the principles to allow an appropriate time frame for consultation to occur. We are also supportive of the broad nature of the principles that include key considerations including the impacts of investments upon food security and nutrition, food producers, and the most vulnerable segments of the population. This process is not just about consolidating existing information. We are building something entirely new. It is therefore a critical part of this process that Civil Society is consulted in a way that not only adds credibility to the outcome, but also truly broadens the understanding that states and other actors have on investment and the realities on the ground. We look forward to the 2013 report by the HLPE on “Constraints to Smallholder Investment” and we look forward to working with the open ended working group to build a truly inclusive set of principles on responsible investment in agriculture within the CFS.

Intervention #3 – The importance of proper consultations

[Consultations about agricultural investment are not academic or technical exercises for us. The full and active participation of Civil Society, and in particular, those social actors who are the most affected by food insecurity; small-holder food producers, indigenous peoples, pastoralists, rural poor, women and youth, is the only way to build these principles in line with the mandate of the reformed CFS. This will represent the first time in history that such a broad base of realities will be drawn upon to develop a global instrument on investment. The consultation process to develop the principles needs to be considered very carefully by member states. We are not just consolidating existing information. We are building something entirely new. It is therefore a critical part of this process that Civil Society is consulted in a way that not only adds credibility to the outcome, but also truly broadens the understanding that states and other actors have on investment and the realities on the ground. We would like to respectfully ask that states fully support the autonomous consultations of civil society in this matter, recognizing that mobilizing the resources for effective consultation, in particular with the constituencies of those most affected by food insecurity, is not an easy task and must be considered a priority.]

My name is Magimai Appakuti of Tamil Nadu Dalit Women's Movement in India and of the Asian Rural Women's Coalition. I represent one of the many women farmers' groups doing collective farming.

Consultations about agricultural investments are important to us. It is not an academic nor a technical exercise but it is a sharing of our daily struggles, experiences, expertise and perspectives from the land, water, seeds, forests and other productive resources on which our lives and livelihood depend on.

The full and active participation of the Civil Society, particularly those of us who are most affected by food insecurity, poverty and hunger -- the small-holder food producers, indigenous peoples, pastoralists, fisherfolk, Dalits, rural women, rural poor and youth, is the only way build to these principles in line with the mandate of the reformed CFS.

Local to regional consultation processes ensure that our voices, strategies and recommendations will be heard and represented.

From these, a broad base of realities will be drawn upon to develop a global instrument on investment. The consultation processes to develop the principles need to be considered very carefully by Member States.

We would like to respectfully ask that States fully support the autonomous and meaningful consultations of civil society, and recognising that mobilising resources, in particular with the constituencies most affected by food insecurity, is not an easy task and must be considered a priority.

GLOBAL STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK (ALREADY IN FR AND ES)

Before it's adoption, the following intervention was read during the CFS 39 plenary:

CSOs express their profound concern about the most recent threats of the US, Canada and Australia, to reopen the agreed text of the GSF in today's plenary session which is scheduled to approve the document.

Any attempts to block the GSF approval must be understood as an attempt to weaken the CFS. The GSF is at the heart of the reformed CFS. It will ensure that the CFS is the most inclusive international platform to discuss and ensure policy coherence and convergence on food security and nutrition.

CSOs have participated intensively in the formulation of the GSF, and appreciate the participatory process. The full adoption of the GSF First Version by the CFS 39 is fundamental.

The GSF is an important achievement of the CFS in that it defines an overarching framework for food security and nutrition targeted to the entire range of actors. This ensures policy coherence firmly based on a human rights approach.

The current text, which was the result of intense negotiations over a two-year period and concluded in July, should be the exclusive content of the GSF First Version to be adopted today by consensus. This includes Chapter VI as negotiated on 19 July, which lists issues that may require further attention.

We expect all governments to honor their commitment to the democratic and transparent process that has led to this extremely important document of the CFS.

We will defend this process and will react strongly on any attempt to weaken the CFS.

A preliminary assessment of the First version of the GSF is also available and can be found here:

http://www.csm4cfs.org/news/preliminary_assessment_of_the_gsf_from_a_civil_society_perspective-75/

PROTRACTED CRISES (ALREADY TRANSLATED INTO FR AND ES)

1- Participation of Civil Society and the Inclusion of marginalized stakeholders

- Endorsing the process for the development of the Agenda for Action, and stressing on the need of setting a time frame.
- Civil Society Organizations should be partners in all initiatives\all stages of action. All stakeholders (governments, communities, CSOs, agencies, institutions) should connect and collaborate and coordinate efforts.
- Strategies should be community driven and include marginalised groups e.g women, children/youth, small-holder farmers, indigenous peoples, pastoralists and fisherfolk/. CSOs can play a role in facilitating their organisation, supporting their empowerment and capacity to address the structural and underlying causes of food insecurity in protracted crises
- Risks of conditional aid on serving the needs/priorities of the local community, and endangering the capacity of local production

2- Local Agricultural Production

Local agricultural production system are particularly important in situations of protracted crises and deserve inclusion in the Agenda for action. For instance;

- Access to and control over land, seeds and credit,
- Depleting soil and water quality and heavy dependency on fossil fuel based agricultural production
- Deterioration of agricultural research and extension system and little if any focus on sustainable agriculture and agro-ecology
- Lack of integration of recurrent climate challenges (like drought, floods and disasters related preparation) in medium to long term agriculture and related policies
- Marginalisation of women farmers be it control over land, seeds, credit, research and extension
- No role of producer communities in policy making and implementation
- Community based seed banks and enterprises are empowering and providing good quality seeds to thousands of farmers in different countries.

In a field survey in many countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America it was clear that those local communities, which were growing enough food in their areas were less impacted by food crisis and the households with land entitlement were better off compared to those with no land entitlement.

Following elements on market systems are also important for inclusion in the Agenda for action:

- Insufficient infrastructure and storage facilities
- Hoarding by traders both in terms of seeds, fertilisers and food items
- Currency exchange rates and taxes on food items

3-Self-determination and food sovereignty

Today it exists more than 370 M indigenous people in 70 countries of the world and we are happy that this is being recognised and supported by all governments who have signed the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous peoples.

In many countries, communities live in difficult situations because common problems of land grabbing and privatisation of water and land are exacerbated by natural environmental disasters as well as armed conflicts, wars and occupations which destroy livelihoods and put the natural development of populations at great risk.

If not addressed, these crises may lead to violations that include forced displacement, contamination or appropriation of natural resources, movement restriction and simply using food and water as direct or indirect weapons of collective punishment against populations.

The actual protracted crisis, make it difficult for populations to exercise their own rights for self-determination. We need to guarantee the rights of:

- Documentation of violations and
- Reparation, including restitution (right of return and resettlement), compensation and the guarantee of non-repetition

As we endorse the process to reach the agenda for action, we the populations of the world, farmers, fisher men, indigenous and occupied people, farmers' women, pastoralists, who are often victims of cultural, economic and political and military violence, demand an agenda for action that ensures sovereignty over our resources and our right to self-determination.

4- Normative Framework and Accountability

The civil society mechanism welcomes the outcomes of the HLEF on Protracted Crises and recognizes the great progress in trying to address both the most affected and least voiced.

There are key points that we need to accentuate:

We welcome the HLEF's recommendation that urges all stakeholders to address the root causes of Protracted Crises. We hope that the agenda for action tackles drivers of wars, including the commercialization of wars that has often managed to keep the world in status of prolonged and recurrent crises.

We endorse the process of formulating and Agenda for Action, hoping it will facilitate the development of a code of conduct/ voluntary guidelines to guide all stakeholders including governments, international and national organizations and the private sector on aspects of food security in times of protracted crises, incorporating matters of access to, and management of, food and natural resources.

5- Social Protection and Monitoring

We support the choice to keep the Decision Box short and general, and for this reason we don't want to put too much emphasis on proposing changes at this time. Instead, we advocate for a strong Agenda for Action to be built in the coming year and we hope to receive more details about the timeline of this agenda.

In the report annexed to the Decision Box, there are number of good elements worth mentioning, for example the reference to "the need to integrate the 'security' concept into 'food security programming' going beyond the 'do no harm' principle and ensuring a focus on protection. But because we talk about protection, we believe there are other forms of protection worth highlighting in the future Agenda for Action. One of these is Social Protection. Our suggestion is therefore to highlight:

1) The particular challenges faced by countries in protracted crises and the need for effective and context-specific social protection measures. In contexts of increasing risk and vulnerability, safety nets for example can make important contributions to protecting food consumption for the most vulnerable, as well as protect access to basic services when people face livelihood shocks.

2) Predictability in social protection programmes is very important. We are concerned that the response of many Governments in the current financial crisis is to cut social protection at a time when it is most needed. We call on governments then to improve the mobilisation of their domestic resources and to set up flexible and predictable funding for Social Protection. It is also important to invest in Social Protection to prevent crises to intensify with the aim of strengthening people's resilience.

3) Finally, SP measures should not be used for short-term responses and should not replace government-led programmes aimed at providing long-term and more inclusive systems of social protection. From there, the need to incorporate safety nets and other social protection measures into national and regional food and nutrition, and income security, policies is paramount.

As a last point, in order to ensure effective implementation of all these actions, we propose that the CFS sets up a participative monitoring mechanism which holds all stakeholders to account, and entails the development of common indicators tracking progress towards the principles and the actions of this agenda.

No action can be effective without proper monitoring and without promoting the accountability of stakeholders.

FOOD SECURITY & NUTRITION TERMINOLOGY

Four main CSM talking points:

1. Before the reform of the CFS we all worked separately in our own technical silos. policy coherence was limited, let alone coordination among sectors. The new reformed CFS has become a committee that is multi sectoral and includes all relevant actors around areas concerned with food and nutrition, including also civil society. In fact the adoption of the new term food and nutrition security would be a logical step for the cfs to take, emphasising the need to have a really integrated approach to tackle food and nutrition insecurity. It is a further call to step down outside of our silos and come forward with integrated policies, programs and action.

2. Our vision on nutrition

It is now estimated that 870 million people are undernourished while many more suffer from some form of malnutrition due to the consumption of food of inadequate quality. In order to tackle this enormous problem we need to move towards more sustainable consumption, linked to sustainable local production. This vision of local sustainable food systems is based on the right to food as well as the concept of food sovereignty, which was defined in the Nyeleni Conference of 2007:

Food sovereignty is the right of peoples to healthy and culturally appropriate food produced through ecologically sound and sustainable methods, and their right to define their own food and agriculture systems.

We need to move away from the idea that nutrition is just an issue for developing countries but is a global issue. Therefore we suggest the removal of the word “development” before the word goal to emphasize food and nutrition security is a global goal for all countries. We also urge the inclusion of a reference to the right to food in bullet point 2 of the current decision box.

3. We need to move away from the limited and technocratic way we have been using to discuss nutrition so far. Malnutrition has social and political causes and solutions that need to be prioritized in the debate. We support the proposed definition of food and nutrition security, but we caution that more work is needed to define and debate policy and institutional

implications of the new definition as well as implications for the mandate of the CFS and its relation to other institutions working on food and nutrition related matters

4. We suggest the following modifications to the decision box (4 points):
1. We support the first bullet point of the existing decision box
 2. In the bullet point 2, we urge the inclusion as a WORKING definition of the food and nutrition security definition contained in the document (page 8, paragraph 33) (read sentence)
 3. We suggest that this point is re-formulated as follows (read sentence)
 4. We urge more concrete action prior to CFS 2013 (read sentence)

For decision by the Committee

Based on an in-depth review and discussions of the meaning and different uses of the terms "Food Security", "Food Security and Nutrition", "Food and Nutrition Security" and "Nutrition Security", the Committee:

- i)** Recognises the long history and evolution of the meaning and use of the terms food security and nutrition security,
- ii)** Acknowledges that the term "food and nutrition security" best reflects the conceptual linkages between food security and nutrition security, while also expressing a single integrated goal to help guide policy and programmatic action effectively and recognises the close relationship between the concept of food and nutrition security and that of the right to adequate food.

Proposes the following working definition:

See page 8 para 33 "Food and nutrition security exists when all people at all times have physical, social and economic access to food, which is safe and consumed in sufficient quantity and quality to meet their dietary needs and food preferences, and is supported by an environment of adequate sanitation, health services and care, allowing for a healthy and active life."

- iii)** Recognizes that the following important issues have not yet been addressed fully: (a) the policy and institutional implications have not adequately been discussed, (b) the possible implications for the mandate of the CFS have not yet been sufficiently explored, and, (c) linguistic consequences.
- iv)** Recommends that the Bureau, in consultation with the Advisory Group and the joint secretariat determines the scope and timing of further work to be carried out by the CFS 2013 to address the issues under point (iii) above.

MONITORING & ACCOUNTABILITY (ALREADY IN FR AND ES)

Civil Society Organisations support the information note and the decision box presented by the Chairperson of the OEWG on Monitoring. It is important that the working group highlight the original roles of the reformed CFS, which demands accountability and the need to create an innovative monitoring mechanism within the CFS.

Civil Society Organisations, in particular, social movements are already undertaking monitoring work in their respective countries and regions. This work includes both public policies that have resulted in land grabbing and concentration of land, territories and water, policies that displace the communities of small-scale food producers, away from their source of livelihoods. It also includes the monitoring processes for public policies and national legal frameworks that have an impact on the realization of the human right to food.

As stakeholders, we are able to measure the progress of the States in achieving their commitments to implement the decisions of the CFS, the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security, the Voluntary guidelines on the Right to Food, the Global Strategic Framework and other instruments. Therefore, we have the technical and political capacity to contribute to the creation of an innovative monitoring mechanism within the CFS.☐

We believe that an innovative monitoring mechanism needs to be firm in demanding accountability from States and all stakeholders, including international agencies and transnational corporations to ensure policy coherence and implementation of human rights. This mechanism should be independent and focus on priority areas for the sectors most affected by hunger and malnutrition.☐☐

Civil society asks the working group to ensure the participation of civil society, especially social movements, throughout the construction process of an innovative monitoring mechanism and reflect the human rights struggles that are taking place in our countries. We support strengthening the process of developing the monitoring mechanism by using the experience of the Special Rapporteur on the Human Right to Food of the United Nations.

POLICY GAPS & EMERGING ISSUES (ALREADY IN FR AND ES)

Proposal for a process for identifying emerging issues:

The CFS is the foremost international and intergovernmental forum to strive for a world free from hunger, and it needs to be able to anticipate vital emerging issues so that it can act as a source of guidance and a focus for policy making on the key relevant issues that threaten food security and food sovereignty.

The CFS needs a clear vision for the future that is developed in an inclusive, open and consultative manner, taking advantage of all the experience and expertise of CFS stakeholders in their work around the world.

Taking a step back from the current discussion on emerging issues, for a wider perspective, the current discussions highlight a need within the CFS for a structured, coherent, regular, consultative process that is able to:

- Identify emerging issues, particularly taking into account the role of the CFS in promoting policy coherence
- Prioritise among them and
- Lift them into the CFS agenda Civil society would therefore like to propose that the CFS establish an ongoing process on emerging issues beginning at regional level and feeding in to the CFS with two main stages:

1. At regional level this process would take advantage of the FAO Regional Conferences

- to hold consultation with all stakeholders, including civil society.
2. The regional consultations would then be consolidated at the global level. We ask the bureau to establish a new open-ended working group to facilitate this. The OEWG would consolidate the regional inputs into a global priority list for proposal to, and eventual adoption by, the CFS and inclusion in the CFS work programme.

We hope that this proposal will be understood as a constructive and practical initiative that adds a vital element to the CFS, enabling it to better achieve its urgent work in striving for a world free from hunger where countries implement the voluntary guidelines for the progressive realisation of the right to adequate food in the context of national food security.”

GLOBAL & REGIONAL COORDINATION AND LINKAGES WITH THE CFS

Mr. Chairman, the CSM is concerned to hear about initiatives by the G8 and G20 that undermine the central role of the CFS. The New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition is a good example. By coming in from the outside with recipes for food security and targeting specific countries within regional communities, the New Alliance disrupts the frameworks that African countries themselves have established and undermines regional solidarity. It imposes conditions on Africa and requires countries to change their policies in directions that are not in line with the newly adopted Voluntary Guidelines on tenure of land and other natural resources. It opens the door to profitable investments by multinational agrifood corporations rather than supporting the investments of small-scale producers.

The New Alliance also promotes the application of the World Bank/UNCTAD/FAO/IFAD Principles on Responsible Agricultural Investments. These principles were not endorsed by the CFS and they should not be legitimized. The CFS's own process for deciding on principles for responsible investment should be respected and prioritised.

Today we are faced with two contrasting visions for Sub-Saharan Africa: on one hand, the desire to regain control of our own development and, on the other hand, the temptation to rely too much on external resources.

The food security and sovereignty of Africa cannot be secured through international cooperation that ignores the policy frameworks already formulated with the participation with the peasants and the producers of the continent.

We must build our food policy on our own resources as other regions have done. Agricultural progress in Europe, the United States and emerging countries like Brazil and India, has always been the result of sovereign will and of a partnership between the states and the economic actors (the producers, the processors, and the traders). The G8 and the G20 are clearly not the appropriate fora for these decisions.

Last year, the CFS failed to take decisive action on food price volatility, ignoring the strong demands from the Civil Society Mechanism and some member countries. Instead it deferred to the G20 Action Plan on Food Price Volatility and Agriculture, which includes the creation of AMIS and the Rapid Response Forum. This year, the debate on food price volatility was held in a special session – a ministerial – in the midst of the CFS, but not imbedded in the program.

Civil Society is concerned about this trend for two reasons. Firstly, it is incoherent with the vision of the CFS as an inclusive platform. By becoming the “high bar” for CFS decision boxes, it undermines the more inclusive and coordinated process of the CFS.

Secondly the G20 plan itself has also proven woefully inadequate to prevent the recurrence of price spikes – as evidenced by the 2012 food price spike. In its implementation, the plan attempts to address short term crises, but by neglecting to include changes to long term structural issues, the G20 Action Plan, fails to prevent food price volatility or ensure food security for all.

ANNEXES

ANNEX 1: CSO EVALUATION OF THE CFS 39 OUTCOMES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) welcome the successful conclusion of the 39th Session of the CFS, which provides proof of both a productive and inclusive CFS. Social movements and other CSOs prepared during the CSM Annual Forum that took place the weekend before CFS 39 and identified several concerns and proposals to be brought to the attention of the CFS. We consider that most of them have been taken into account during the deliberation of this session, which, in our view, is encouraging.

Regarding the outcomes of this session, we welcome the adoption of the first version of the **Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition (GSF)**. The GSF, as the overarching framework, will become the primary global reference for coordination and coherence in decision-making on food and agricultural issues. The GSF constitutes a step forward in promoting a new model of governance on food, agriculture, and nutrition, built upon human rights and the central role of smallholder farmers, agricultural and food workers, artisanal fisher folks, pastoralists, Indigenous Peoples, landless people, women, youth, poor consumers and the urban poor. Considering the fact that food sovereignty was not addressed in the current version of the GSF, we affirm our commitment to ensure that the new paradigm for food security policy will be based on food sovereignty. We expect countries and all actors to fully support the implementation of the GFS at all levels. We will make use of this important tool for our initiatives and struggles at local, national and international level.

We welcome the adoption of the Terms of Reference to develop a broad and inclusive set of **principles on responsible agricultural investment** within the CFS. In particular, we are pleased that many States clearly emphasized the fundamental role of smallholder food producers in this process. The investment by, and for, smallholder producers is indeed the most important investment needed for food security and though we are supportive of the Terms of Reference, we regret that there is not a more explicit prioritization of smallholder food producers within the document. We would like to reiterate the importance of States fully supporting autonomous and meaningful consultations by civil society, and recognizing that mobilizing resources, in particular by the constituencies most affected by food insecurity, is not an easy task and must be considered a priority. We look forward to the 2013 report by the HLPE on “Constraints to Smallholder Investment” and participating in

the Open Ended Working Group to build a truly inclusive set of principles on responsible investment in agriculture within the CFS.

On **climate change**, we see the decisions taken as a first step, but much more is needed to make our local, national and global food systems sustainable. We welcome the fact that the decision box recognizes the impacts on small-scale food producers, the urgency of action to address climate change impacts and root causes as well as the fact that adaptation is the top priority for small-scale food producers. Governments recognized their responsibility to ensure that all their policies and actions on climate change are consistent with the right to food and the commitment to eradicate hunger. Unfortunately, there was not an agreement on the need to prioritize and increase support to agro-ecological approaches or on the need for an HLPE study on genetic resources. These issues are critical to achieve food security and CFS Member States should discuss more and take action on these key issues.

CSOs are pleased that all governments supported the development of the Agenda for Action on **Protracted Crises**. There is now a need to clarify the time frame and process envisioned for the development of the Agenda for Action. CSOs urged the CFS to ensure partnership with civil society, encourage community driven processes, and the protection of the freedom of self-determination and sovereignty over food and natural resources. We also called for the strengthening of local agricultural production, social protection, and the development of a normative and accountability framework that guides and monitors all stakeholders including governments, international and national organizations and the private sector on aspects of food security in times of protracted crises, incorporating matters of access to, and management of, food and natural resources.

We appreciate the emphasis given to **social protection** as a universal human right and the important role of the social protection floor in implementing this right. We commend the leadership that the CFS demonstrates in strengthening comprehensive, nationally owned, context sensitive, social protection systems guided by human rights norms and standards, in particular in relation to the progressive realisation of the right to food. We believe that the decisions proposed on social protection can contribute to address food and nutrition insecurity and ensure the progressive building of higher levels of social protection and rights for all. The recognition of a twin track approach that helps to address the root causes of vulnerability is indeed critical. However we do believe that follow up - recognizing the roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders - remains a critical component to translate the recommendations into concrete impacts on people's vulnerability and resilience. This can only happen when the root causes of poverty and vulnerability are addressed and all people, especially those experiencing vulnerability, have the capacity to claim their rights.

On **food security and nutrition terminology**, we stress the need to go further and conduct a political debate about the implications of the conceptual discussions. We would have preferred the adoption of the new term of "food and nutrition security" during this 39th Session. However we are happy that the decision box acknowledges this term best reflects the conceptual linkages between food security and nutrition security. CSOs would have preferred to also see a reference to the Right to Food in the decision box. We agree that more needs to be done, especially on the policy implications and would have preferred that this work is finalized by the next CFS in 2013. We will continue to urge the CFS Secretariat and Bureau to conclude this work as soon as possible.

On **monitoring and accountability**, we are pleased with the decisions made in relation to the work by the Open Ended Working Group on Monitoring. We consider it important that

the CFS highlights its original role to ensure the accountability of States, including international agencies and transnational enterprises, in order to guarantee the coherence of international policies with human rights standards. It is important that the CFS recognizes the role of civil society, and also of the Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food, in the monitoring process. We look forward to the elaboration and establishment of the innovative monitoring mechanism within the CFS.

Regarding **policy gaps and emerging issues**, social movements and other CSOs have clearly spelled out our priority issues for further discussion, in particular food sovereignty, genetic resources and agro-ecology. We believe that the CFS should not exclude certain topics, which are considered essential by many CFS stakeholders, including civil society. The two studies that the CFS will request from the HLPE for 2014 - fisheries and food waste - are important, but not necessarily the top priority issues in terms of the global food crisis. We therefore see a "banalisation" of the requests to the HLPE and by implication, the future agenda of the CFS. It is unfortunate that the CFS did not recognise the role of the High Level Panel of Experts (HLPE) in identifying emerging issues even though this is one of the three pillars of the HLPE mandate as laid out in the CFS reform document. In this context, CSOs express appreciation of the HLPE for both, the work done so far, and their involvement in the identification of emerging issues in the future.

We are glad that our suggestion for a CFS process to identify emerging issues through the Open-Ended Working Group on the Multi Year Programme of Work (MYPow) was approved. We were disappointed that a link between the FAO regional conferences and this process was not recognized - despite the fact that many governments supported the proposed bottom-up approach for the identification of emerging issues, including through regional conferences.

On the process during this week, we make the following remarks: there were several tense moments during CFS 39, particularly on the GSF and climate change. Consensus building is a difficult job in the multi-stakeholder setting of the CFS, and based on these most recent experiences, we strongly call upon governments to act in the constructive spirit of the CFS, and not to abuse the consensus principle to block debate on certain important issues, such as food sovereignty.

We also question the way in which the session on **global and regional coordination and linkages** was held. CSOs highlighted during this session that the CFS should not be used as a tool to give legitimacy to G8/G20 initiatives which are undermining the principles of democracy that are the foundation of the CFS. Initiatives such as the New G-8 Alliance on Food Security and Nutrition must actually be discussed by the CFS and evaluated according to the criteria of whether they are coherent or not with CFS decisions and guidance. It is very unfortunate that this session was organised as a showcase, with a disregard for the true mandate of the CFS. The CFS Advisory Group was not adequately consulted in the planning for this session, raising concerns about the transparency of the process. In the future all stakeholders must have a say in the planning phase of all agenda items. Being true to the mandate of the CFS means using the CFS as a space to call relevant institutions to report on their work and discuss together how they will better coordinate and converge their policies. Such sessions might lead to decisions being taken by the CFS, for which relevant background documents and decision boxes should be drafted in advance.

We also regret that a ministerial meeting was held on October, 16th on **food price volatility** outside the premises of the CFS. That meeting has shown that excessive price volatility is still unresolved and that further debate is required to address its root causes. The CFS is the place where ministers, together with all other CFS participants should further discuss price

volatility and strengthen policy convergence to address it. Furthermore, decisions made at the CFS 37 on food price volatility, in particular those on food reserves, have not been taken up appropriately. We therefore call that further discussions on food price volatility will be integrated in the regular CFS agenda and that measures to enable the CFS 40 to review the assessment of the constraints and effectiveness of local, national and regional food reserves and debate a draft code of conduct for emergency humanitarian food reserves.

CSOs also express their concern about the desire of some governments to limit the scope of issues discussed in the CFS on the basis that they are the responsibility of other inter-governmental bodies. We would like to remind governments that the CFS is the “foremost inclusive international and intergovernmental platform for a broad range of committed stakeholders to work together in a coordinated manner”. Therefore, the CFS needs to strengthen its outreach to other key actors and bodies working with issues related to food and nutrition security, in order to inform their work and fulfill its roles of “coordination at global level” and “policy convergence”. These actors and bodies should also be invited to participate regularly in the CFS plenaries and inter-sessional processes in order to inform the CFS of their work related to food and nutrition security.

Looking to the future, the CFS has to strongly address the challenge of its Vision statement, to strive for a world without hunger where the right to adequate food is realized. In that sense, we welcome the decision taken to assess the implementation of the Right to Food Guidelines in the CFS 41st Session in 2014, ten years after the Guidelines were adopted.

Finally, we reiterate our commitment to the CFS as a new model of inclusive governance on food and nutrition security, and particularly our support to the implementation, dissemination and monitoring of the decisions governments have taken in this and other Sessions. We commend the CFS Chair, the Chairs and Rapporteurs of Working Groups and Round Tables, the Secretariat for the incredible work, the interpreters and all other stakeholders involved, for the successful conclusion of this 39th Session of the CFS.