

---

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

---

Civil society meeting in preparation for the 40<sup>th</sup> Session of the Committee on World  
Food Security (CFS), 5 – 6 October 2013  
FAO, Rome

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

---

<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>OBJECTIVE .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>METHODOLOGY AND PARTICIPATION .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>POLICY WORKING GROUPS OUTCOMES .....</b>	<b>4</b>
(SMALL) RAI .....	5
<i>Key Messages</i> .....	5
<i>CSO Interventions</i> .....	5
INVESTING IN SMALLHOLDER AGRICULTURE – POLICY ROUNDTABLE .....	7
<i>Key Messages</i> .....	7
<i>CSO Interventions</i> .....	8
BIOFUELS – POLICY ROUNDTABLE .....	15
<i>Key Messages</i> .....	15
<i>CSO Interventions</i> .....	15
PROTRACTED CRISES .....	21
<i>Key Messages</i> .....	21
<i>CSO Interventions</i> .....	21
GLOBAL STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK .....	22
<i>Key Messages &amp; Interventions</i> .....	22
MONITORING & ACCOUNTABILITY .....	23
<i>Key Messages</i> .....	23
<i>CSO Interventions</i> .....	23
CFS MULTI-YEAR PROGRAMME OF WORK AND PRIORITIES .....	24
<i>Key Messages</i> .....	24
<i>CSO Interventions</i> .....	24
CFS COMMUNICATIONS STRATEGY .....	25
<i>Key Messages &amp; CSO Interventions</i> .....	25
COORDINATION & LINKAGES SESSION .....	26
<i>CSO Interventions</i> .....	26

## INTRODUCTION

---

The CSM is the largest international mechanism of civil society organisations (CSOs) seeking to influence agriculture, food security and nutrition policies and actions - nationally, regionally and globally. It works exclusively in the context of the UN Committee on World Food Security (CFS).

As a result of the Reform Process of the CFS in 2009, a proposal for the establishment of the CSM was endorsed by CSOs at the Civil Society Consultation held in Rome in October 2010 and acknowledged by CFS Member States during the 36th Session of the CFS in the same month.

The CSM is reaching out to hundreds of CSOs in all continents, sharing information with them on global policy debates and processes, promoting civil society consultations and dialogue, supporting national and regional advocacy and facilitating the participation of a diverse range of CSOs at the global level, on all CFS-related issues.

The Annual CSM Forum is the apex of their work, where two days prior to the CFS plenary session, civil society gather in Rome to discuss, strategize and finalise messages for the negotiations ahead.

Hosted for the second year in a row by the UN's Food and Agriculture Organisation, close to 200 civil society individuals actively participated – a 25% increase from last year. Participants represented a broad and diverse range of marginalized groups including, farmers, fisherfolk, Indigenous Peoples, pastoralists, agricultural workers, urban poor, youth - echoing the CSM's mandate to prioritize the voices of those most affected by food insecurity and malnutrition.

The increase in participation is a positive sign that outreach efforts are paying-off, and civil society organisations from around the world are recognizing the opportunity CFS presents as the foremost inclusive platform dealing with Food and Agriculture policy. A platform where civil society are not only welcome and appreciated, but heard.

During the opening ceremony, civil society panelist Angel Strappazon of La Via Campesina appealed for a minute of silence for the more than 300 victims of the Lampadusa tragedy, Italy's deadliest migrant shipwreck that occurred just days earlier. He appealed to all participants to turn such a horrific tragedy as a way to open and change the hearts of the decision makers.

Honorary guests, Director General of FAO, José Graziano da Silva and CFS Chair, Ambassador of Nigeria, Yaya Olaniran also welcomed participants, with Graziano proclaiming, "The CSM is the voice of the most marginalized, excluded groups – the voice of the hungry". In his welcome address, he reminded participants to keep focused on achieving results – as the world is waiting.

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 40<sup>th</sup> 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 40 agenda – what is at stake, and what are the controversial issues?

## OBJECTIVE

---

In preparation for the 40th Session of the Committee on World Food Security, the Forum assisted in the development and endorsement of common civil society positions and strategies in relation to the CFS agenda.<sup>1</sup> The outcomes of these discussions can be found below in the “policy working group section”. More specifically, participants gathered to:

- Develop, as much as possible, common policy positions and lobbying strategies on key CFS policy issues for the 40th Session of the CFS
- Develop our understanding of the role, organising principles and functioning of the CSM
- Enhance participation and involvement of social movements in the CSM and CFS processes
- Review the functioning of the CSM during 2010/11 and learn lessons to improve functioning in the future

## METHODOLOGY AND PARTICIPATION

---

### *Organising Committee*

An ad-hoc Organizing Committee for the Forum was established by and from the CSM’s Coordination Committee, comprised of 1 representative per region + alternate (where required) and 3 members of the CSM’s Advisory Group.

- Africa - Gertrude Kenyangi
- Asia – Lalji Desai
- Europe & North America – Stineke Oenema with Judith Hitchman as alternate
- Latin America – Natalia Landivar
- Advisory Group Members – Margaret Nakato, George Dixon Fernandez and Jorge Stanley Icaza

The role of the organizing Committee was to:

- Discuss and agree on the objectives, agenda and process & methodology of the Forum, with the support from the CSM Secretariat and with inputs from the CSM policy working groups.
- Assist to access the funding to cover the costs of the Forum, with the support of the CSM Secretariat
- Other responsibilities as required.

The organizing team also met just prior to, and throughout the CSM Forum to prepare for the coming days, and make any adjustments needed.

### *Funding*

Although the CSM Forum is open to all interested civil society participants working in the field of food security and nutrition, there was limited funding to support the participation of social movements from the South.

Due to these budget constraints, the CSM was only able to provide funding support to the CSM's Coordination Committee members, plus a few civil society policy support persons, with a total of 45 funded. By financing the members of the Coordination Committee, we were able to ensure that the funding was used in a fair and balanced way across regions and constituencies.

The methodology for selecting funded participants will be re-visited for next year by the CSM's Finance and Administrative sub-working group, who have been requested by the Coordination Committee to look into doubling the budget for the Annual CSM Forum, in order to ensure that others, apart from CC members are given the chance to receive financial support to participate.

### *Participation*

CSO participants to the Forum were divided into 3 categories, identifiable by a colour-coded badge, in the exceptional case that a decision would need to be taken to a vote. Voting participants were reserved for CC members in order to maintain gender, geographical and constituency balance.

- ⇒ **Green** = Voting delegate (CC members)
- ⇒ **Blue** = Non-voting delegate (other civil society)
- ⇒ **Red** = Observer (academics, journalists, institutions, etc.)

### *Format*

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. 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.

## **POLICY WORKING GROUPS OUTCOMES**

---

Throughout the two days, participants broke into 8 policy working groups:

1. Agricultural investment (responsible agricultural investment & policy roundtable on smallholder investment) – Breakout session 1,2 & 3
2. Biofuels – Breakout session 1
3. Protracted crises - Breakout session 1
4. Global Strategic Framework - Breakout session 2
5. CFS Communications Strategy - Breakout session 2
6. Monitoring & accountability – Breakout session 3
7. CFS Multi-Year Programme of Work (MYPOW) – Breakout session 3
8. Coordination & Linkages with CFS – Breakout session 2  
+ 1 small group on Nutrition and the 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 from CFS 40 were developed and finalised as a result of the working group discussions and the months of preparation in the lead up to the Forum:

### (SMALL) RAI

---

#### KEY MESSAGES

Small-scale food producers - who include farmers, fisherfolk, pastoralists, workers, indigenous communities, women and processors - must be at the centre of the principles. This requires the rai principles:

- to acknowledge and address the imbalances of power among different investors; small-scale food producers cannot be grouped in the same category as other “private investors” that include large-scale investors, state enterprises, financiers and corporations
- to offer a clear condemnation of land and resource grabbing and the importance of safeguarding legitimate tenure rights as elaborated in the VGGT
- to recognize and facilitate public investment that favours small scale food producers
- to elaborate the roles and responsibilities of the state in relation to regulatory and legal frameworks that address the interests and priorities of small-scale food producers, including in the regulation of local, national, regional and global markets

Civil society also wishes to express concerns regarding the time-line of the rai consultation process and the drive by some to push the consultations beyond 2014. In a context in which small-scale food producers are losing access to and control over the world’s land, fisheries, and forests at a rapid pace, we cannot afford any delays. The original agreed upon time-line, in which the principles are to be endorsed in October 2014, should be respected.

#### CSO INTERVENTIONS

---

##### Intervention #1: Monday October 7th

“Civil society participated in the OEWG meeting on 23-24 September to provide feedback on the Zero draft. We see huge huge gaps and several highly problematic aspects of the draft that we feel we should mention again:

Overall, we find that the importance of small-scale food producers--who include farmers, fisherfolk, pastoralists, workers, indigenous communities, women and processors-- their valuable contributions to food production and particular needs are missing in the Zero Draft. The document is drafted from the perspective of large-scale investors, while small-scale producers are "add-ons" requiring 'safety-net' type protections.

Also, in the Zero draft, small-scale food producers are grouped in the same category as other "private investors," that include large-scale investors, state enterprises, financiers and corporations. This is not acceptable. Small-scale food producers must be prioritised, their particular needs addressed appropriately and imbalances of power among small scale producers, corporations, governments, financiers and state enterprises, be acknowledged and addressed.

As mentioned also by other parties during the OEWG meeting in September, the rai principles will only have an added value if they include clear criteria of what kinds of investment are considered not responsible. So far, they these criteria are missing.

Across the document, language about enabling investment favours large-scale investors, not small-scale food producers and local food systems that link producers and consumers. It is not enough that agricultural investment generate co-benefits for concerned communities; small-scale producers must be mentioned as the most important group of investors. Public investment that complement small scale food producers investment should be a central theme. Further, the interests of large investors are protected by 'hard law'—including international agreements and investor protection--whereas small-scale producers and workers are protected by 'soft law' such as voluntary norms, corporate social responsibility, dispute mediation, etc.

The draft focuses excessively on increasing productivity, market mechanisms (such as incentives) and integrating small-scale producers into externally controlled value chains. The draft should reflect existing power imbalances and ensure that fair shares of value remain with small-scale producers and rural economies.

There are major gaps in the roles and responsibilities of the state in relation to public investment, provision of public goods and services, public policy, and regulatory and legal frameworks that address the interests and priorities of small-scale producers.

There are major gaps in mechanisms, laws and regulations to discipline large-scale investors that violate the rights of small-scale food producers.

The zero draft must provide a clear condemnation of land and resource grabbing. After having referenced the VGGT as one of the baselines for the rai principles, the rest of the document remains almost completely silent on the issue of safeguarding legitimate tenure rights.

The document contains no references to agro-ecology, calling for agricultural systems based primarily on the use of local resources and natural interactions of

ecosystems, and supporting bottom-up processes that make the best use of local producers' traditional knowledge, know-how, experimentation and innovation.

In relation to Indigenous Peoples, the zero draft does not make reference to the ILO convention no.169.

The zero draft fails to address adequately the concerns of agricultural and food workers.

The document does not address the particular situations, priorities and needs of women producers, including women workers.

We feel that a Rights-based approach-- especially the Right to Food--must be at the core of the Principles. Human Rights are not a barrier to trade and investment but should encompass investment at all levels and improve the ability of small scale producers to progressively realize decent work and the right to safe adequate and nutritious food. An approach that respects human rights can also increase and sustain food production through the prevention of environmental degradation.

Our detailed comments on the zero draft were submitted to the OEWG Chair in writing. Additional language was also submitted to the Chair to be included in the Chair's summary.

(Additional language sent for Chair's Summary: *Prioritisation on investments by and for small-scale producers for realizing the Right to Food while meeting sustainability requirements, throughout the document.*)

Civil society also expressed concerns about adequate space for participation of small-scale food producers in the CFS regional consultations on rai. ”

## INVESTING IN SMALLHOLDER AGRICULTURE – POLICY ROUNDTABLE

---

### KEY MESSAGES

---

#### **Key importance of smallholders**

- Small scale food producers are the most important investors in agriculture, not only “in their” agriculture. The challenge is not to “include” them into markets (they are not isolated from markets), but to make markets work for them. It also means that particularly they - and not just stakeholders in general - should be at the core of the process of developing country owned visions for smallholder agriculture.
- It is of utmost importance to provide sufficient public investment, complementing smallholders own investments in support of their production models, market systems and local infrastructure. Moreover, the essential health related investments are first and foremost the responsibility of public authorities.
- We have prepared wording proposals on the introductory section as well as on paragraphs 1, 12 and 13.

### **Models of production**

- Agroecology encompasses a wide diversity of agricultures which are resilient, innovative and highly productive. Agroecology is referred to in the Global Strategic Framework and in the Tenure Guidelines. It must thus be included in paragraph 10.

### **Access & control of resources**

- Secured access and control over land, water and other natural resources is a key component of the human right to adequate food. We therefore need a much stronger language when referring to the application of the Land Tenure Guidelines. Among the obligations under national and international law, the existing human rights framework must have priority.
- Farmers rights to save, use, exchange and sell their seeds as reaffirmed last month by the governing body of the international seed treaty (IT PGRFA) must be recognized.
- We have prepared wording proposals for paragraphs 10 and 11 accordingly.

### **Markets**

- Paragraphs 16 and 17 should point out measures to promote a good investment climate for small scale food producers and to ensure access to stable markets for them. Power asymmetries between them and other actors as well as regulatory instruments should be addressed. Apart from that, priority must be given to domestic food systems that allow for small scale producers autonomy and control over their resources.

---

## **CSO INTERVENTIONS**

---

Intervention #1: “Importance and central role of small scale subsistence farmers” by Mamadou Cissokho, ROPPA  
Tuesday October 8<sup>th</sup>

### **Who are they?**

To begin to address the issue of agricultural investment we should remind ourselves that:

**The central role of small scale subsistence farmers**, as defined by the FAO as including ‘small scale farmers, pastoralists, forest dwellers and artisanal fishers, that operate in areas from less than a hectare to a maximum of 10 hectares’. According to the FAO, small scale subsistence farmers are characterised as being family focused, ensuring that their system of agriculture is sustainable, and mostly relies on family members for man power and uses a part of the produce for family consumption. Many small scale subsistence farmer’s count themselves among the 370 million people globally that define themselves as indigenous, living in 70 countries around the world.

## **What do they do?**

Out of the 2.5 billion people that live in poor countries and are directly supported by the food and agriculture sector, 1.5 billion live in small scale farmer households.

Small scale farmers produce 80% of food products in Asia and sub-Saharan Africa.

Artisanal fishing makes up 46% of the global catch (this figure goes up to 54% in developing countries).

According to estimates, artisanal fishing employs more than 90% of the 35 million people who practise capture fisheries throughout the world and supports 85 million people who are employed in processing activities, distribution and associated commercial activities.

As IFAD highlighted in its 2012 report, more than 370 million people say that they are indigenous in about 70 countries. Indigenous lands and territories contain almost 80% of the world's biological diversity.

Indigenous people represent 5% of the world's population, but make up 15% of people that live in poverty. One of the main causes of poverty and marginalisation of indigenous people is the loss of their lands, territories and their traditional natural resources.

The CFS High Level Panel of Expert's 2013 report concluded that 200 million small farms cover 10% of available agricultural land, and produce 20% of the food.

The same report highlighted the fact that in Brazil small scale farmers only take up 24.3% of the total agricultural surface area, but they generate 74% of agricultural jobs and produce 38% of the total amount of production.

In Africa, more than 60% of the population generate 80% of food produce, and create 65% of employment, but legally in many countries they are unemployed and have no form of social insurance. We have to be legally acknowledged as workers, and as workers we deserve better than just handouts, 'cash for food', we want social protection like any other worker.

So we would like to reiterate the fact that the main investors in agro-sylvan systems for land and sea are the men and women that work in family agriculture.

Economically the private sector definition is one of a person who invests, creates wealth, takes risks and creates jobs. For all of these activities, men and women invest, create wealth, take risks and also create jobs. They are thus part of the private sector, but not in the same way as businesses that seek to create profit to the detriment of people and family agriculture. These men and women are in a private sector that has based itself on the conservation of the environment, natural resources, lifestyle and above all the stability of their agricultural household and the use of their own produce within the family. So the main priority now is that public investment supports them, and that investments must support small scale subsistence farmers.

**Issues that limit their capacity for investment and productivity ;** ability to satisfy increasing demand is curbed by :

- Lack of advance public investment in rural infrastructure (transport, storage, local markets),
- Lack of financing for agricultural and food research institutions,
- Lack of financing for rural advice services
- Lack of financing for basic social services,
- Lack of funding for improvement, credit funds, guarantee funds and emergency funds,
- Lack of support for baseline prices for essential products.

All of this is within the framework of partnership between countries, organisations and producers, small scale peasants and civil society actors. The state's role in securing land and access to resources for the people, as well as the central role of public investments, must be asserted.

If you agree with us that we must strengthen investment in agriculture, we must remind ourselves that:

**What kind of investment? What kind of system of production? Which products? What markets? Who will profit?**

The consensual, negotiated response to these issues will allow us to create a charter on investments, which should get to small scale subsistence farmers. This charter which will also include the decision box on the national strategies for small scale agriculture, and that should be integrated into policies. Also the budget should be available for as many participants as possible, so as to ensure their human rights. This should be binding, and legally irrefutable.

We must ensure support for all kinds of food systems in which small holders are the main actors:

- The model of family farming is from an ecological point of view more useful than the industrial model, it is also more diversified and nutritious.
- The right peasants to access land, seeds, and the first steps towards food sovereignty
- Small scale subsistence farmers, that exist everywhere. What is lacking is the infrastructure. We want public investment in order to create infrastructure to ensure the distribution of produce, and we want rules for the regulation of markets and protecting small holders, controlling and stabilising prices, as those that invest want to be sure that their investment will be protected.
- The primordial role of women in production, processing and commercialisation is recognised by all institutions; however they are often forgotten by policies and programmes.

We are also stating that the CFS is the main space in which we should discuss food and nutrition issues.

My colleague will present specific requests with regards to changes in the decision box that will help establish this vision for the future of small scale producers.

Intervention #2: “Appropriate Marketing Systems” by Antonio Onorati, Crocevia  
Tuesday October 8<sup>th</sup>

**In 1958** FAO stated that:

*“...Modern marketing is difficult without modern production. Attempts to transplant a marketing system developed to handle the specialized output of commercial farmers into a rural community quite different in character and outlook, may only lead to difficulties” - FAO, Rome - 1958*

Now they say they are going to link us to modern markets at last, as if this represented our salvation. In reality we small-scale producers have always been in markets. The question that needs to be addressed, rather, is which markets? at what conditions? for whose benefit?

The globalized market system, built by public policies, benefits agri-businesses that are able to override the rules of supply and demand.

It is clear that the legal framework that has allowed big business to have huge power in the markets is not appropriate for small scale producers and peasant agriculture.

Despite the fact that less than 10% of agricultural and food production goes through the global markets, national public policies are based on a global model which totally marginalises small scale agricultural and food production.

We must remember that « “...when *family farmers* enter the **commoditized market** they become part of a **commoditized chain**, losing autonomy and control of the resource base, **local markets** and jobs...”

And also that: “... ‘Local’ can **mean** different things in different contexts. Sometimes it refers to the **range of daily activity**, at others to the national economy as contrasted with the international; often it means the regional economy including urban-rural linkages.

**‘Local’ is not simply a geographical concept, but one that combines geographic, economic, social and cultural dimensions in a complex matrix....”**

(Source “**Family farmers for sustainable food systems: A synthesis of reports by three African farmers’ regional networks on models of food production, consumption and markets.**” **EUROPAFRICA**, 2013 )

Yet many governments, along with FAO, in its most recent technical documents, claim that the solution for small-scale producers is to integrate them in the market:

\* ( “*Smallholder integration in changing food markets*” – FAO, Rome – 2013)

This approach is reflected in the decision box on investing in smallholder agriculture which is the object of our discussion today.

In the final analysis, according to FAO and the decision box, it is not even an issue. We have no choice, they say. We must conform to the global model and its rules and regulations.

The organisation of markets and the circulation of goods shape the mode of production. It is clear that if we wish to promote modes of production that are better suited to small scale production and family production than industrial monocrop production (like agroecology) we also need to 'construct' markets that are appropriate for these modes of production. It is clear that these 'markets' have a local character, and are specific to each country and region. Trade systems of this nature exist in all parts of the world, but they are invisible for those who are able to perceive only the rules of the global markets. To defend and develop these "invisible" (informal) markets requires appropriate tools and infrastructure as well as public policies – including investment policies -that are targeted specifically to this purpose. The markets that are congenial to small-scale producers need to be supported and strengthened. Value-addition should be conducted in a way that ensures that value added remains in the pockets of producers and the rural economies in which they are rooted. Public policies need to guarantee fair and remunerative prices for producers, and to regulate and protect such markets. If globalized agri-businesses are allowed to fiddle with the iron rules of supply and demand to their advantage, there is no reason why smallholders should be crushed by them.

We are certain that there is no invisible hand or internal force of the market; markets are shaped through public policy that establishes the ground rules.

And in conclusion, *"...Outside of the commodified market **family farmers seek to build markets** that are within the democratic control of the people, that respect nature and promote livelihoods. **If policy makers could recognized and strengthen the broad range of informal trade systems** and structures that are, thus far, still strong ....., this could support **creating an alternative to the commodified market** that can better serve the needs of the people. ..."* (Fonte: EUROPAFRICA, 2013)

Intervention #3: "Models of Production" by Maria Noel Salgado, MAELA  
Tuesday October 8<sup>th</sup>

We have to reject the pressure of homogenizing agriculture of the people into a single model based on dependence on industrialised production of food, as we all know that provision for food in this world remains in the hands of peasants. In order to ensure food for the world in the future, agricultural investment must strengthen existing investment that small scale food producers already undertake in their own model of production; that of ecology, biodiversity and nutrition, commonly known as Agro-ecology. This contributes to the right to food for all people, establishing Food Sovereignty.

Agro-ecology encompasses a considerable diversity of argo- and hydro- cultures that are local, resilient, creative and innovative. They are able to sustain food systems that are based on small scale food producers. They all share the following principles: they value local specificities, ensure agricultural biodiversity, especially relating to seeds and breeds of animals, water, land, and this generates diverse productive networks that are more energy efficient and based on peasant values. These are systems that create innovations in the various sub-systems of the market, creating and developing economic sub-systems through local markets, towards the goal of a solidarity economy.

Agro-ecology as a peasant food system is threatened by land grabbing perpetrated by big corporations that are protected by legal frameworks, the imposition of globalised biotechnology and laws that affect peasant seeds. This occurs through the contamination and privatisation of water, and policies that prop up research and development in agribusiness. Thus this type of investment needs to be regulated, and then we will clearly see that small scale food producers are the main investors in agriculture.

With specific regard to this document, in paragraph 10 (Access to resources), we believe that this should explicitly include 'agro-ecology as a peasant system of food production, that acknowledges the role of Food Security, based around a system of production and distribution of food, as well as the establishment of agrarian policies that are more in step with cultural realities.

At a later date we can send more detailed written information to be incorporated into the text.

Intervention #4: "Natural Resources" by Stephane Parmentier, Oxfam solidarité  
Tuesday October 8<sup>th</sup>

We would like to stress our key concerns with regard to smallholders' access to and tenure over land and natural resources, and to farmers' rights to save, use, exchange and sell their own seeds and livestock breeds.

First, we would like to flag to your attention, once more, the fact that on a daily basis, hundreds of small-scale food producers, indigenous peoples, nomadic, pastoralists and other communities across the world, including and especially women, are facing investments which violate their legitimate rights of access to and tenure over land, including coastal land, water and other natural resources they depend on, thus violating the realization of their right to adequate food, as well as other of their fundamental human rights and undermining their livelihoods. The lack of adequate and secure access to land, water and other natural resources is one of the major causes of food insecurity and malnutrition in the world, from which women are suffering the most. Given the mandate of the CFS, it is of utmost importance that CFS Member-States strongly commit to ensure that those rights are respected and protected. For that to happen, governments must ensure a responsible governance of tenure of land and other natural resources, by applying effectively the land, forests and fisheries tenure guidelines approved within the CFS in May 2012. Those guidelines are the interpretation of existing Human Rights obligations of States and other actors in the context of access to and tenure over land, fisheries and forests. Their application therefore should not be considered as wishful thinking, but as an

absolute necessity. Human Rights are not something to play with. It is something to realize at all costs. We would also like to stress the crucial importance of land reforms as a necessary pre-condition in many contexts for securing small-scale producers adequate access to land and other natural resources, before considering investments. In this regard, we would like to remind to CFS the need to implement the International Conference on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development (ICARRD) adopted in 2006.

With regard to those concerns, we think that so far, the draft smallholders' decision box is not coherent enough, and we have wording proposals that we will communicate later on to address these gaps, more specifically related to current paragraph 11.

Concerning smallholder access to seeds, we would first like to share our great satisfaction concerning the outcome of the Fifth Session of the Governing Body of the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture that was held in Muscat, Oman, from September 24 to September 28. We are particularly pleased about the specific attention given by the resolution adopted to increasing awareness, building capacity and promoting the access of farmers and local and indigenous communities to the genetic resources they need in order to continue production of much-needed food crops, as well as by the decision to promote the conservation and sustainable use of local and locally adapted crop varieties, as also underutilized crops, and to strengthen the *in situ* and on-farm conservation of their genetic resources. We are pleased about the fact that the resolution adopted calls basically States to implement and support the rights of peasants and farmers over their own seeds. This signal marks a clear break from the current laws and intellectual property rights regimes which tend on the contrary to criminalize peasant's seeds. National relevant policies that impact those rights should be made coherent with their realization. All projects to develop terminator seeds should be definitely banned and dropped. All actors must duly recognize the rights of farmers to save, use, exchange and sell their own seeds, as well as their own livestock breeds, against biopiracy. Ensuring those rights, including and especially for women whose role is key in seed conservations, is the very first condition for realizing the right to Food Sovereignty, which 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*", as well as "*the rights of consumers to control their food and nutrition*". This right notably implies "*the rights to use and manage lands, territories, waters, seeds, livestock and biodiversity are in the hands of those of us who produce food*".

Keeping this in mind, we would like to flag to all CFS Member States and other participants that we will be particularly attentive to ensuring that those rights of farmers to save, use, exchange and sell their own seeds and livestock breeds are consistently recognized within the decision box.

---

## BIOFUELS – POLICY ROUNDTABLE

---

### KEY MESSAGES

We need to act now, and address policies that are at the root cause of the food crises. Biofuel production – and the policies, subsidies and mandates behind much of the supply and demand in the biofuels market – has been directly linked to higher food prices and increased food price volatility in recent years. The demand for biofuels and high prices for food crops are also directly linked to land - and water - grabbing. Coordinated policy actions at the global level are necessary to eliminate mandates and subsidies; protect the rights to food, land, and water; and ensure that biofuel production does not threaten food security. The CFS has no other option than to deliver to meet its obligation to improve policy coherence for the realization of the right to food and to ensure food and nutrition security for all.

### CSO INTERVENTIONS

---

Intervention #1: by Sylvia Mallari, Asian Peasant Coalition  
Monday October 7th

I speak on behalf of the CSM Working Group on Biofuels and of the Asian Peasant Coalition and the Philippine Peasant Movement. For small food producers like us, biofuels means greater hunger, poverty and displacement.

Thus, we urge the CFS to recognize and respond to the overwhelming evidence that the artificial demand for biofuels is undermining the right to food, is aggravating food insecurity and malnutrition, and is intensifying the corporate grabbing of resources like land and water. Such artificial demand is being created by subsidies, mandatory blending quotas and targets, especially in the EU and Americas. The 2011 and 2013 reports of the High Level Panel of Experts (HLPE) both show that biofuels are critical in the latest price spikes and volatility in food prices.

Sadly, the current draft of the Decision Box is too much in favor of biofuel production and fails to respond to the negative impacts of biofuels on the right to food. It does not mention anything about the elimination, or even reduction, of mandates and targets. It gives token recognition of the right to food. It ignores the well-documented evidence of the negative impacts of biofuel policies. Its gender dimension is weak and so is its language about the protection of land, water and biodiversity. Biofuel production is often on large scale using huge amounts of pesticides, fertilizers and water resources resulting in severe human hazards for agricultural workers and

environmental destruction. It does not say anything about preventive measures to limit the risks of food price spikes. If the CFS will approve the Decision Box in its current form, it will only legitimize the continuing violation of the right to food and the eviction of small food producers from their productive resources.

We challenge the CFS to address these legitimate concerns. Concretely, we propose that the Decision Box categorically state that (1) Mandatory targets, subsidies and other policies that artificially create strong demand for biofuels be eliminated; (2) Multi-stakeholder human rights assessments at the country and regional levels be undertaken to ensure that biofuels policies are consistent with the right to food; (3) Food production is more important than the production for biofuels; (4) Access to land and water resources by small food producers will be ensured and that biofuel policies do not result or legitimize the grabbing of these resources; and (5) Preventive measures that limit the risks of food price spikes triggered by biofuel production be put in place.

With the establishment of the CSM, the CFS has been supposedly reformed. The CFS should show its sincerity about listening to the voice of the civil society, of social movements, and of the marginalized and oppressed. Otherwise, all our efforts to reform the CFS will become meaningless. Otherwise, the CFS will just be another instrument that legitimizes the violation of the right to food and the rights and welfare of small food producers.

Intervention #2: “De Pasies Productores de Granos a Importadores Dependientes”  
by Helmer Velasquez, CONGCOOP (in Spanish)  
Monday October 7th

Centro América, a partir de la Desregulación de los Mercados Agrícolas, Tratados Internacionales de Comercio y la Sustitución del uso del Suelo particularmente Maíz por Azúcar y Palma aceitera. Ha pasado de ser productor de alimentos a importador. Pagando, altísimos costos por la importación. Para el Maíz –base importante de nuestra dieta y de la industria de etanol en Estados Unidos- el alza atribuible a la franja de crecimiento por la demanda para elaborar etanol fue del 25 % en su precio en el mercado internacional.

Pese a la evidencia, EL “DECISION BOX”, no reconoce, como causal del alza de precio del maíz y otros alimentos LA PRODUCCIÓN DE AGRO COMBUSTIBLES, pese a que aquello es ahora un CONSENSO EN LA COMUNIDAD DE ECONOMISTAS Y HLPE. CENTRO AMERICA; en seis años -2005 a 2010- importo de Estados Unidos de América, DIECISEIS MILLONES DE TONELADAS de MAÍZ, con un costo “extra” de trescientos sesenta y ocho millones (368) millones de dólares.

GUATEMALA, ese país pequeño, al que metafóricamente se le llama: “país de hombres de maíz”

Importo, en el mismo período- CUATRO (4) MILLONES DE TONELADAS del grano, con una diferencia de costo –al alza- de noventa y un (91) millones de dólares; esto fue producto de la misma causa: la demanda de maíz para producir etanol en Estados Unidos de América. Esta elevación “extra” de los costos, ha castigado a muchos países, entre ellos: México, Egipto, Japón, Korea, Irán.

- a. **La Panacea:** generación de empleo a través de monocultivos base, para la producción de AGRO COMBUSTIBLES. Guatemala Cuarto (4º-) productor mundial de azúcar. Esta producción genera, aproximadamente 60 mil empleos directos por año. La palma aceitera 17,000. El cultivo del maíz genera 400,000 jornales año, empleo gravemente amenazado por la expansión del monocultivo.
- b. **Conflictividad Social:** Los monocultivos, particularmente los destinados a elaborar etanol, provocan: desarticulación comunitaria y desestructuración de culturas, producto del desplazamiento de comunidades indígenas y campesinas. La expulsión de las comunidades se da en el medio de represión militar y policíaca. Afectando vidas y patrimonio social.
- c. **Crisis Ambiental:** Los productores de caña y palma aceitera, desvían los ríos hacia sus fundos; provocando crisis ambientales, comunitarias: Sequía en verano e inundaciones en invierno.

Por razones, como estas: EL “DECISION BOX” debe reconocer las presiones que genera la creciente producción de agro combustibles, sobre alimentos, tierra y agua. Aceptando además que se trata de una obvia violación del derecho humano a la alimentación. Nadie seguramente duda que los alimentos son una necesidad humana, superior al combustible. Lo cual, a nuestro juicio implica que en el “Decisión Box” se contenga LA ELIMINACIÓN DE SUBSIDIOS Y MANDATO A LA INDUSTRIA DE AGRO COMBUSTIBLES.

Intervention #3: by Thierry Kesteloot, Oxfam Solidarité  
Monday October 7th

“Two years ago, Ibrahim Coulibaly, a farmer leader of Mali came to the CFS to call for urgent action to address the root causes of food price volatility. Unfortunately, the CFS was not able to respond to this call and decided for BF to delay any bold and urgent decisions by asking the HLPE to look into the opportunities and risks of BF and discuss it two years later at this session,

In the meantime, the CFS has endorsed the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land and Natural Resources and the GSF, which we welcomed as important steps towards the need for a human rights approach, the central role of small scale food producers and the need for policy coherence to achieve the right to food and food and nutrition security.

Biofuels are emblematic of a failing food system, increasing food price volatility, reinforcing inequity where a few capture scarce resources and many are bearing the costs. We would like to refer to the evidence (and ask also the PSM) to look into the HLPE reports of food price volatility and biofuels, including the long list of case studies referring to the land grabs, and price impacts biofuels has had.

This week’s debates are also an opportunity for the CFS to show that we are able to address the root causes of the food crises, of people evicted from their land, some risking their lives and future by migrating to other horizons.

Two years later, the HLPE has reconfirmed the evidence we already knew; policies play a central role in the rise of biofuels, creating acute competition with food production for land and water with an ever-important role of large-scale biofuel investment at the detriment of small-scale food producers.

Evidence also shows that some jobs can be created but many others are lost. Evidence also shows that investments in small-scale food production is more effective in job creation than the large scale monocultures as well as attaining food security.

Ladies and gentlemen, Madame chair, Delegates, hungry and vulnerable people cannot wait any longer. There is no time for a pause. There is no time for excuses to not change policies, investments and practices that have negative impacts on food security. We are extremely worried that the proposed decision box will not deliver on the expectations. We are extremely concerned that the vested interests of the biofuels industry might prevail over our common obligation to realize the right to food

This is an urgent appeal to all of you to ensure that the CFS does not lose its credibility by not responding to its mandate.”

Intervention #4: by Timothy A. Wise, Tufts University  
Monday October 7th

“In relation to biofuels, the obligation of the CFS is to ensure that the rapid and recent expansion of first-generation biofuels, and its projected continued expansion, is not undermining agreed rights to food, land, and natural resources. We strongly believe it is, and the evidence is clear. The HLPE report is unambiguous about the contribution of biofuels to food price increases, added pressure on land and water rights, and gender inequities.

Other independent research has confirmed such findings, particularly in relation to the US and EU biofuel programs. A report last month to the European Commission by the Joint Research Centre showed that eliminating current EU tax incentives and blending requirements would lower vegetable oil prices significantly and prevent the conversion of 6 million hectares of land to biofuel production, with much of that land instead devoted to cereals production for human consumption.

In the United States, 40% of maize is consumed by ethanol production, accounting for 15% of global maize supplies. Estimates on price impacts range from 20-79%, as Prof. de Gorter argued yesterday.

The oil industry can find or hire scientists who will claim to prove that climate change is not happening. That does not make it true. The scientific consensus is otherwise. So too is the consensus on biofuels and food security, as confirmed by the HLPE, in two different reports, with comprehensive literature reviews, as well as by a wide range of international agencies and experts.

The time to act is now. As an open letter from 80 civil society organizations, released this afternoon, states:

“We are deeply concerned that the recommendations in the current CFS draft Decision Box would not protect the right to food from existing biofuels policies and the growing demand for biofuels. Instead, the text proposal refers to the alleged benefits of biofuels, which have not been shown to exist at any significant scale.”

As the Special Rapporteur has pointed out, the delegates to the CFS would betray their obligations if they fail to take action to address the very real impacts of biofuel expansion on world food security.”

Intervention #5: Thursday October 10<sup>th</sup>

“The CSM would like to recall that the mandate and spirit of the reformed CFS are to create a body that includes all countries and stakeholders. The CFS serves as the place where action can be taken to respond to food crises, increase policy coherence, and secure the right to food for all. Additionally, we would like to remind governments that the Global Strategic Framework is at the heart of the reformed CFS, This framework represents an overarching global consensus that provides clear guidance to coordinate actions on food security and nutrition, with the HLPE providing scientific and knowledge-based analysis to inform governments on priority issues.

Therefore we are deeply concerned that

- The evidence and the recommendations of the HLPE on biofuels have not been reflected in the decision box, its recommendations, nor in the negotiations.
- The Friends of the Rapporteur negotiations failed to reflect the views of countries whose right to food is affected by biofuels policies. The text overwhelmingly reflects the opinion of countries defending the interests of their own biofuels industry.
- The current decision box fails to address the impacts of biofuels on the right to food, as agreed in the GSF, nor the responsibility to achieve policy coherence.

We are confronted every day as biofuel crops compete with our food production, with the land we till, and with the water that sustains us. For many years now, we have confronted unpredictable prices, not from natural causes but imposed from afar. We watch as our productive assets are signed over to foreign biofuel investors.

The text before us acknowledges that biofuels policies should not compromise food security. The introduction acknowledges that the production and consumption of biofuels influences commodity prices, as well as that current biofuel production creates competition between biofuel crops and food crops.

Finally it also acknowledges the significant guidance to address these issues given by the GSF the VGGT and the VGRtF. This was for us a minimal reflection of the evidence given by the HLPE and of the concerns raised by us and by different member states. However these elements are not reflected in any substantial recommendation for action.

Therefore, this assembly must strengthen the decision box to respond to the mandate of the CFS and – at the least – to be consistent with its introduction. To do this, the CSM demands to CFS to integrate two important principles.

The first one is the need to phase out developed countries' policies that have negative effects on food security, notably by driving land and water grabbing, by increasing food import costs and by impacting staple food prices in developing countries

The second principle is to undertake multistakeholder assessments of biofuels policies, investments, and operations on the right to food. They should be carried out ex-ante and ex-post and include direct and indirect impacts in third countries.

It is incumbent on this plenary to change this decision box. This assembly must address these two requirements to fulfill the mandate to mitigate any negative effects of biofuels on the right to food, and to be compliant with the mandate of the reformed CFS.”

Intervention #6: Friday October 11<sup>th</sup>

“Since the reformed CFS, biofuels have been recognized as a critical issue to be addressed given the strong linkages it has with the right to food and FS. Mister chair, indeed the honeymoon is over and the debate is obviously not over.

We welcome that we all have reconfirmed the acknowledgement that biofuels affect food prices and secure access to land and water. We all agreed that biofuels policies should not compromise food security. We did also agree about the significant guidance of the voluntary guidelines on the right to food and those on the governance on land tenure, as well as the GSF in addressing the issue of biofuels .

But we regret that governments failed to respond and we regret that the whole process ended up in a decision that will not deliver tangible results.

Despite what is in the decision box we participated in a constructive way and the whole process has been very useful to have common, and solid exchanges. But let's be honest, most of us in this room could agree with us that the text overwhelmingly reflects the opinion of countries defending the interests of their own biofuels industry.

Your recommendations indeed failed to address those policy incentives including set mandates, subsidies and tariffs that further fuel hunger and poverty. Moreover most of us in this room would agree with us – as also reflected in the decision box - that biofuels poses serious threats to smallholders land rights and are one of the main cause of food price spikes, and that this also has not – or insufficiently - been addressed in the recommendations

Madame Chair, let us indeed be frank, as friends. We all know why the decision box in the report does not include those elements. Powerful countries didn't want to take action because of short term economic interests. This assembly was obviously not ready to discuss and agree to eliminate those policies. We need to recognize that

we were not able to provide the required responses to address the negative impacts of biofuels policies, investments and operations on the Rtf and FS.

Two years ago, we delayed decisions on BF on the basis to be informed by science based evidence. Clearly, in the case of biofuels, during most of the negotiations, the evidence and science were replaced by vested interests. And, while we all wait for the potential of new biofuel generations to arrive, people go hungry and land is grabbed. We express our deep concerns that the process failed to reflect the views of peoples and countries whose right to food is affected by biofuels policies.

We will all go back home soon, but the evidence will remain for long. We urge you to work hard when returning to your capitals and address what we have failed to conclude this week. And as Civil Society, Madame Chair, we will continue to work on this in a constructive and frank way. In the meantime we would like to inform you, mister chairman, for the sake of the follow-up on this session that we will send to the new bureau and advisory group the statement we've read yesterday explaining why we could not agree the decision box.”

## PROTRACTED CRISES

---

### KEY MESSAGES

We appreciate the efforts to include civil society in the development of the Agenda for Action (A4A) for Addressing Food Insecurity in Protracted Crises, but demand further involvement in the immediate actions surrounding resilience and the New Deal, and the criteria and selection process for countries in protracted crisis. Additionally, we stress on the following:

- Affected communities should be at the centre of the assessment of the underlying structural causes, consequences of protracted crisis to enable them to be active in decision-making processes and claiming their rights under legally binding instruments.
- The A4A should be directed at enhancing local food systems defined by affected communities rather than short-term interventions that breed dependency.
- The A4A should ensure that “nutrition” is mainstreamed into the A4A title, design, implementation, and monitoring processes.

## CSO INTERVENTIONS

---

### Intervention #1 by Zoila Bustamante, CONAPACH Wednesday October 9<sup>th</sup>

Civil society organizations welcome the inclusion of this very important discussion on food security and nutrition in protracted crises. We recognize and appreciate that efforts have been made to include civil society in the Agenda for Action, however we believe that the present level of involvement within the other processes, specifically the immediate actions surrounding resilience and the New Deal, and the criteria and

selection process for countries in protracted crisis has not been sufficient. Civil society and affected communities should be at the center of the assessment of the underlying structural causes and consequences of protracted crisis in order to enable them to be active participants in decision-making processes and claiming their rights under legally binding instruments.

All actors working in protracted crisis must be accountable to international human rights norms and humanitarian law, including extra-territorial obligations as outlined in the Maastricht Principles. Appropriate accountability mechanisms must be implemented, which may be judicial or extra-judicial, to enable rights holders to obtain adequate remedy and reparations and keep violators accountable under international law. This applies to a comprehensive list of actors including, but not limited to, governments, local authorities, international and national organizations, the private sector, international financial institutions, donor agencies, and civil society.

Intervention #2 by Saoudata Aboubacrine, Indigenous Caucus  
Wednesday October 9<sup>th</sup>

The objective of the Agenda for Action for protracted crises should be towards long-term, sustainable solutions that support the enhancement of local food systems defined by affected communities, rather than short-term interventions that breed dependency. This comprehensive approach is consistent with the right to adequate food stated in article 11, International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and outlined in the general comment 12.

The Agenda for Action should ensure that “nutrition” is mainstreamed. Improved nutrition outcomes and indicators should be integrated into A4A design, implementation, and monitoring processes. In order to do so, an integrated, multi-sectoral approach is needed to address long term food insecurity, poverty, lack of safe drinking water, sanitation and affordable health services, enhance the food production systems which feed the affected populations and provide sustainable livelihoods, as well as poor governance and collapse of public services. In order to ensure this focus it is imperative that “nutrition” is included in the title of this action, as well as in all references to food security; the reference of nutrition within a footnote of the present document is unacceptable.

## GLOBAL STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK

---

### KEY MESSAGES & INTERVENTIONS

---

As the CSM we are deeply committed to using the GSF. We expect the CFS, in communication strategy, to disseminate and raise awareness of the GSF in the same manner that we are doing. As far as this year's decision box, we will accept it. However, although we are in favor of this being a living document we caution against the yearly update, as cut and paste from decision boxes. We urge the CFS to identify a clear inclusive process for the periodic update of the GSF and to resource it accordingly. In case it is decided to go ahead with yearly updating this should be done using annexes. We would like to see the removal of the sentence, which refers to updates being subject to available resources.

---

## MONITORING & ACCOUNTABILITY

---

### KEY MESSAGES

We welcome and appreciate the work done so far by the OEWG. We recall the importance of monitoring and accountability as one of the main tasks of CFS. Particularly we stress the mandate of the CFS Reform Document to develop and establish an innovative mechanism on monitoring, which is to be built on the elements agreed upon by the OEWG and the GSF. We understand that the explicit OEWG mandate given by the CFS 39 to further develop the innovative monitoring mechanism will be part of the work plan in 2014.

### CSO INTERVENTIONS

---

#### Intervention #1: Wednesday October 9<sup>th</sup>

“We would like to congratulate the Open Ended Working Group for all the work achieved so far.

We would like to highlight the importance of monitoring and accountability as one of the key tasks of the CFS, as stipulated by the CFS reform document.

We particularly welcome the consensus reached in the OEWG on basing the guidance framework for monitoring on the GSF Five Principles, which underscore a human rights-based monitoring and accountability framework.

We upkeep that the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security, as the most important decision reached at the new CFS, should be the starting point for monitoring.

We also share the conviction that public policy monitoring should involve inclusive platforms that represent all actors, especially smallholder food producer organisations, as well all relevant State sectors.

We wish to particularly underscore article 6 from the CFS reform, which mandates the CFS to establish an innovative monitoring mechanism that builds upon decisions

already made, especially the Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition and the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security.

We understand the OEWG has been given the explicit mandate at CFS 39 to develop an innovative monitoring mechanism, which will be part of the 2014 programme of work. Social movements and civil society organisations are committed to further supporting the OEWG in this process”

---

## CFS MULTI-YEAR PROGRAMME OF WORK AND PRIORITIES

---

### KEY MESSAGES

On the process, we have complained about the attempt of certain governments to reduce the work of the CFS, as this undermines the role of the CFS as the global governance platform, which gives recommendations and coordinates policies on food and nutrition security. The reduction in the number of HLPE reports from two to one for the 2014-2015 period is just one example. There are no economic reasons why the number of HLPE reports should be reduced.

On CFS priorities, we believe that the topic of seeds is central to food security, especially for small-scale food producer organizations. The CFS should be able to coordinate the actions of international bodies involved in the topic of Genetic Resources at one single articulation level, with bodies such as the ITPGRFA and the Commission on Genetic Resources, the CBD, WIPO and UPOV. This should be a priority for governments in order to provide coherence to international agreements aimed at guaranteeing food security.

### CSO INTERVENTIONS

---

Intervention #1: “Stressing the value of the CFS” by Maria Noel Salgado, MAELA  
Wednesday October 9<sup>th</sup>

“A trend on behalf of certain governments aimed at reducing the work of the CFS on specific issues can be seen. The implication here is that an attempt is being made to limit the reach of the main CFS working areas. This is tantamount to an attack on the role of the CFS as a global governance platform which should give recommendations and coordinate policies on Food and Nutrition Security.

The most alarming aspect for us is the reduction in HLPE reports, with budget limits being put forward as an explanation. Nevertheless, the number of reports has only dropped from two to one for the 2014-2015 period – hardly constituting a significant reduction in cost despite the considerably diminished effectiveness brought about in the work of the HLPE.

It has also been argued that governments do not have sufficient human resources to carry out follow-up on all the topics. However, the very countries to have made these claims are rich nations from the Global North.

The document currently proposed in no way matches the consensus reached throughout the process and nor does it conform to the priorities outlined by most stakeholders, since the proposal for one of the major workstreams for the preparatory phase of 2015 was, “A framework for implementing the post-2015 agenda on issues related to sustainable agriculture, food security and nutrition”.

Two topics which were unequivocally set as priorities for the ranking exercise by the various regions and constituencies have been removed entirely: “Agroecology” and “Genetic resources”, which now do not even appear in the list of “Other workstreams”. This removal is of great concern, especially considering that no countries put up opposition.

We are adamant that an explanation on this is necessary, since what comes into play here is the value attributed to civil society proposals within the CFS.

Intervention #2: “Priorities” by Alberta Guerra, Action Aid  
Wednesday October 9<sup>th</sup>

“Justifying the choice of topics and making a concrete proposal for the main workstream or for the HLPE report. We believe that the topic of seeds is central to Food Security, especially for small-scale food producer organisations. For this reason and in line with the CFS mandate to coordinate policies on Food Security, it is key that the CFS is able to coordinate the actions of international bodies involved in the topic of Genetic Resources at one single articulation level, bodies such as the ITPGRFA and the Commission on Genetic Resources, the CBD, WIPO and UPOV. This should be a priority for governments in order to give coherence to international agreements aimed at guaranteeing Food Security.

We have proposed this topic to the CFS for the major workstreams since the outset. We realise that this may pose difficulties to some governments, which is why we suggest the alternative of having a second Panel of Experts report which would address the issue of access to genetic resources from a food security perspective, with a view to developing recommendations for a more coherent and coordinated way of managing genetic resources, since they represent the foundations of agricultural biodiversity.”

## **CFS COMMUNICATIONS STRATEGY**

---

### **KEY MESSAGES & CSO INTERVENTION**

---

Intervention #1 by Henry Kimera, Consumers International

“The CSM supports the overall CFS Communications Strategy and suggests further consultations with civil society on communication needs assessment in finalizing the strategy and implementation plan. The communications strategy should take into consideration the people who do not have regular access to electronic infrastructure such as internet/email or even electricity and explore alternative communications means such as traditional/folk media, radio, and interpersonal communications and others. The CSM wishes to work closely with the CFS Secretariat in developing communications messages and products, which should be made available during campaigning activities across the globe.

To ensure coherence in implementing CFS policy guidance, the CFS strategy should elaborate how it relates to, and supports the processes. The CSM wishes to highlight that different constituencies may not always automatically endorse CFS communications messages and products which at times may need adaptation and contextualization for a specific audience. In addition to this, the CFS website should be separate from that of the FAO, “articles” should be replaced with “other communication products and initiative” on page 7 (point 26) and “CFS Champions” should clearly be defined on page 7 (point 27) as the CSM constituencies and sub-regions would also like to be a part of the “Champions”.

---

## COORDINATION & LINKAGES SESSION

---

### CSO INTERVENTIONS

---

#### Intervention #1: G8 New Alliance by Patrick Mulvany, Practical Action Wednesday October 9<sup>th</sup>

“We are concerned that, in contrast to the CFS, the G8 New Alliance has developed its “cooperation frameworks” between States and Agribusiness, behind closed doors. It seems that now CSOs and Farmers’ Organisations are being tacked on to give legitimacy to the initiative: we, and especially smallholder’s social movements, were not involved in constructing the initiative. African smallholders are the primary investors in the production of food and the main providers of food, as the CFS recognizes; their food regimes should be supported – not have new initiative dumped on them. The frameworks link national agricultural policies to earmarked corporate investment. This initiative undermines the hard work of the CFS and the negotiations that take place here. From this, four brief questions arise:

First, in what way can the CFS ensure accountability of governments towards their population, in particular the most vulnerable groups, rather than towards Agribusinesses?

Second, the New Alliance directly attacks a key component of small scale food producers’ resource base by undermining Farmers’ Rights to save, use, exchange and sell their seeds and through requiring changes in, and the harmonisation of, seed laws in favour of corporations - so what will the CFS do to change this?

Third how will the CFS call to account the initiative’s threat to the multifunctional,

resilient agroecological food production systems of Africa's family farmers, which help realise food sovereignty?

Finally, we are a bit confused by the multiple hats worn by the Honourable CFS chair – now apparently legitimising the New Alliance; but in his role of CFS Chair defending the principles of the CFS. Can we have clarity that, as Chair of the CFS, you will, as my colleague said, ensure that this initiative complies with GSF and defends the interests of Africa's family farmers and local food provision negatively affected by this so-called alliance? “

Intervention #2: Post-2015 by Sarojeni Rengam, PANAP  
Wednesday October 9<sup>th</sup>

“The Social movements and CSOs that compose the Civil Society Mechanism for the CFS are concerned that the CFS hasn't been more strongly involved in this process, for instance through the Rome-based agencies.

As the foremost inclusive international and intergovernmental platform on food security and nutrition issues CFS should play the key role in the development and implementation of the post-2015 development agenda related to these themes.

It has the expertise and ability to ensure that food and nutrition security in the post 2015 agenda is addressed in a systemic and holistic manner, within the human rights framework, and reflecting issues around production, consumption, land, seeds and other agricultural genetic resources, waste and water, as well as women's rights and gender dimensions, having the promotion of nutritional well-being and human dignity for all as the goal.

This should be done in a participatory, transparent and inclusive manner.

### Interfaces

Post-2015 MDG process needs to address the global crisis we are facing today. The challenges are multiple, including environmental disasters, unfair trade practices, land grabbing, unsustainable agro industrial practices, climate change, discrimination, violence against women, violation of workers' rights, slave like labor, child labor, among others. The post-2015 agenda needs to deliver the transformational change we need towards human rights compliant sustainable agro-ecological practices and sustainable food systems,, that guarantee nutritional well-being for all.

Human rights Accountability is key in realizing the post-2015 agenda. Well-functioning information, monitoring and evaluation systems are important to ensure that decision makers' responses accelerate progress towards reduced hunger, better food security and nutrition, as well as environmental sustainability. Indicators should allow to adequately assess progress made.

Women's rights, with special attention to sexual and reproductive rights, towards the full protection of women and girls against structural violence, including child marriage.

Access to good quality health care, water and sanitation and social security.

### Key elements

Key elements to be considered in a post-2015 agenda related to food security and nutrition and sustainable agriculture, include among others:

- Food sovereignty as the core conceptual framework to be explored
- Small scale food producers and women, must be at the core of the post-2015 development agenda.
- Human rights need to be the basis of the agenda and its monitoring, highlighting five main dimensions:
  1. primacy of human rights
  2. policy coherence with promotion and protection of all human rights
  3. emphasis on promotion of equity and reduction of unacceptable disparity
  4. accountability, including holding the private corporate sector accountable on their abuses of human rights
  5. Extra territorial obligations

Reflected in:

- People at the center, with special attention to the most affected - participation
  - Food sovereignty
  - From charity to justice.
  - Protection and promotion of access to productive resources
  - Women's rights , with special attention to sexual and reproductive rights, against structural violence, links to hunger and malnutrition
  - Human dignity and nutritional well being for all.
- Guidance of the framing of goals, to be transformational with clear benchmarks pointing to a paradigm shift
- Stand-alone goals on reduction of disparities and on universal social protection Floors
- Eradication of discrimination and all forms of exclusion
- Human Rights based international and national policy coherence, based on:
  - Global Strategic Framework
  - Sustainable development and food system
  - Sustainable use of resources. (IAASTD)
  - Solidarity economy
  - Universal social protection
- Rights based accountability
- Regulation of TNCs on the basis of ETOs
- Inclusive governance, such as the CFS, in the whole UN system: rights holders must have a say in all policies that concern them. Nothing on us, without us. “

