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INTRODUCTION

This Annual Report documents the work of the CSM during the period August 2015 to August 2016, and aims to be an essential tool for the internal and external communication and accountability process.

The Report 2015-2016 consists of the following parts:

- Summary of CSM engagement with the CFS (2015-2016)
- A civil society view on the CFS, 7 years after its reform
- Reporting and Follow-Up to CFS 42
- Civil Society contributions to CFS Processes in 2016 (towards CFS 43)
- Operational information on the CSM during the reporting period

In October 2016, the CSM Coordination Committee and the CSM Forum considered the draft Annual Report that was then later revised and is now being published.

The report shows the substantial collective work carried out by a huge number of global, regional and national social movements and civil society organizations who achieve, through participatory deliberation processes, to formulate and defend joint positions towards all complex policy processes in the CFS.

Martin Wolpold-Bosien
CSM Secretariat Coordinator
November 2016
SUMMARY OF CSM ENGAGEMENT WITH THE CFS (2015-2016)

The Civil Society Mechanism (CSM) for relations with the CFS is the largest international space of civil society organizations (CSOs) working to eradicate food insecurity and malnutrition. The purpose of the CSM is to autonomously facilitate civil society participation in policy processes of the CFS. During the reporting period, the CSM has facilitated civil society participation to all processes on the agenda of CFS. This participation is organized through the creation and continued work of CSM Policy Working Groups which are open to all interested civil society organizations. Each Policy Working Group prepares the positions and written submission to the respective CFS Open-Ended Working Group (OEWG) meetings. Between August 2015 and August 2016, the CSM activities carried out in relation and support of CFS related processes focused on:

a) Negotiation of CFS Recommendations on Water for Food Security and Nutrition
b) Assessment and follow-up to the Framework for Action on Food Security and Nutrition in Protracted Crisis (FFA)
c) Contributions to advance the Monitoring of CFS Decisions
d) Contributions to the CFS Negotiations on Connecting Smallholders to Markets
e) Contributions to the Technical Workshops on Urbanization and Rural Transformation
f) Contributions to the CFS Negotiations on Sustainable Agricultural Development, including Livestock
g) Contributions to the OEWG on CFS Engagement with Nutrition
h) Contribution to the OEWG on CFS Engagement with SDGs
i) Contribution to the OEWG on Global Strategic Framework (GSF)
j) CFS Multi-Year Program of Work (MYPoW)
k) Participation and contributions to the Joint Meetings of the CFS Bureau and Advisory Group.

Regarding contributions to CFS 42
The CSM statements and positions on all agenda items of the CFS 42 Plenary are documented in a publication accessible here: http://www.csm4cfs.org/civil-society-statements-for-cfs-42-2015/. During the CFS 42, the CSM organized four side-events and was involved in several others. During the weekend before the CFS Plenary, more than 200 participants from all constituencies and continents attended the CSM Forum in 2015.

Regarding CSM
The CSM, as a Constituency of the CFS Advisory Group, consists itself of 11 constituencies. All participating organizations in the CSM belong to one of the following 11 constituencies: smallholder farmers, pastoralists, fisherfolks, indigenous peoples, agricultural and food workers, landless, women, youth, consumers, urban food insecure, and NGOs. The CSM as a space does not represent the organizations that participate in it. They represent themselves and formulate positions together with others in the CSM. The participating organizations, particularly those who organize small-scale food producers and consumers, have more than 380 million affiliated members from all continents. The CSM and its participating organizations are involved in the work of the CFS through:

a) Policy Working Groups (WG) that contribute and participate to the OEWG meetings of the CFS: the CSM translated the CFS documents to the languages of the Working Group, the Working groups, under the lead of their coordinators and facilitators discuss the positions, selects the speakers and agree on the written submissions.
b) The CSM Members to the CFS Advisory Group (AG): they gather the inputs from the Policy Working Group and the CSM Coordination Committee on the items of the agenda and then deliver these positions to the Joint meeting of the CFS Bureau and Advisory Group.
c) The CSM Coordination Committee (CC): the CC reflects the 11 global constituencies and 17 sub-regions and is gender and regionally balanced. In 2015-2016, the CC is composed by 20 women and 19 men (5 members Europe, 10 Asia, 3 Australasia and Pacific, 2 North America, 11 Africa and 8 from Latin America and the Caribbean). CC members facilitate the participation of civil society from their constituencies and sub-regions, and serve as the steering body of the CSM.

SUMMARY OF CSM ENGAGEMENT WITH THE CFS (2015-2016)
The CSM uses several instruments to disseminate information on CFS processes and outcomes to its constituencies.

The most important instruments are:

- **The CSM Website**: it provides an always updated information on all CFS processes and outcomes, and the CSM contributions to them, in three languages. The written contributions to the CFS OEWG processes are accessible on the CSM website under [http://www.csm4cfs.org/policy-working-groups/](http://www.csm4cfs.org/policy-working-groups/). The written contributions to the Joint Meetings of the CFS Bureau and Advisory Group (AG) are documented here: [http://www.csm4cfs.org/csm-contributions-to-the-cfs-agbureau-meeting/](http://www.csm4cfs.org/csm-contributions-to-the-cfs-agbureau-meeting/)

- **The CSM Update**: this regular summary information on the CFS processes and results, and the CSM contributions to it, is circulated 10 times a year to more than 2,300 addressees of civil society organizations, see here: [http://www.csm4cfs.org/csm-update-of-march-and-april-2016/](http://www.csm4cfs.org/csm-update-of-march-and-april-2016/)

- **Regarding ongoing CFS processes and their intermediate results**: The CSM Working Group coordinators and facilitators continuously inform the WGs about the most recent developments, documents and results of the different workstreams, and consult about the next steps to be taken. In the reporting period, internal communication was particularly intense on the CFS workstreams on SDGs, Smallholder to Markets, Nutrition, Rural Transformation and Urbanization, Monitoring and MYPoW.

- **Regarding CFS outcomes approved by the CFS in 2015**, CSM Working Groups have disseminated and promoted the use and application of the respective CFS policy documents, particularly the Policy Recommendations on Water for Food Security and Nutrition the Framework for Action on Protracted Crises (FFA), as reported to the CFS Advisory Group and Bureau in March 2016 and the CFS FFA Outreach event in September 2016 in Nairobi.

- **Regarding earlier CFS outcome documents**, CSM Constituencies have realized capacity buildings to promote the use and application of CFS outcomes, for example through international workshops of the agricultural and food workers’ constituency in September 2015 and July 2016.

- **Monitoring the use and application of CFS outcomes**: the CSM Working Group on monitoring has embarked in a major undertaking for a global civil society monitoring report on the use and the application of the VGGT. A broad range of local, national, regional and global civil society organizations have contributed to this effort. The report will be presented to the first Global Thematic Event on Monitoring during CFS 43.

In principle, the linkages and working relations between the CSM and the members, participants and bodies of the CFS are well defined in the CFS Reform Document. The CSM, as established in the CSM Founding Document is fully acknowledged by the CFS as an essential and autonomous part of the reformed CFS. Achievements and challenges in the reporting period: the CSM has taken several measures to increase mutual understanding in the CFS through enhanced regular dialogue, exchange with CFS members and participants. In practice, this pro-active and explanatory approach included three well attended CSM organized information events during the inter-sessional period and continued bilateral dialogues with the CFS Chair, Bureau members, OEWG Chairs, AG members and the CFS Secretariat. In general, the perception is that mutual understanding has improved during the reporting period through this kind of interaction. However, at some point of time a further clarification was necessary, when a misleading statement was made that farmers, pastoralist, fisherfolks, and other food producers had not participated in the CFS so far. The CSM expressed its concern, and the CFS Bureau decided to invite the CSM for a presentation of its work and constituencies which was certainly helpful to illustrate and clarify the character of the CSM as the space through which the most representative international platforms of family farmers, pastoralists, fisherfolks and other small-scale food producers have engaged with the CFS since its reform. The lesson learned from this case is that utmost clarity is needed, to ensure that the CFS can fulfill its mandate effectively. The CSM expects that the fundamental decision of the CFS Reform, to give special attention and space to the voices of the constituencies of the most affected by food insecurity and malnutrition, who are at the same time the most important contributors to food security and nutrition, will continue to be a consensus within the CFS.
1. Context

Discussions about the political situation of the CFS and the assessment of its development after the reform have been part of the CSM Work since the beginning. Important occasions of collective debate within the CSM during the recent years have been:

- The CSM Forum 2014, with substantial assessment of the CFS 5 years after the reform.
- The CSM Forum 2015 which included a discussion on global trends and challenges – What role for the CFS?
- The CSM Forum 2016 public debate on the “CFS at the crossroads - 7 Years after its reform”, which was included in the agenda of the Forum after an in-depth discussion of the CC in May 2016 on the topic.

This discussion is also important and timely as the CFS Evaluation has started in September 2016. It will involve all actors and bodies of the CFS, including members, participants and observers, on the Rome level and also through several country visits. Two draft versions of the evaluation report shall be discussed in February and March; the discussion on the response to the report recommendations will be a major issue of debate between April and October 2017.

Many social and civil society organizations participating in the CSM, and also the Coordination Committee of the CSM believe that the CFS is at a critical point. In order to inform proposals for the future, it is important to highlight some of the most important assets and achievements of the reformed CFS, and to assess the limitations and challenges the CFS faced during the past years and months.

2. Main assets and achievements of the CFS

Civil society organizations have considered the following points as essential assets and achievements of the CFS:

- Since its reform in 2009, the Committee for World Food Security has become the foremost inclusive intergovernmental and international platform to promote policy convergence, coherence, coordination and cooperation for food security and nutrition.
- In response to the food price crisis of 2007/8, the CFS reform established a new vision for global governance on food security and nutrition, with a strong mandate to foster the progressive realization of the human right to adequate food, opening the space to all relevant actors, but explicitly underlining that particular spaces and voice should be given to those constituencies who are most affected and at risk, and who are at the same time the most important contributors for food security and nutrition worldwide.
- In that sense, the CFS has become a unique space in the United Nations System where the voices of small-scale food producers, family farmers, fisher folks, indigenous peoples, food and agricultural workers, pastoralists, landless, women, youth, consumers, the urban food insecure and NGOs have been able to actively participate through an autonomous and open space, the CSM.
- Most topics dealt with by the CFS so far have been extremely relevant to urgent demands of CSM constituencies: governance of tenure of land, fisheries and forests, gender equality, investment in smallholder agriculture, connecting smallholders to markets, fisheries, climate change, responsible agricultural investment, food security and nutrition in protracted crises, water, food loss and waste, and others which all together compose the Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition.

2. The analyzed trends and challenges at that occasion included global trade policies destroying small-scale food production; mega-mergers and concentration processes in the global agri-food and nutrition corporate sector; Sustainable Development Goals; the unprecedented displacement of people through conflicts and protracted crises; and the monitoring and accountability challenge of the CFS.
• The CSM constituencies and working groups have formulated positions and contributed proposals to all CFS processes since the reform, with an enormous commitment of its participating organizations to the different workstreams. Through this engagement, social movements and civil society organizations have contributed an enormous amount of substance and legitimacy to the CFS, and are among the most active actors and promoters of the use, application and monitoring of CFS outcomes.

• The CSM, with its exclusive mandate to facilitate civil society participation to the CFS, is at the same time the most inclusive and largest space of civil society organizations working on food security and nutrition worldwide. Its participating organizations, particularly those who organize small-scale food producers and consumers, represent far more than 380 million individual members from all continents. This fact is an incredible asset for the CFS. No other UN Committee or Commission can claim to have a similarly huge participation of these constituencies.

• The HLPE has been called by many the second pillar of innovation to the CFS, as it introduced a knowledge-policy interface with the CFS, which in addition to the comprehensive analysis of academic research also uses the extraordinary diversity of actors in the CFS in their role as knowledge holders. The inclusive methodology as well as the quality of its reports have been widely acknowledged by actors from governments, intergovernmental agencies, academia, civil society and private sector.

3. Limitations and challenges

Since the discussion before the Reform of the CFS, there have been controversial discussions about the general orientation of the process, including the vision and roles of the reformed CFS. All these discussions were concluded with the unanimous approval of the CFS Reform Document in 2009. When assessing the effectiveness of the CFS Reform 7 years later, we can observe that some of the previous controversies still remain and present challenges today. Other limitations have become more evident over the years, others only recently. The following list is not complete, but points out some key concerns from a civil society view:

• Regarding the Vision of the CFS: the Reform Document clearly defines as essential part of the CFS Vision Statement that: “The CFS will strive for a world free from hunger where countries implement the voluntary guidelines for the progressive realization of the right to adequate food in the context of national food security.” The mandate of the CFS to work for the progressive realization of the right to food, in line with the principles of universality, indivisibility, interdependence and interrelatedness of all human rights, has been challenged by some actors in many occasions. The centrality of human rights for the CFS work on food security and nutrition is fundamental to contribute to the progressive realization of the rights to adequate food. The fact that the concept of women’s rights has not been explicitly and consistently included into CFS outcome documents, is not acceptable and extremely problematic. We expect the CFS Members and all other participants to fully recognize and support the centrality of human rights and women’s rights for food security and nutrition in future CFS decisions.

• Priority attention to the voices of the most affected by food insecurity and malnutrition: the Reform Document states: “The CFS is and remains an intergovernmental Committee. It will be composed of members, participants and observers and will seek to achieve a balance between inclusiveness and effectiveness. Its composition will ensure that the voices of all relevant stakeholders – particularly those most affected by food insecurity – are heard.” These sentences express clearly that a) decisions of the CFS will
be taken by Member countries, that b) everybody will be heard, and c) special voice and space will be given to the constituencies of the most affected by food insecurity and malnutrition. This is the spirit of the CFS Reform, of a new vision of inclusive governance on food security and nutrition. The constituencies of the most affected by food insecurity are specified in paragraph 11, ii) in the Reform Document, and they are identical with the constituencies of the CSM. The CSM was created as the space for them in the CFS. If some actors today claim that the private and corporate sector should have the same space as civil society in the CFS, they try to ignore this fundamental decision of the Reform. Moreover, an observer organization with strong links to the interests of large-scale and industrial agriculture suggested in two recent negotiations (Smallholder to Markets, and Livestock) that the smallholder focus of the respective CFS negotiation document should be deleted. This is a deep misunderstanding of the CFS Reform and an attempt to destroy the focus on small-scale food producers that has been consensus in the CFS outcomes so far. We expect CFS members and participants to consistently reject all attempts to abolish these main achievements of the reform.

- The implementation challenge: It is evident that one of the weaknesses of the CFS is the lack of use, implementation and monitoring of its decisions and outcomes. There is an enormous potential of impact when a CFS instrument such as the VGGT is being applied in policies and programmes. The ongoing monitoring exercise provides detailed evidence for that. Unfortunately, this is not the case for many other CFS outcomes. Civil society organizations have taken important steps to facilitate the use other complex CFS outcomes, such as the GSF, to make CFS decisions useable for actors on the national level, to “bring the results of Rome back home”. However, the general assessment is that government, civil society and the RBA need to do much more to foster and promote the use and application of CFS outcomes on all levels.

- The monitoring challenge: When looking into the roles of the CFS, as defined in 2009, it is clear that the role on “Promoting accountability and sharing best practices”, including through an innovative monitoring mechanism, has been the CFS function with the lowest degree of compliance. However, the recent decisions of CFS 42, which led to the Global Monitoring Event at CFS 43 and to the Terms of Reference for Monitoring Events, to be adopted by CFS 43, are initial steps of progress in this area. It is important in this regard to remind that without a proper monitoring mechanism, it would be impossible to know if and how the CFS outcomes have made a difference for policies on food security and nutrition on country, regional and global level. Hence, strengthening the monitoring and accountability function of the CFS remain one of the outstanding challenges of the future.

- Policy convergence: The negotiated strategic outcomes of the CFS are the result of policy convergence processes that took several years, and their extraordinary value is widely appreciated within and outside the CFS. These negotiation processes addressed burning and controversial issues of high relevance for food security and nutrition. However, the current biennium is the first after the reform in which no major negotiation process is taking place. And still, many members and participants complain about the amount of work required for the different processes. A general feeling is that the CFS has entered too many processes, some of them only superficially, while an increased amount of papers makes it difficult for many delegations to fully follow and participate in processes. Policy convergence should not shy away from the difficult topics, and some of them have been blocked by few actors, just because they don’t want to see these topics being discussed. Policy convergence is particularly necessary on those issues of high relevance on which a divergence of views prevails. What is needed is the courage to prioritize and address those key issues that are contentious but central to food
security and nutrition, taking into account particularly the relevance for constituencies most affected by hunger and malnutrition.

• **Budget and MYPoW**: a key problem of the CFS in the current biennium is the lack of funding to carry out the integrity of the agreed MYPoW. A donor-driven agenda setting of the CFS is not acceptable, nor a donor-driven partial implementation of the agreed MYPoW. Unfortunately, some workstreams are funded, and others are not. The negotiations on “Connecting Smallholders to Markets” where the first negotiations within the reformed CFS without official interpretation. The cost of the interpretation for this important policy convergence negotiation would have been 35,000 USD which was finally not within the financial possibilities of the CFS. No resources were available at the beginning of September 2016 for the CFS workstreams in 2017 on Women’s empowerment, GSF, monitoring, while other workstreams can even afford organizing additional events. The lack of interpretation puts the inclusiveness of the CFS at risk, particularly when it comes to negotiations. The current deficit in the budget of the HLPE puts at risk the possibility to having its reports translated in other languages than English in 2017. A structural and effective solution to the CFS budget problem must be found, and for that the collaboration of all Member States, regions and the RBA is essential.

• **Inclusiveness and roles of actors in a multi-stakeholder setting**: what does inclusive governance mean in the CFS context? It does mean that all actors, as Member States or in advisory function, or as observers can contribute according to their roles, and that clarity about roles and responsibilities is ensured. An unspecified use of multi-stakeholder language, that does not differentiate between members, distinct kind of participants, and observers sometimes creates confusion about the roles and responsibilities. For instance, there is an important distinction between stakeholders and rights-holders, particular when addressing rights and duties in a human rights based institutional framework. There is another important distinction between public interest and private interest, particularly when it comes to the formulation of policy formulation for food security and nutrition in an UN context. While the role of states and intergovernmental agencies, as well as of civil society organizations is very clear in this framework, there is a need to better clarify the role of the private sector: the private and corporate sector that has been defending interest of profit-oriented agribusiness cannot claim the same legitimacy and space in the CFS as the constituencies of small-scale producers, consumers and public interest groups that defend the rights of hundreds of millions of people affected or at risk of food insecurity and malnutrition. In addition, the CFS needs to elaborate robust standards against potential conflict of interest, to address properly the tensions between public and private interest in the field of food security and nutrition.

• **Ambition**: the added value of the CFS lies in the full compliance with its vision to be the foremost inclusive intergovernmental and international platform within the United Nations on food security and nutrition, to promote coordination, convergence, coherence cooperation and accountability of policies on food security and nutrition towards the progressive realization of the right to adequate food. This is the ambition of the CFS reform. It is not the added value of the CFS to be reduced to a niche for issues that are dealt with in other forums, to conduct “light” negotiations or focus on being a forum to share best practices and lessons learned. There is indeed a strong need for much more effective policy convergence, policy coordination and policy coherence on food security and nutrition.
on the global level. If the CFS does not address this challenge, it misses its mission. Other forums or diffuse multi-stakeholder initiatives cannot claim the legitimacy the CFS has.

4. The way ahead: the CFS at the crossroads

Taking into consideration what is outlined above, there are two possible pathways to the future of the CFS.

1. **One option is the way of the erosion of the CFS reform,** by revising fundamental decisions taken with the reform, and slowly evolving into an insignificant multi-stakeholder forum which claims to comply with its vision and roles, but in reality does not have the needed political commitment, clarity, support and budget to comply with its functions as defined in the Reform. Such CFS would:
   - Put in doubt its fundamental commitment with the right to adequate food and its human rights mandate;
   - Ignore the decision of the CFS reform to give special space to the voices of small-scale food producers, family farmers, fisherfolks, indigenous peoples, food and agricultural workers, pastoralists, the landless, women, youth, consumers, the urban food insecure and NGOs;
   - Treat the constituencies of the most affected by hunger and malnutrition as equal to the agribusiness community composed by the private sector, companies, large farmers, and private philanthropic foundations;
   - Avoid to make strong and new efforts to foster the use, application and monitoring of its outcomes on the national, regional and global level;
   - Avoid to tackle difficult issues for the policy convergence process, concentrating in those issues that are not contentious and are not dealt with by others;
   - Shy away from the fundamental need to foster policy coordination and coherence on food security and nutrition on all levels;
   - Be weak due to the lack of political and financial support of its members and the RBA.

2. **The other option is to strengthen the CFS in line with the vision and roles defined in the CFS Reform.** This would require self-critical, in-depth learning process on progress and shortcomings regarding the effective compliance with its roles, and the political commitment of CFS members and participants to reaffirm and reinforce their practical commitment with key decisions of the CFS Reform. Such CFS would give priority attention to:
   - The human rights mandate of the CFS, particularly the right to adequate food and women’s rights in the context of food security and nutrition;
   - The focus on the constituencies most affected by food insecurity and malnutrition, giving more space to the voices of the constituencies of small-scale food producers, family farmers, fisherfolks, indigenous peoples, food and agricultural workers, pastoralists, the landless, women, youth, consumers, the urban food insecure and NGOs;
   - Promote together with Member States and RBA, civil society and other actors, the use and application of CFS instruments on all levels;
   - Put in practice and further develop the monitoring mechanism of the CFS, encouraging the realization of national and regional monitoring events and establishing an annual Global Thematic monitoring event during the CFS Plenary;
   - Focus the selection of topics for the policy convergence process on those issues that are most relevant for food security and nutrition, particularly for the most affected and at risk, and on which policy convergence, policy coherence and coordination are strongly needed.
   - Establish a solid and sustainable funding structure of the CFS, which would reflect the support of all members and the RBA to the CFS, and ensure the full implementation of the agreed MYPOW.
   - Clarify the terms of participation of the private and corporate sector within the CFS and develop robust safeguards to protect the space from conflict of interest, to address the tensions between public and private interest in the field of food security and nutrition in an adequate and effective way.
   - Keep the ambition of the CFS Reform and make every effort necessary to fulfill its vision to be the foremost inclusive intergovernmental and international platform within the United Nations on food security and nutrition, to promote coordination, convergence, coherence, cooperation and accountability of policies on food security and nutrition towards the progressive realization of the right to adequate food.
REPORTING AND FOLLOWING-UP ON CFS 42

Assessing the CFS process on “Water for Food Security and Nutrition”

The process towards developing the CFS recommendations on the Water for Food Security and Nutrition was challenging, but largely a success for Civil Society in terms of both process and content. Not all things were included, but the recommendations encourage states to make small-scale producers, workers and other CSM constituencies at the centre of the strategies towards Food Security and Nutrition (FSN) (see Rec. number 7). Additionally, many of the recommendations promote cross-sectorial coordination in policy implementation, and build mutual understanding on the multidimensional sides of water as it relates to food security- as the CFS box states and recalls: “water is the lifeblood of ecosystems.”

The political process towards the development of the decision box, and even to an extent the HLPE Report, took into account a lot of the civil society inputs. The coordination of the CFS Working Group (WG) remained very open to all actors, respecting the rules and procedures of the CFS policy processes. CSM worked to put forward inputs with support from Member States, which were well-rooted in other CFS processes, and reflected a great deal of consolidation and consultation across the CSM constituencies, organizations and those who were very knowledgeable on issues of water. The process was thus constructive overall.

Human Rights

General approach:
The original language in the draft decision box reduced the emphasis on the linkages between the rights to water and food, and further diminished the right to water to drinking water and sanitation rather than encompassing the multiple dimensions of the right. For the CSM, the realization of the right to water is essential to the realization of many other human rights, as it has many dimensions and linkages to other rights and issues. The authoritative interpretation of the right to water, in General Comment no 15 with its linkages to the rights to land, food, health and nutrition underscores this broader understanding. The language used in the HLPE report was very progressive but many states wanted to see weakened language with a focus on “accessibility” rather than rights. The CSM was unwilling to accept language that lowered the standards agreed upon UN language on human rights. In the end- we were unable to have our ideal language, but we were able to have clear linkages stated between the human right to adequate food in the context of national food security and the human right to safe drinking water and sanitation- this is an important precedent that we should maintain in future negotiations and policy processes.

Women’s rights:
Despite the strong overarching human rights framework - specific issues arise in the negotiations where the CSM did not get their position. These issues should be a huge red flag for civil society in moving forward in future negotiations, as these are consistent areas of contention. One of them is the issue of gender and women’s rights, which consistently comes into play in the CFS spaces and negotiations - with states preferring mild language such as “gender equality” and “women’s empowerment” over women’s rights- with some states, specifically Russia, blocking the discussion all together (see paragraph 3. E). It is critical that in terms of water and FSN - “empowering women” to access water is much different than ensuring compliance to human rights obligations of states- this is something that continues to come up in other workstreams, and we should seek to set a ‘precedent’ elsewhere, and build capacity of states to understand the difference between rights and empowerment.

Territories
The CSM WG pushed for language that reflected issues around territorial approaches (noting that the Spanish version of the HLPE report used the work “territorio” instead of the English word “landscape”). Member States were not convinced that this language should be used, as the understating of the limits of “territories” and how it is actually defined was and is still under development in many international fora. For the CSM this term reflects not only the indigenous concept of territory, but also reflects trans-boundary issues, and the potential for discussion policy implications at different scales- specifically the local/sub-national level. This is an issue that surely came up in the workstreams during the coming year leading to CFS 43, and is something that civil society needs to define, defend, and use in future policy negotiations and discussions.

Investments and PPPs
As always, public-private partnerships were presented as a primary strategy towards realizing improvements in food security and nutrition- and in this case towards efficient and diverse water for agricultural systems (paragraph 4). As public funding continues to decrease, in general, many states are quick to support PPPs as a way to finance development, and are presented as best practices. The HLPE report was quite critical towards PPPs, and was quite clear on the negative impact of a lack of regulations on private (and to an extent some public) actors across sectors. In the draft decision box, PPPs were presented as the best practice rather than one strategy, and without mentioning the wealth of information that exists to counter this position. With the current direction of policymaking and “solutions” to FSN and infrastructure generally, it was impossible to convince the CFS actors to remove PPPs as a strategy, however there was a big achievement in the document with the addition in paragraph 4b of “public-private partnerships with regulations to safeguard the public interest”. This addition is an important precedent, and allows an entry point to hold states accountable to obligations of regulating the private sector, and to be accountable to the public/citizens.

Governance of Natural Resources
The participatory governance of natural resources in general, and of water resources in particular is promoted in this decision box (specifically recommendation 7).

An important addition in recommendation 7 is the addition of local mechanisms of resource governance, which can be interpreted to sub-national governments, as well as legitimize and promote community-level water management strategies and mechanisms. Additionally, point 3a and 8b also recognize the needs to understand how the issues of water and land tenure intersect, and with the promotion of the Tenure Guidelines, they provide a clear entry point to better understand how water could be interpreted in the Tenure Guidelines- an issue that was intentionally left out of that document.

The issue of water pricing was discussed at some length in the development of the decision box, and in the actual negotiations. It also further pushed the trend that we are increasingly seeing towards the financialization of natural resources. The issue of water pricing, like other mechanisms of financial regulation, are presented to encourage sustainability, but in reality they often block access for small-scale producers, communities, and other persons in need but without financial resources to have access. Water has a value, which should be separated from the financial prices. The word “prices” itself reduces the value of water to its economic value only, ignoring the social and cultural values that water, and for that matter other natural resources have. This also goes into the larger issue of “pricing” the commons, and to alternative ways of regulating natural resources. Also, it is noteworthy that emergency food reserves were recognized as a strategy for water stressed net food importing countries to prevent and minimize food price volatility risks.

It was important that the CFS agreed to include in the Policy Recommendations the sentence stating: “Refrain from using water as an instrument for political or economic pressure”. This insertion is important in many different contexts, and particularly in situations of protracted crises.

Follow-up, Monitoring and Accountability
As in all CFS processes, and in the CFS as a whole, issues of monitoring and accountability were a huge challenge in the negotiations of the decision box. It was agreed that CFS should “take into account” water in future decisions- and it will be up to the CSM to ensure that this is followed through within the framework that was developed in the decision box. The HLPE report on Water for FSN is also very comprehensive and covers many topics and has very good recommendations, and doesn’t shy away from criticism when appropriate- this document should be recalled when relevant in other CFS workstreams.

While additional forums within the CFS were not agreed upon, what was acknowledged is that:

1. The CFS should ensure a thorough Follow up on the decision box on Water for Food Security and Nutrition
2. The CFS should take into account the decision box when following up the SDGs As the CFS decides how it will relate to the SDGs, what is clear is that national level reporting and data collec-
tion will be strong, and the inclusion of water as it relates to goal 2 (ending hunger and malnutrition), will be important - and the responsibility of all, including Civil Society, to push for this holistic and integrated approach.

3. The strong human rights framework of this decision also ensures a clear link to human rights obligations, which we could recall when producing reports towards State reporting mechanisms within the human rights council.

**Framework for Action for Food Security and Nutrition in Protracted Crises (FFA) – The Way Forward**

The CSM WG working on Protracted Crisis presented a summary assessment of the Framework for Action negotiation process in last year’s CSM annual report of 2014/2015. Regarding the way forward, the following considerations and proposals should be taken into account.

Following the endorsement of the Framework for Action on Food Insecurity and Nutrition in Protracted Crises (FFA) there is a need to ensure that its principles are implemented both broadly and effectively. To do this, a number of actions need to be taken.

**Mobilize Political Commitment**

All stakeholders should disseminate the FFA and promote its use in the development, implementation, and monitoring of more effective policies and actions at global, regional, national, local and institutional levels. The CFS should develop a communication strategy for the FFA.

**Define Roles and Responsibilities**

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

**Integrate the FFA into the work of different UN Bodies**

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

The UN Secretary General (UNSG) through existing mechanisms (e.g. High Level Task Force on the Global Food Security Crisis, the UNSG's Special Representative for Food Security and Nutrition, or the Chief Executives' Board) should act as an advocate and catalyst in order to: address food security and nutrition in protracted crisis situations; promote the use of the FFA in reviewing and strengthening policies and actions; promote integration into broader global and regional initiatives; work together to mobilize high level commitment and action amongst all stakeholders.

The UN Human Rights System and Special Procedures, particularly the Special Rapporteurs on the Right to Food, on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, on the Human Rights of Internally Displaced Persons, and other relevant offices under the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, should integrate the FFA into their work and contribute to its implementation, monitoring and evaluation of progress, as well as to develop the capacity of States and other stakeholders for this purpose.

**Develop and Strengthen Multi-Actor Platforms**

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

---

7. For more information on this process visit: [http://www.csm4cfs.org/working-groups/protracted-crisis/](http://www.csm4cfs.org/working-groups/protracted-crisis/)
On the global level, the CFS Bureau and Advisory Group could oversee the establishment and work of a multi-stakeholder technical working group (TWG). The TWG will provide and facilitate demand-led support to regions and countries to develop, implement and monitor policies and actions, and to collate and disseminate lessons learnt. Greater benefits can also be gained through increased regional and South-South cooperation.

Enhance the role of Civil Society Organizations
CSOs have a vital role to play in the promotion and application of the FFA by helping shape policies, design and implement projects, build institutional and human capacity, and facilitating knowledge and technology transfer. CSOs must also be pro-active in monitoring and accountability mechanisms.

In line with FFA Paragraph 36 (i) stakeholders should facilitate the framework “access to, and understanding by, the communities and organizations of protracted crisis affected populations.” The CSM could commit, with the support of other stakeholders, to producing simplified guidelines on how civil society should act to advance the principles in the FFA.

Revise Current Policies and Actions
There is a need to revise current policies and actions to ensure that they fall in line with the FFA. All stakeholder including donors, cooperation partners, international organizations, civil society and the private sector should facilitate reviews of their own policies and actions. Lessons learnt and plans for advancing the FFA principles should be shared amongst stakeholders.

Development of Materials to Support the FFA
Additional materials should be developed to support the application of the FFA, including:

- A user-friendly guide to existing human rights norms applicable to food insecurity and malnutrition in protracted crisis situations, and an accessible policy reform kit to assist CFS stakeholders in developing informed and legally compliant policies and actions. This will allow all parties, both within bureaus and in the field, to benefit from a common, accessible reference tailored to meet their need to make informed and legally compliant decisions.

Monitoring
Monitoring the progress of the implementation of the FFA is another key step. The CFS should be responsible for this at the global, regional, national, and local level, ensuring that monitoring is in line with the five principles set out in the GFS (vii) and is informed by the CFS endorsed Framework for Monitoring CFS Decisions.

The CFS should strengthen and further develop its own monitoring mechanism with the aim of receiving, compiling, and synthesizing feedback, field reports and case studies relevant to the progress of the FFA implementation, and preparing and disseminating an annual report on the use and effectiveness of the guidelines, including lessons learnt.

The CSM Working Group on Protracted Crisis was invited by the CFS Secretariat to participate in the one-day “Reach Out Event on the Framework for Action for Food Security and Nutrition in Protracted Crises” held on the 19th of September in Nairobi, Kenya.

The objective of the event was to raise awareness on the FFA at country/regional level and to promote operationalization at field level.

The event, sponsored and funded by the EU, focused on seven African countries where the EU has ongoing projects: 1) Somalia; 2) South Sudan; 3) Sudan; 4) Ethiopia; 5) DRC 6) Chad 7) Kenya; where by about 5 participants from each country, including government representatives, CSM and the Private Sector Mechanism (PSM) representatives and RBA field staff were invited.

Please read the CSM WG on Protracted Crises Update, including the Report from the Nairobi event at this link: http://www.csm4cfs.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/Protracted-Crises-Working-Group-Updates.pdf
CIVIL SOCIETY CONTRIBUTIONS TO CFS PROCESSES IN 2016: TOWARDS CFS 43

Nutrition

The Nutrition Working Group has been involved in various activities during the inter-sessional period following CFS 42. The group—comprised of over 120 individuals representing social movements and public interest CSOs—has participated in the development of the CFS document that will be presented for endorsement at CFS 43 entitled “Engagement in Advancing Nutrition”, which outlines the CFS’s vision for its work stream on nutrition.

The working group’s involvement in this process included the joint development of comments on draft versions of this document and participation in each of the Open-Ended Working Group during which this document was negotiated.

The work of this group has focused on several key themes that will be described below and that are further detailed in the group’s vision statement:

- The CFS’s work on nutrition should re-affirm the centrality of human rights and the right to food to ensure that there is convergence between the activities of the nutrition work stream and the mandate of the CFS;

- The human rights perspective should not simply be employed at the level of discourse to frame the topic of nutrition but rather it should permeate each activity within the CFS’s nutrition work stream;

- Acknowledgement of the indivisibility of human rights and that the full realization of women’s human rights, the right to water, seeds, land, indigenous peoples and health are indispensable to ensure the right to food;

- Recognition that addressing the challenge of malnutrition in all its forms requires a holistic analysis that combines political, social and technical perspectives. Above all, it requires recognizing the need for urgency and justice, and appreciating that nutrition is achieved not only when nutrient requirements are met but when agricultural diversity, human dignity, equity, sustainability and sovereignty are achieved and individuals are enabled to express their values, cultures and social relations through their food practices;

- It should be guaranteed that the work on nutrition includes a focus on the root causes of all forms of malnutrition—political, environmental and social—rather than solely on medicalized or product-based solutions, when not in conditions of strict emergency.

- There is a need for robust safeguards against conflicts of interest that protect the integrity of CFS’s decision-making processes; the financial integrity and independence of the CFS and the independence of the scientific/knowledge generation process.

These positions have also framed the CSM WG contributions to the High-Level Panel of Experts Report on Food Systems & Nutrition (to be completed in the lead-up to CFS 44). The Nutrition Working Group submitted a joint submission for the online consultation for this report.

Also, the WG was instrumental to suggest and organize a CSM Side Event during CFS 43 on Conflict of Interest (CoI), with the objective to raise awareness for the risks that conflicts of interest pose to the realization of the right to food and nutrition and the ability of CoI to undermine the legitimacy and effectiveness of nutrition efforts. The event will recall the need to protect the decision making processes on food security and nutrition against such conflicts, as explicitly mentioned in CFS’s ‘Engagement in Advancing Nutrition’ document, the Second International Conference on Nutrition (ICN2) Framework for Action and the ‘Public Interest Civil Society Organizations’ and Social Movements’ Forum Declaration to the ICN2’.

Please visit the CSM webpage for more information about the activities of the working group: http://www.csm4cfs.org/working-groups/nutrition/

Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)

The SDGs Working Group was established during the CSM Forum of October 2015. The Working Group had the mandate to draft and consolidate CSO’s positions, visions and inputs into the CFS workstream on “CFS engagement with Sustainable Development Goals” for the next biennium 2016-2017 as approved by the Multi-Year Programme.
of Work (MYPoW) endorsed at the 42nd CFS Plenary Session in October 2015.

The WG participated actively in the various meetings and started by presenting the CSM vision on the engagement of the CFS in the implementation of the Agenda 2030. The CSM position was based on a number of core principles, notably the full respect and enhancement of the current CFS mandate, the Centrality of Human Rights (the perspective of the Right to Adequate Food, RAF), the centrality of past and potential future policy products, as included in the GSF, the subsidiarity between the CFS and the High-Level Political Forum (HLPF), and the engagement of the primary contributors to food security and those most affected.

The CSM continued by identifying three core domains for CFS engagement, the normative domain, stressing the need to strengthen CFS normative instruments of the past, present and future, the coordination domain in particular the importance of policy coherence with RAF and GSF, and finally the monitoring and accountability domain, deeply embedded in the direct participation of the primary contributors to food security and those most affected, (this domain is complementary of the approach on data and indicators).

Based on this approach, the SDGs WG negotiated the final CFS proposal which outlines the most relevant areas where the CFS can contribute. The final proposal reflects some of the major CSM points. First of all it recognizes the CFS as the foremost global governance platform on food security and nutrition, and the fact that “The Committee provides an enabling space which emphasizes the centrality of human rights, gender equality and women’s empowerment and targeting of vulnerable groups, as essential conditions for country progress on food security and nutrition, including on the food security and nutrition related goals of the 2030 Agenda.” One Country Delegation raised an objection aimed at removing the centrality of human rights, and will probably be brought to discussion in the Plenary. However, the CSM is firmly rejecting this option and will defend this point vocally.

The proposal also respects the mandate of the CFS as defined in the CFS reform document, although the monitoring and accountability is not as strong as we would have liked to see, focusing more on sharing lessons and exchanging good practices and challenges. However, the participation of the most vulnerable in this exercise and the inclusion of “stock-taking sessions on the use of CFS products, documenting catalysts, constraints and results achieved around a CFS product at local, country or regional level (such as the VGGT event planned for CFS 43 and contributing to CFS monitoring)” is in coherence with the approach the CSM pushes for around monitoring.

The SDGs WG also contributed in framing how the CFS could and should play a role in the global thematic review that the HLPF will undertake periodically. In this regard, the SDGs WG pushed for the principle of subsidiarity, the respect of the primary mandate of the CFS in the analysis and review of the food and security situation, and the full consideration of the CFS policy products as tools for the achievement of the right to food.

The SDGs WG is also quite satisfied with the process for the way forward, as the mandate of the MYPoW is well recognized in defining further activities, as well as the participatory approach which will be ensured by foreseen role for the CFS Task Team and the same OEWG for all the follow up activities.

As last activity, the SDGs WG worked on the Guidance Note that will guide the discussion in the Plenary on the contribution that the CFS will prepare for the HLPF review in 2017. The Guidance Note, with the Proposal for the CFS engagement in the Agenda 2030, will be presented to Plenary for endorsement and discussion.

Please visit the CSM webpage for more information about the activities of the working group: http://www.csm4cfs.org/working-groups/sdg/

Connecting Smallholders to Markets

The CSM argued strongly that the CFS should open up a workstream on this vital issue following-up to the 2013 policy recommendations on “Investing in Smallholder Agriculture for Food Security”. The CSM participated actively in preparations for the High Level Forum (HLF) held on 25 June 2015 and delivered clear messages to it. It was originally envisaged that the HLF would agree on policy recommendations to be submitted to the CFS plenary in October 2015. It became evident, however, that this would not be possible due to the serious gap in information and analysis regarding the “invisible” markets in which most smallholders participate and differences of view among CFS members and participants. As advocated by the CSM, it was decided that the CFS Task Team (including a member each from the CSM and the PSM) would continue to work, collecting additional information and preparing a two-day “once-off” OEWG meeting in June 2016.

The CSM is convinced – and the experience of this workstream confirms it – that participation by key AG members in the preparation of documents for debate by the CFS, alongside the secretariat, makes an important contribution to framing the discussion in a way that is relevant for those participants most subject to food insecurity. Moreover, political negotiation in an OEWG or a CFS plenary is indispensable to confer authority and ownership on CFS products.

The outcome of the HLF was reported to a broad range of civil society parti-
participants during the CSM Forum in October 2015 and a strategy for the successive months was discussed.

The CSM strategy set the following objectives:

- Make visible our “invisible” markets. Document our existing markets throughout the world. Systematize our ongoing experience and demonstrate how these markets work for us and for food security/right to food and how they differ from “the formal market”.
- Clarify key concepts and question dominant paradigms such as “the market”, value and value chains, PPPs, contract farming, cooperatives, urban/rural relations, local food markets and international trade.
- Emphasize the importance of public policies and indicate what kind of legal frameworks, infrastructure and investments are required at all levels to support markets that work for people’s right to food.
- Looking at the implications for food security/right to food of different trade regimes.

A working group dedicated to follow this workstream was set up. It grew to include 54 members from all regions and constituencies, demonstrating the importance of this issue for small-scale food producers. Members of the group, supported by some academics, collected case studies and articles documenting the importance of informal, territorial markets and supportive public policies (Bibliography) to begin to fill the data gap on territorial markets and provide evidence to back up civil society positions. The CSM participated actively in the Task Team and made detailed comments on the Zero Draft and successively on the Chair’s Proposal. As always, all of these positions have been circulated in English, Spanish and French to maintain the inclusiveness of the consultation.

Thanks to the support provided by the French Government and by IFAD it was possible to bring larger delegations to both of the meetings that took place in 2016. 25 focal points from different constituencies and regions attended the Informal Consultation held on 28 April, preceded by a two-day civil society consultation on the Zero Draft and a CSM information meeting with governments. Following this meeting an advocacy document was produced and used widely in discussions with governments and other CFS participants between April and June.

A group of 26 persons prepared for the round of negotiations (6-9 June). The Chair’s proposal to follow an “innovative approach” to negotiations created confusion, and, combined with the lack of interpretation made it difficult for non-English speakers. The CSM has strongly stated that interpretation is a prerequisite for negotiations in the CFS and that the modality used in these negotiations should not be replicated without an overall assessment. However, thanks to the Chairs’ capacity for dialogue and listening and the great efforts that the CSM made to reach out to governments and allies, the outcomes of the negotiations were positive. The CSM, supported by some governments, insisted on including explicit mention of the application of the recommendations in the negotiated text. The CSM is also committed to using them in its advocacy to help ensure that they are applied in the context of national and regional policies and programmes and in the work of CFS participants and that they are brought back to the CFS for review.

In fact the recommendations include the major points advocated by the CSM: i) they recognize that the main bulk of food is channelled through markets linked to local, national and regional food systems, which are those in which most smallholders participate, thereby clearly positioning these markets as uppermost amongst different kinds of market systems in the context of food security and nutrition; ii) they urge governments to employ public policy to support these markets, both by strengthening territorial markets where they already exist and by opening up new spaces for these markets to take root and flourish. In effect, the essential contents of demands from small-scale food producer and other civil society organizations were accepted during the negotiations, although the term “territorial market” could not be included due to the reluctance of some countries to use the word territory this context.

A CSM analytical guide explaining key concepts in the recommendations will be released during CFS 43 and a strategy for application and monitoring of the recommendations will be discussed during the CSM Forum.

Urbanization, Rural Transformation and implications for food security and nutrition

The CSM Working Group on “Urbanization, rural transformation and implications for food security and nutrition” was established in January 2016 with the task of elaborating the CSOs position on CFS work on “Urbanization, rural transformation and implications for food security and nutrition 2016-2017”.

Please visit the CSM webpage for more information about the activities of the working group: http://www.csm4cfs.org/working-groups/connecting-smallholders-to-markets/
The theme of this workstream is broad and overarching, and while attempts have been made to narrow it down, it remains vague. The process seeks to contribute to the implementation of the SDGs in relation to the SDG2, which the entirety of the CFS is focused on, but it also relates to the SDG 11: make cities inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable.

Initially the CFS Multi-Year Plan of Work (MYPoW) 2016-2017 established to hold a Forum on “Urbanization, rural transformation and implications for food security and nutrition” to address the challenges and opportunities arising from rapid urbanization and the transformation of agriculture, the food systems and the rural space. The CFS working process in January – September 2016 was focused on: a) identifying key implications for food security and nutrition presented by urbanization and rural transformation; b) framing the key areas for policy attention; and c) providing options for possible roles for CFS going forward. The process was led by the CFS Secretariat, which elaborated the background document and a draft decision box to be discussed at the CFS 43 Forum on “Urbanization, rural transformation and implications for food security and nutrition.” The documents were developed ostensibly based on previous HLPE Reports, literature review, two technical (expert) workshops organized by the CFS secretariat on February 22 and July 7, the outcomes of the online consultation on the Zero Draft of the background document, and comments from the CFS Bureau and Advisory Group. Finally, the CFS secretariat used these processes to create the background document, which will be the basis for the HLF during CFS 43.

The draft decision box envisages discussion and endorsement of the following issues:

- Convening a two-day Open Ended Working Group (OEWG) meeting on “Urbanization, rural transformation and implications for food security and nutrition” in 2017 to ensure peer and multi-stakeholder learning and good practice sharing as well as reviewing the compilation of identified good practices which can be submitted at CFS 44 as a compendium of effective policy approaches;
- Encouraging the OEWG MYPoW to consider the request of an HLPE report on “Urbanization, rural transformation and implications for food security and nutrition” for presentation to CFS in 2019 as a priority for CFS activities in the biennium 2018-2019, as a starting point for the development of a CFS global policy guidance tool after 2019.

The whole process has been challenging. The objectives of the workstream are not yet clearly defined, and the very weak focus on problems and issues around food production and consumption is problematic, including on food system analysis and solutions. The working group also questioned the unclear vision of the workstream for 2017, which originally suggested for 2017 to limit the focus of this workstream to an exchange of “good practices” on “main policy attention areas” defined in the background document. It was clarified then, that the background document as presented now, has the character of an information note and does not represent the outcome of the policy discussion process.

Additionally, funding constraints prevented translation of documents and interpretation of sessions (held only in English), and limited participation in the “expert workshops” to primarily Rome-based agencies, European participants, or others who could self-fund. This seriously limited input not only from civil society, but also from government and other experts and particularly researchers from the Global South.

**The engagement of the CSM WG in the process**

The theme of the workstream is extremely important for the CSM, as it gives a platform to start discussion on the nature of “rural transformation” the world is facing today and to build alternatives towards more resilient rural spaces, based on territorial approaches, and more coherence between rural and urban development policies. This is especially important as these themes such as “urbanization” and “rural transformation” have often been dealt with by a “silo-approach”, neglecting the rural-urban linkages and driven by centralized, industry-focused policies, which pay little attention to the needs of the communities and most at-risk groups, including (and especially) women. On the other hand, the discussion on “urbanization and rural transformation” is clearly linked to the issues of governance of tenure, smallholder’s access to markets, social protection, etc., on which CFS has already created policy documents and tools, and which need to be applied in practice.

The working group was actively involved in all events and processes related to the workstream in 2016: the representatives of the working group participated in both technical workshops and made active interventions. The working group also submitted inputs on the Zero and First Drafts of the background document, the draft decision box and the agenda of the HLF. These can be found at [http://www.csm4cfs.org/working-groups/urbanization-and-rural-transformation/](http://www.csm4cfs.org/working-groups/urbanization-and-rural-transformation/).

During the discussions and through submitted papers, the civil society presented analysis and wide range of recommendations/suggestions both from rural and urban perspective, which included not only general processes of the work stream and the vision and structure of the background paper, but also detailed recommendations and useful literature for the pre-identified policy attention areas. Main concerns raised by Civil Society related to:

- Better and more clear problem statement aiming at focusing the policy attention on defining the nature/root causes of modern urbanization and rural transformation tendencies and developing more resilient al-
Sustainable Agricultural Development for Food Security and Nutrition, including the role of Livestock

The Civil Society Mechanism (CSM) Working Group (WG) on sustainable agricultural development and livestock comprises 78 participant organisations. Since the beginning of this process, the WG has been actively committed to coordinate the pluralism of its experiences and knowledge and to make political contributions to the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) process. In October 2015, the WG developed a substantial collective response to the zero draft of the HLPE Report and managed to have a political impact on subsequent drafts, thus laying the groundwork for a political framework for the CSM’s input to the negotiations on the CFS Recommendations on this topic.

The first round of negotiations took place on the 8th and 9th of September. The work was carried out on the basis of 10 recommendations out of a total of 14, as proposed by the rapporteur. The next negotiation session to finalise the document will take place on October 12 2016.

The rapporteur’s recommendations are divided into 40% for livestock and 60% for agriculture-related matters. This work was done together with the FAO and the CFS Secretariat. This proposal is considered to take more distance from the HLPE’s document, which had an approach that was closer to the CSM’s contributions.

During our preparatory meetings, we agreed to address the document and make our contributions based on the rapporteur’s suggested criteria, so as to be as specific as possible and not deviate from the agreed language. Below is a summary of the work undertaken at the meeting of the WG on sustainable agricultural development and livestock.

We believe that is essential to recognise small-scale food producers as the main suppliers of good quality foods and to understand that their systems are sustainable. To this end, we need to intervene on the introduction of the text as well as on points 1, 2, 4 and 6, by using the following elements: statistics with clearly disaggregated data, direct linkages with the nutritional benefits of foods from pastoralist family farming, linkages with sustainable management and the belonging to different ecosystems, sustainability from the perspective of production and the contribution to diets. In point 2, we have also included a proposal that is specifically geared towards workers of the sector.

In point 3, we have placed emphasis on human rights as the central pillar of our proposals and women’s rights as the cornerstones of a guaranteed sustainability in the production of food and as the core of the right to food. Nevertheless, we need to insist on the recognition of women’s rights, as some Member States do not approve of a draft that includes this statement.

In point 5, the text provided by the HLPE needs to be reincorporated and the Land Tenure Guidelines should be included, so as to promote our production models. The ecosystem, the community use of natural resources, animal welfare, improved climatic resilience, adequate technology and infrastructure, etc. are all essential components for developing this recommendation.

In points 7, 8, 9 and 10, we consider it to be important to differentiate systems and their characteristics and to highlight the benefits as well as the social and environmental impact of each system, as it would not be possible to make progress if we do not include this description.

Before the negotiation we shared our expectations with some countries; we spoke to Brazil, Ecuador, Argentina etc. They mentioned that we should not lose sight of the focus on food security and nutrition, and that women’s rights should be positioned as playing a key role in nutrition, along with impact on youth and the essential role played by small-scale food producers.

In conclusion, we won some points during the negotiation, and these are worth celebrating, as we have managed to introduce a “focus on small-scale food producers”, “the recognition of the pastoralist sectors and differentiation of integrated systems such as hunter-gatherers”, the degradation of systems, and in the section of prolonged crisis, we have introduced wording on “all situations of conflict.”

Please visit the CSM webpage for more information about the activities of the working group: http://www.csm4cfs.org/working-groups/urbanization-and-rural-transformation
Some of our suggestions were not approved, for instance sentences on “Human Rights”, “Workers’ rights in the sector paying special attention to part-time and immigrant workers”, and on nutrition, wording on excessive consumption and balanced consumption.

Please visit the CSM webpage for more information about the activities of the working group: http://www.csm4cfs.org/working-groups/sustainable-agricultural-development-including-livestock/

Monitoring

The CSM WG contributed to convince governments to amend the decision box related to monitoring during the plenary of CFS 42 so that it reflected two demands from CSM WG: 1) the request to draft basic terms of reference for national, regional and global events to take stock of the use and application of CFS policies; and 2) the request to hold a global thematic session to assess the Tenure Guidelines during CFS 43.

Based on the proposals developed by the CSM WG for a CFS monitoring mechanism in 2014/2015, the CSM WG drafted a proposal for basic terms of reference (ToR) for the monitoring events and had exchanges with governments interested in advancing the establishment of a CFS monitoring mechanism during November - December 2015.

On January 19, 2016, the CSM WG organized an informal meeting to present to interested governments and the CFS Secretariat our proposal for basic terms of reference. The proposal was well received and managed to influence the proposal later presented by the CFS Secretariat and by France in the first session of the OEWG on February 3, 2016. The OEWG agreed to merge the three proposals on the table. A consolidated proposal was presented and agreed in the second session of the OEWG on March 17, 2016. The final endorsement of the ToR will happen during CFS 43.

The CSM WG welcomed the agreed terms of reference. They are the first concrete step to incrementally build the CFS innovative monitoring mechanism. The ToR are clearly built upon the monitoring principles of the Global Strategic Framework (GSF). The ToR therefore provides a useful monitoring framework that CSOs will need to claim and appropriate.

As with all CFS outcomes, the ToR presents shortcomings as well:

- Two competing monitoring frameworks are included in the ToR: on the one hand, the good practices approach and the human rights based approach on the other hand.
- These events could be used to further promote “multi-stakeholderism”.
- The monitoring events will be conducted only on a voluntary basis.
- It is not clear how regularly the global events will be organized. Governments in the OEWG clearly wanted to first see what happens next October and then decide if and when to hold the next event.
- It is not clear yet what will happen with the outcomes/recommendations emerging from monitoring events.
- It is not clear yet if the preparatory work for global thematic events will continue to be in the hands of the CFS Secretariat or of a multi-actor team as the CSM WG proposed.

As an input for the first global thematic event on Tenure Guidelines, the CSM WG prepared an independent CSO report. The entire process of elaborating the report starting with the terms of reference, the questionnaire to collect information, appointing the writing team and peer reviewers, was done in a participatory manner in the WG. Resources to do this report could be secured through FAO. A session to discuss key messages of the report was held in July 2016 in Rome. The report will be part of the background documents of CFS 43 and will be shared with all CFS members and participants. It will also be presented in plenary during the CFS 43 first Global Thematic Monitoring Event on Tenure Guidelines.

The preparatory process for these Global Thematic Events has to improve in the future. Despite the difficulties this time the CSM WG managed to introduce its independent report officially into the event as well as to put a key accountability question framing the event: Panelists are requested to discuss how the design and results of their experiences have contributed to the VGGT’s objective of improving governance of tenure of land, fisheries and forests for the benefit of all, with an emphasis on vulnerable and marginalized people, and to the progressive realization of the right to adequate food.

For our agenda ahead, there is a need to focus on consolidating the monitoring events as a first step to build the CFS monitoring mechanism. The CSM should encourage and support CSOs to promote the organization of national and regional monitoring events in the next year. The topic of the next Global Thematic Event should be identified.

Please visit the CSM webpage for more information about the activities of the working group: http://www.csm4cfs.org/working-groups/monitoring/

Global Strategic Framework (GSF)

This WG was established in 2010 to contribute to the process of developing, drafting and negotiation of the first version of the Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition (GSF), which was adopted in October 2012. The Working Group is currently actively engaged in the periodic updating process of the GSF.

Since 2012, there was no further comprehensive negotiation process on the Global Strategic Framework (GSF). The GSF has been updated annually by incorporating the decisions on substance taken by the CFS Plenary. The CFS 42 agreed then to realize a periodic review of the GSF in 2016/2017 through a targeted revision of chapters 3 and 4 of the GSF, with the intention of making the document more concise and easier to use. The intervention of the CSM on this agenda point reaffirmed that during the revision process it “will not accept any loss in substance of the GSF and will make sure that consistency and coherence with the existing human rights based GSF is ensured”.

In 2016 two main process issues were discussed regarding the updating of the GSF:

- The regular updating of the GSF through the incorporation of the newly approved CFS decisions.
- The evaluation of a periodic review of the GSF proposed to take place in 2016.
These two issues were initially dealt with in the joint meeting of the Bureau and the Advisory Group of 15 April 2015. The CSM working group on the GSF, took notice of the 2015 version of the GSF which included the results of recent CFS decisions, and supported a targeted revision for the process to take place in 2016-2017. It defended in particular a targeted revision that shall ensure the internal consistency, coherence and usefulness of the document, without reopening the negotiation of its content. The continuation of this discussion took place during the OEWG meeting of 2 May 2016, where the workplan and revision process was agreed upon. It was decided that the Secretariat will move forward in creating an online-friendly, more useable and accessible GSF. In addition to ensuring that content is not lost in the revision process, the CSM underscored the importance of a strong communication and dissemination strategy, and of making a clear link to the work of the OEWG on monitoring. This discussion will continue during the OEWG meeting of the GSF in December 2016.

Please visit the CSM webpage for more information about the activities of the working group: http://www.csm4cfs.org/working-groups/global-strategic-framework/

**Multi-Year Programme of Work 2018-2019 (MYPoW)**

With the OEWG Meeting of 18 March, a new cycle of a MYPoW process started, with the aim to identify the CFS workstreams and HLPE Reports for the biennium 2018-2019. The challenge to secure resources for the MYPoW implementation remains central to avoid a donor-driven CFS and to defend the integrity of the Multi-Year Programme of Work itself.

The OEWG agreed to request the HLPE a note on Critical and Emerging issues to be ready at the end of 2017 in order to better inform the debate of future CFS priorities and the next MYPoW process 2020-2022.

From March until July the OEWG on MYPoW worked to define the theme for the HLPE Report in 2018. The CSM has proposed two important themes for the CFS, of high relevance for food security and nutrition: Agroecology and Genetic Resources. The CSM participating organizations believe that on both of these topics, an HLPE report would be very much needed and extremely helpful for an evidence-based deliberation process in the CFS.

Nevertheless, the outcomes of the electronic consultation and the ranking exercise on the possible future HLPE themes were disappointing in terms of methodology, participation and outcome. Only 29 members and participants of the CFS participated in the survey, among them 16 OECD countries and only 7 of the Global South. The results therefore did not adequately reflect the balance of countries and regions participating in the CFS. It would have been advisable to reflect more on the methodology of the survey and ranking, to ensure greater participation and objectivity. Concerning the results of the ranking exercise, the proposal of Agroecology was well supported and came in second place in the list of ranked topics. However, the OEWG failed in having an open and substantive discussion on the highest ranked themes and decided to only work on the first ranked topic, a proposal for an “HLPE report on multi-stakeholder partnerships to finance food security and nutrition in the framework of the 2030 Agenda”.

The CSM Working Group on MYPoW led by the CSM Advisory Group members, expressed in several occasions its concern and disappointment on the selection of this topic, as it does not reflect a priority for social movements, being so distant from their daily life and the food security and nutrition challenges of small-scale producers. The CSM also questioned the misleading statement made in the document that all partnerships are beneficial to FSN. Such assumption is not correct and particularly misplaced in a request to the HLPE where the CFS should get its question right and not intend to already prescribe potential answers.

If the HLPE will now be requested for a report on this topic, it should be a critical review in order to learn from the challenges and the constraints of such platforms, to understand roles and responsibilities of different actors in food security and nutrition governance, and to assess the central challenges of some of such settings, including the tensions between rights-holders and stakeholders and issues related to conflicts of interest.

Please visit the CSM webpage for more information about the activities of the working group: http://www.csm4cfs.org/working-groups/mypow/
OPERATIVE INFORMATION ABOUT
THE CSM IN 2015-2016

The CSM as an open and autonomous space related
to CFS

What is the CSM: Nature and mandate

- The Civil Society Mechanism (CSM) for relations with the CFS was estab-
  lished in 2010, as an essential and autonomous part of the CFS.
- The CSM was created in response to the fundamental decision of the CFS
  reform to give a particular voice and space to the participation of those
  social groups most affected by food insecurity and malnutrition.
- The purpose of the CSM is to facilitate civil society participation and articu-
  lation into the policy processes of the CFS.
- Is an open and inclusive space and hence does not have formal members,
  but participating organizations. Every organization that belongs to civil soci-
  ety and works on food security and nutrition can join and participate.

Organizing Principles

The CSM is based on 11 constituencies:

- Smallholder and Family Farmers, Fisherfolks, Pastoralists, Indigenous
  Peoples, Pastoralists, Food and Agricultural workers, Landless, Women,
  Youth, Consumers, Urban Food Insecure, Landless, NGOs

These 11 constituencies are organized through:

- 11 units for global and continental organizations of each constituency
- 17 sub-regional units for organizations from all subregions: North America,
  Central America and Caribbean, Andean Region, Southern Cone, West
  Europe, East Europe, North Africa, Central Africa, East Africa, West Africa,
  South Africa, South Asia, Southeast Asia, Central Asia, West Asia, Aust-
  ralasia and Pacific

The CSM:

- …gives priority to the organizations and movements of the people most
  affected by food insecurity and malnutrition, recognizing that they are the
  organizations of the rights-holders that are the subjects of their own de-
  velopment and also the most important contributors to food security and
  nutrition worldwide.
- …respects pluralism, autonomy, diversity and self-organisation and tries to
  ensure a balance of constituencies, gender, and regions.
- …as a space does not represent the organizations that participate in it.
  They represent themselves and articulate positions together with others
  through the CSM to the CFS.

Who is part of the CSM?

The participating organizations, particularly those who organize small-
scale food producers and consumers, represent far more than 380 mil-
lion individual members from all continents. In this sense, the CSM is the
largest global space of civil society organizations working on food security
and nutrition.

It is not possible to give in a short presentation a comprehensive overview
about the hundreds of national organizations that participate in the CSM.
Therefore, the presentation here just focuses on those global and regional
organizations from different constituencies. Most of them also express
their strong engagements through their participation in the CSM Coordi-
nation Committee.

Smallholder and family farmer organizations:

- AFA - Asian Farmers Association (Asia), 20 organizations in 16
countries, with a total of 14 million members
- COPROFAM – Confederation of Family Producer Organizations in
  the Mercosur /Confederación de Organizaciones de Productores
  Familiares del Mercosur (South America): 12 national and regional
  organizations, with a total of 35 million members
- ESAFF - Eastern and Southern Africa Small Scale Farmers’ Forum
  (Eastern and Southern Africa), national platforms in 13 countries
- FIMARC – International Federation of Rural Adult Catholic Move-
  ments, member organizations in 50 countries in all continents, with a
  total of 5 million members
- MAELA – Movimiento Agroecologico Latinoamericano, 200 mem-
  ber organizations in 20 countries (Latinamerica), with a total of 2 mil-
  lion families
- PROPAC: Plateforme Regionale des Organisations Paysannes
  d’Afrique Centrale (Central Africa): national platforms in 13 countries
- ROPPA, Reseau des Organisations Paysanne et de Producteurs de
  l’Afrique de l’Ouest (Africa), national platforms in 14 countries, with a
  total of 50 million members
- VIA CAMPESINA, 164 member organizations in 73 countries in all
  continents, with a total of 200 million members

Together, these organizations of smallholder and family farmers represent
more than 330 million people around the world. Regarding the other con-
stituencies of the CSM, the following information can be provided:

Fisherfolks organizations:

- WFP: World Forum of Fisher Peoples, 52 member organizations in
45 countries (all continents), with a total of 10 million members
- WFF: World Forum of Fish Harvesters and Fish Workers, 41 member organizations in 39 countries (all continents), with a total of 10 million members

Indigenous peoples:
- IITC-International Indian Treaty Council: 87 member organizations, nations and indigenous peoples in 17 countries (North America, Latin America and Caribbean, Pacific)

Pastoralists:
- WAMIP – World Alliance of Mobile Indigenous People: 200 member organizations in 48 countries and ecoregions, (all continents), with 1 million families as members

Food and Agricultural Workers:
- IUF - International Union of Food Workers: 416 organizations in 126 countries, all continents, with more than 10 million affiliated members

Landless:
- Landless organizations are part of several global and regional organizations of smallholders and agricultural workers
- APC – Asian Peasant Coalition: 42 member organizations on 20 countries, Asia

Women:
- Women’s organizations are part of several global and regional organizations of all constituencies
- World March of Women: More than 5000 groups in 146 countries, all continents
- International Women’s Alliance: global network of women’s grassroots networks

Youth:
- Youth organizations are part of several global and regional organizations of all constituencies
- MIJARC (International Movement of Catholic Agricultural Rural Youth): 38 member organizations in 31 countries, all continents

Consumers:
- Consumer International: 209 member organizations in 120 countries, all continents
- Urgenci: 46 networks members, 14,258 Groups reaching more than 1,857,461 consumers, in 60 countries, all continents

Urban Food Insecure:
- Habitat International Coalition: 387 member organizations in 87 countries, all continents

How is the structure and deliberation process:

CSM positions brought to the CFS are products of collective, participative and inclusive deliberation processes among many actors from different perspectives.

All CFS workstreams are followed by a CSM Policy Working Group which is open to all civil society organizations that want to engage with this process.

The key word for CSM deliberation processes is “facilitation”: each coordinator or facilitator of Policy working groups, as well as all members of the Coordination Committee or members of the CSM to the Advisory Group have to first serve the participative and inclusive deliberation process, not just represent and push for their own interest or organizational profile.

Why is the CSM so committed to the CFS?

- The CSM has formulated positions and contributed proposals to all CFS processes since the reform, with an enormous commitment of its participating organizations to the different workstreams.
- Through this engagement, we have given a lot of substance and legitimacy to the CFS and its negotiations and decisions.

Why are the participating organizations in the CSM so committed to the CFS?

- The CFS reform was expression of a new vision for global governance on food security and nutrition, focusing on the progressive realization of the right to food, opening the space to all relevant actors, but with a particular attention to those who are most affected and at risk, who are at the same time the most important contributors for food security and nutrition worldwide.
- Most topics dealt with by the CFS so far have been extremely relevant to urgent demands of our constituencies. Most processes and results of the CFS have shown that many of civil society’s concerns and proposals have been heard by the member states and included into their decisions.
- Civil society organizations have emphasized the need to strengthen the use, application and monitoring of CFS policy outcomes. Many organizations have engaged with using them, particularly the VGGT.
- The CFS philosophy of “nothing about us without us” is fundamental for us. Participation and inclusiveness have made the CFS to a unique experience in the UN, particularly for organizations of small-scale producers.

Therefore:

- We have high expectations on the CFS, the quality of its processes and results, the implementation and monitoring of its decisions, its agenda ahead and its future as a truly inclusive governance space for food security and nutrition.
- The CSM and its participating organizations are an essential and autonomous part of the CFS. We are among the most important contributors to, and promoters of, the CFS - also as part of a new way of understanding and organizing the UN: opening the UN to the people is opening the future to the UN.
The CSM Working Structure in 2015/2016

The Policy Working Groups
The Policy Working Groups (WG) are a fundamental part of the CSM work. The Working Group is the space where political inputs to CFS Processes are articulated, debated, constructed, analyzed and confronted. The aim, starting from the pluralities of expertise, knowledge and point of views, is to build a civil society common position to be brought to CFS inter-sessional and plenary decision-making and policy debate activities. Working Groups are established in relation to the CFS processes approved in the biannual Multi-Year Program of Work. Working Groups are open to all participating organizations of the CSM and ideally comprise organizations from all global constituencies and sub-regions. Each of the WG is led by one or two coordinators who are members of the CC and is usually supported by technical facilitators and resource persons. For information on the different CSM Working Groups, please consult the following link in the CSM Website: http://www.csm4cfs.org/policy-working-groups/

The Coordination Committee
The Coordination Committee (CC) is the governing body of the CSM; this means that all relevant political decisions within the CSM, on internal and external issues, are taken by the CC by consensus, if possible, and by vote if a consensus is not possible. The Members of the CSM Coordination Committee are elected by the 11 constituencies and 17 sub-regions (5 sub-regions in Africa, 4 sub-regions in the Americas, 6 sub-regions in Asia and 2 sub-regions in Europe). The Coordination Committee in the period 2015-2016 was composed by 20 women and 19 men. Gender and geographic balance within its composition is always ensured. The CSM Coordination Committee will be renewed next year; the new CC will come together in October 2017. See the CC composition for the reporting period 2015-2016 in the following chart:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituency</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smallholder Farmers</td>
<td>Javier Sánchez</td>
<td>La Via Campesina (LVC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chukki Nanjundeswami</td>
<td>La Via Campesina (LVC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Clementino</td>
<td>COPROFAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Esther Penunia</td>
<td>AFA – Asian Farmers’ Association for Sustainable Rural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastoralists/Herders</td>
<td>Hindou Oumarou Ibrahim</td>
<td>WAMIP – World Alliance of Mobile Indigenous Peoples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maria Teresa Alvarez</td>
<td>WAMIP – World Alliance of Mobile Indigenous Peoples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisherfolk</td>
<td>Naseegh Jaffer</td>
<td>WFFP – World Forum of Fisher Peoples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Editrudh Lukanga</td>
<td>WFF – World Forum of Fish Harvesters and Fish Workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous Peoples</td>
<td>Taina Hedman</td>
<td>IITC – International Indian Treaty Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anaru Fraser</td>
<td>IITC – International Indian Treaty Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumers</td>
<td>Isabel Alvarez Vispo</td>
<td>Urgenci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marisa Macari</td>
<td>Consumers International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural and Food Workers</td>
<td>Adwoe Sakyi</td>
<td>IUF - International Union of Food, Agricultural, Hotel, Restaurant, Catering, Tobacco and Allied Workers’ Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paulomee Mistry</td>
<td>IUF International Union of Food, Agricultural, Hotel, Restaurant, Catering, Tobacco and Allied Workers’ Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Food Insecure</td>
<td>Christiane Costa</td>
<td>HIC - Habitat International Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kurla Gathuru</td>
<td>HIC – Habitat International Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landless</td>
<td>Jamai Al-Talab</td>
<td>LRC- Land Research Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sylvia Mallari</td>
<td>APC - Asian Peasant Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Sophie Dwellin</td>
<td>WMM- World March of Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emily Prangue Cahilog</td>
<td>International Women’s Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>Israel Batz</td>
<td>IITC - International Indian Treaty Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coly Papa Bakary</td>
<td>LVC- La Via Campesina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Shaimali Gutial</td>
<td>Focus on the Global South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alberta Guerra</td>
<td>ActionAid International- IFSN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The CSM Coordination Committee (CC) members are called each year to report on the work carried out within their own constituency or sub-region, as part of the CSM internal accountability exercise.

CSM CC members have responsibilities toward CFS processes and their political steering role for the whole CSM, but many of the CC members play a guiding role as coordinators or facilitators of CSM Policy Working Groups, as members of the CSM Advisory Group, the CSM Finance Working Group or an ad-hoc internal working group of the CSM. In addition to these tasks, CC members have the duty to ensure a double way communication flow with the other organizations their own Constituencies and Sub-regions.

The following section presents a synthesis these reports on key activities and obstacles faced by the Coordination Committee members for the reporting period 2015-2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Regions</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>Faris Ahmed</td>
<td>USC Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central America and Caribbean</td>
<td>Antonio Gonzalez</td>
<td>MAELA - Movimiento Agroecológico de America Latina y el Caribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andean Region</td>
<td>Gabriela Cruz</td>
<td>FENACOPEC - Federación Nacional de Cooperativas Pesqueras del Ecuador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Cone</td>
<td>Rodolfo Gonzalez Greco</td>
<td>CLOC - Coordinadora Latinoamericana de Organizaciones del Campo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Europe</td>
<td>Thierry Kesteloot</td>
<td>Oxfam Solidarite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Europe</td>
<td>Elene Shatabashvili</td>
<td>Biological Farmer Association Eikana/LVAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Africa</td>
<td>Karim Akrouit</td>
<td>Synagri - Syndicat des Agriculteurs de Tunisie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Africa</td>
<td>Nathanael Buka Mupungo</td>
<td>PROPAR - Plateforme Regionale des Organisations Payannes d'Afrique Centrale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Africa</td>
<td>Richard Rabertrano</td>
<td>ESAFF - Eastern and Southern Africa Small Scale Farmers' Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Africa</td>
<td>Nadjiro Sall</td>
<td>RCOPPA - Reseau des Organisations Payannes et de Producteurs de l'Afrique de l'Ouest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asia</td>
<td>Ratan Sarkar</td>
<td>Right to Food Network Bangladesh and South Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East Asia</td>
<td>Antonio Tuhan</td>
<td>PCFS - People's Coalition on Food Sovereignty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Asia</td>
<td>Marlam Aljaajaa</td>
<td>Arab Network for Food Sovereignty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australasia</td>
<td>Imogen Ebsworth</td>
<td>Australia Food Sovereignty Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>Robert Bishop</td>
<td>Paulau Organic Farmers Association/POETcom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CC members have been active by successfully ensuring:

- Awareness raising among civil society organizations within their constituency and sub-region on CSM work and CFS processes;
- Advocacy work at local level with relevant national officials to promote a better understanding and mobilize support for the use and application of CFS outcomes at the country level, and to influence governments’ positions in Rome during negotiation sessions;
- Distribution of the CSM Updates and CSM relevant policy material to all participating organizations within the constituency and sub-regions, including CSM/CFS chapters in their organizations’ annual reports/newsletter/policy material/websites; drafting and sharing of travel reports by the CC members after attending meetings and processes in Rome;
• Active engagement on HLPE electronic consultations and collection of collective inputs from the constituency and sub-region for the Policy Working groups and CSM processes;
• Facilitation of civil society meetings with CFS Chair at regional level; Participation to FAO regional conferences when a CFS related activity was held (e.g. European Regional Conference – Turkey, May 2016);
• Capacity building measures addressed to civil society organizations on CSM and CFS;
• Mainstreaming of adopted CFS decisions into workplans and activities of CSM participating organizations at local, national and regional level;
• Include CSM common positions achieved and used in CFS processes into local, national or regional statements and official declarations of CSM participating organizations;
• Supporting the re-construction of the youth and women constituency.
• CSM and CFS have been included as agenda items in the different assemblies, regional meetings, forum and executive board meetings of the different CSM participating organizations;

CC members have also identified the following challenges by performing their roles within their own constituencies and sub-regions:
• One of the challenges is linked to the difficulties of widening the engagement of civil society and social movements due to the generally limited knowledge and understanding of the CFS processes at global level.
• Other challenges pertain specifically to some constituencies, e.g. the term civil society is not commonly used among the Indigenous Peoples constituency;
• The voluntary nature of CFS policy outputs and decisions is also subject to specific domestic sovereignty frameworks (both governmental and Indigenous Peoples) and difficult to implement;
• Difficulties in holding Skype calls to update participating organizations, due to the lack of stable internet connections and limited technical facilities in many rural areas, and due to the lack of resources to translate the material in local languages;

Bureau and Advisory Group are documented here: http://www.csm4cfs.org/csm-contributions-to-the-cfs-agbureau-meeting/

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

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

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

The contributions of the CSM Advisory Group to the Joint Meetings of the CFS
**Financial Report 2015/2016**

**CSM 2015 Financial report**

In 2015 the overall expenses of the CSM amounted to 535,332 Euro. Unfortunately, this only represented 73% of the planned annual budget for 2015. This also had its impact regarding the implementation of the 2015 Work Plan: while most of the activities related to the direct participation of civil society to CFS processes could be ensured, particularly those CSM activities aimed at strengthening the internal interaction within the CSM space, such as CSM constituency and regional meetings could not take place. The funding deficit also impeded broader civil society to CFS inter-sessional activities in 2015.

The resources that helped to cover the 2015 expenses were mainly provided (78%) by Governments and development cooperation agencies. An important financial contribution (22%) was also provided by participating organization to the CSM which responded to the call to help addressing the funding gap. It also should be reminded that the CSM budget here does not reflect the financial contributions of participating organizations which invest resources through staff time and self-funded travel to Rome. Just to give an example: from the 200 participants to the CSM Forum and CFS Plenary in 2015, 160 came as self-funded participants. Also, the work of Working Group Facilitators and Coordinators which is a huge amount of working days each year, is their enormous contribution as individuals and organizations and does not appear in these budget figures.

---

**CSM 2015 Financial statement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2015 CSM TOTAL Planned activities and Budget</th>
<th>2015 CSM Final Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Participation in the CFS AG meetings</td>
<td>€ 81,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sub-total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. CSM policy working groups &amp; participation in CFS inter-sessional</td>
<td>€ 167,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Annual CSM CC meeting, Forum &amp; participation in CFS Plenary</td>
<td>€ 129,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sub-total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Secretariat</td>
<td>€ 130,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sub total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Accountability, monitoring and contingency costs</td>
<td>€ 5,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sub total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTIAL</td>
<td>€ 514,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration fee 5%</td>
<td>€ 20,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL Budget</td>
<td>€ 535,332</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Preliminary remarks on CSM 2016 Financial report for the period January to September ‘16

The resources raised by the CSM in the first 3 quarters of the 2016 have been €687,643, equal to the 95% of the planned annual budget for 2016. The contribution provided this year by governments, development cooperation agencies and international institutions covered 92% of the funding contributions received so far. This financial situation allows to realize most of the CSM activities planned until the end of this year.

In is noteworthy to underline the principle that CFS, as well as the CSM as an essential and autonomous part of the CFS, should be funded by public funds. This discussion is particularly important for the CFS and the planning security of its MYPOW. The lack of financial stability affects the CFS, the HLPE and CSM in 2017 in a direct way. In early September, the overall funding gap of the CFS for 2017 was at more over 2 Mio USD. At the writing of this report, the CSM funding gap for 2017 is at 60% of its planned annual budget for the coming year.

### DONORS

**Governments, Internat. institutions, Development Cooperation Agencies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Amount (€)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swiss Development Cooperation Agency</td>
<td>343,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>30,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>17,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>27,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>419,637</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td><strong>78%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NGOs and CSOs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NGO</th>
<th>Amount (€)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oxfam</td>
<td>44,878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICCO</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bread for the World</td>
<td>19,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Aid + IFSN</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUF</td>
<td>5,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welthungerhilfe</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biovision</td>
<td>3,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIAN + USC Canada</td>
<td>1,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terre Solidaire + CSM in Kind</td>
<td>2,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>115,695</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td><strong>22%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DONORS

Governments, Internat. institutions, Development Cooperation Agencies
Swiss Development Cooperation Agency  € 310,108
EU  € 132,988
Italy  € 77,983
Germany  € 50,355
France  € 19,552
IFAD  € 40,000

€ 630,986  92%

NGOs and CSOs
Oxfam Solidarité  € 10,562
ICCO  € 10,000
SID  € 11,287
MISEREOR  € 8,000
Biovision  € 4,900
CIDSE  € 2,000
Others  € 9,908

€ 56,657  8%

BUDGET FOR THE CSM activities in 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Budget (Euros)</th>
<th>Funds</th>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>Funds received vs Expenses</th>
<th>Budget vs Funds received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Participation in the CFS AG meetings</td>
<td>sub-total € 82,500</td>
<td>€ 73,743</td>
<td>€ 55,920</td>
<td>€ 17,822</td>
<td>€ 8,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. CSM policy working groups &amp; participation in CFS inter-sessional</td>
<td>sub total € 303,152</td>
<td>€ 280,227</td>
<td>€ 243,925</td>
<td>€ 46,302</td>
<td>€ 12,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Annual CSM CC meeting, Forum &amp; participation in Annual CFS Plenary</td>
<td>sub-total € 151,920</td>
<td>€ 146,981</td>
<td>€ 19,457</td>
<td>€ 127,525</td>
<td>€ 4,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Secretariat</td>
<td>sub total € 141,000</td>
<td>€ 139,443</td>
<td>€ 100,807</td>
<td>€ 38,636</td>
<td>€ 1,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Accountability, monitoring and contingency costs</td>
<td>sub total € 8,000</td>
<td>€ 4,800</td>
<td>€ 0</td>
<td>€ 4,800</td>
<td>€ 3,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTIAL</td>
<td>€ 686,682</td>
<td>€ 655,195</td>
<td>€ 420,110</td>
<td>€ 235,085</td>
<td>€ 31,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration fee 5%</td>
<td>34,334</td>
<td>€ 32,448</td>
<td>€ 23,622</td>
<td>€ 8,826</td>
<td>€ 1,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>€ 721,016</td>
<td>€ 687,643</td>
<td>€ 443,931</td>
<td>€ 243,712</td>
<td>€ 33,373</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF ACRONYMS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AG</td>
<td>ADVISORY GROUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>COORDINATION COMMITTEE (CSM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFS</td>
<td>COMMITTEE ON WORLD FOOD SECURITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COI</td>
<td>CONFLICT OF INTEREST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>CIVIL SOCIETY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANISATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANISATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFA</td>
<td>FRAMEWORK FOR ACTION FOR FOOD SECURITY AND NUTRITION IN PROTRACTED CRISSES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSN</td>
<td>FOOD SECURITY AND NUTRITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSF</td>
<td>GLOBAL STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK FOR FOOD SECURITY AND NUTRITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLF</td>
<td>HIGH LEVEL FORUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLPE</td>
<td>HIGH LEVEL PANEL OF EXPERTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLPF</td>
<td>HIGH LEVEL POLITICAL FORUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ</td>
<td>HEAD QUARTERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICN2</td>
<td>SECOND INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON NUTRITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFAD</td>
<td>INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR AGRICULTURE DEVELOPMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYPOW</td>
<td>MULTI-YEAR PROGRAM OF WORK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANISATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEWG</td>
<td>OPEN-ENDED WORKING GROUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP</td>
<td>PRIVATE-PUBLIC PARTNERSHIPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSM</td>
<td>PRIVATE SECTOR MECHANISM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAI</td>
<td>RESPONSIBLE AGRICULTURAL INVESTMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTAF</td>
<td>RIGHT TO ADEQUATE FOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG</td>
<td>SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSF</td>
<td>VOLUNTARY GUIDELINES ON SMALL-SCALE FISHERIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT/TTT</td>
<td>TECHNICAL TASK TEAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TORS</td>
<td>TERMS OF REFERENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VGGT</td>
<td>VOLUNTARY GUIDELINES ON THE RESPONSIBLE GOVERNANCE OF TENURE OF LAND, FISHERIES AND FORESTS IN THE CONTEXT OF NATIONAL FOOD SECURITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>UNITED NATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>WORLD FOOD PROGRAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>WORLD HEALTH ORGANISATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTO</td>
<td>WORLD TRADE ORGANISATION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>