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INTRODUCTION

The period 2016/2017 was a quite intense year for the CSM. This Annual Report gives an overview on the CSM engagement with all CFS Policy Processes and provides a political analysis of key debates in this period. The report also comprises a summary of Coordination Committee (CC) activities, the financial report and an outlook for 2018. In October 2017, the CSM CC and the CSM Forum considered and discussed a draft version of this Annual Report which was then revised and updated, and is now shared publicly with the participating organizations of the CSM and all interested members and participants to the CFS.

The report demonstrates that the CSM is a dynamic and always evolving space where global, continental and national organisations of social movements, civil society and indigenous peoples commit to jointly contribute to the realization of CFS’s vision to strive for a world without hunger and to advance the progressive realization of the right to adequate food.

The CSM is an essential and autonomous part of the Committee on World Food Security (CFS). The report shows how participating organizations to the CSM put into practice the mandate of this Mechanism: facilitating the participation and effective contributions of all its constituencies - Smallholder and Family Farmers, Fisherfolks, Pastoralists, Indigenous Peoples, Food and Agricultural Workers, Landless, Women, Youth, Consumers, Urban Food Insecure, and NGOs - to the deliberations of the CFS.

The new CSM Coordination Committee elected for October 2017- October 2019 took over from the previous CC before this year’s CFS Plenary. We would like to express again the collective and deep gratitude to the outgoing CC members for their extraordinary commitment, energy and contributions in facilitating and guiding the Mechanism during the past two years!

We were very sad when we heard that our dear friend and CC member Kuria Gathuru passed away on November 15, 2017. Over the past three years, Kuria had been an integral part of our CSM family, serving as a co-facilitator of the global constituency of the Urban Food Insecure to the CSM CC and Co-Coordinator of the Urbanization and Rural Transformation Working Group. We always deeply appreciated Kuria and his way of being with all of us, enriching our space and work with his wonderful personality, knowledge and commitment. We are very grateful for the time and wisdom he dedicated to the CSM, bringing in a perspective and expertise from working with communities around Nairobi that were so special and at the heart of the work we do. We will always remember his kind smile, his unique laugh, and his warm heart.

Martin Wolpold-Bosien
CSM Secretariat Coordinator
December 2017
KEY POLITICAL DEBATES AT THE CFS IN 2017

This chapter intends to summarize in a synthetic way some key debates in the CFS in 2017 from a civil society perspective, with the purpose to provide essential background information to the reader. It builds on the general orientations discussed last year during the CFS (“CFS at the crossroads -7 years after the reform”) and reviews the policy processes in the intersessional period from that perspective. This section complements the overview on the different work-streams in 2017 in the following chapter.

The following overview on key debates cannot claim to be complete. It just tries to highlight and briefly explain some of the most relevant issues of this year’s discussions from a CSM perspective. The overall perception is that the controversy about the CFS and its future continues. While a number of governments share the CSM visions for a strengthened CFS in line with its reform, there are at the same time some governments and actors in the room who clearly try to limit the scope, mandate and capacity of the CFS to effectively fulfill its roles and its mandate to strive for a world without hunger and to advance the progressive realization of the right to adequate food.

a) The “no reform of the CFS reform” debate

Certainly, the CFS process that demanded most energy and involvement this year has been the CFS Evaluation report and the discussions about the responses to it. This process will continue in 2018-2019: the CFS Plan of Action in response to the evaluation will be discussed and approved in 2018, and implemented in 2019. The main question in this context was in which direction the evaluation discussions would be going. CSM has always demanded that they must not be used to reform the reform of 2009, but should be guided by the spirit of the reform and make the CFS much more effective in line with its mandate and its roles.

After the first round of discussions on the CFS evaluation, in June 2017, the Co-Chairs of the process (Egypt and Iceland) concluded one of the debates with an explicit statement that there won’t be a reform of the reform of the CFS. This is certainly a positive step, which is also reflected more concretely in the first results from the evaluation discussions that confirm that the vision and the roles of the CFS won’t be changed but rather further strengthened. However, at the same time, the discussions also show that there is no collective willingness to consequently going this way towards a stronger and more ambitious CFS that would respond in a much more effective way to the needs and demands of the constituencies that most contribute to food security and nutrition, and who are as well often the most at risk.

The following sections provide concrete examples of this contradiction: there are still delegations in the room who try to block topics from just being discussed in this forum; who do not mind to challenge the normative basis of the CFS; who try to limit the scope of the CFS to a niche where nobody else is playing, denying its coordination role; who try to avoid policy negotiations by reducing
the policy convergence role to an exchange of best practices; who deny the priority attention of the CFS to those constituencies most affected by food insecurity and malnutrition; who try to stop the process towards a strengthened monitoring and accountability function of the CFS. Other examples of this contradiction are the chronic and still unsolved budget deficit of the CFS and the limited support from governments and RBAs to the effective dissemination, use and application of CFS policy outcomes. There is an obvious inconsistency between the verbal commitment for a stronger CFS and the lack of political will to consequently go this way.

b) Agroecology and the debate on red line 1
The CSM proposed topic for an HLPE report on Agroecology won the ranking exercise of members and participants to the CFS for the Multi-Year Program of Work (MYPOW) in November/December 2016. However, when the Open-Ended Working Group (OEWG) on MYPOW started its discussions, there was a frontal attack from some countries and the Private Sector Mechanism against taking up this topic. The US delegation expressed in their intervention in the February meeting their expectation that any discussion on this topic in the CFS would be a red line for them. The intense and complicated discussion process ended only in June with an agreement for an HLPE agroecology report in 2019.

The process showed that some actors tried to prevent the CFS from simply requesting a report from its expert body on a topic they didn’t like. This goes against the spirit of the CFS space: using red lines to generally block a discussion of a relevant topic in the CFS is not legitimate. CSM reminded the other delegations that we did not consider the topic of the 2018 HLPE report a good choice, but we did never intend to prevent the CFS to have a debate on it.

It was important that finally, the OEWG could agree on the agroecology report, but many hours of meetings and discussions were lost due to this problematic attitude of some few delegations. If the CFS cannot take on controversial issues, it would lose one of its functions as the foremost inclusive policy platform on food security and nutrition.

c) The right to food and the debate on red line 2
The OEWG on monitoring had expressed its collective appreciation about the first Global Thematic Event (GTE) on monitoring the use and application of the VGGT at the CFS Plenary in 2016. When discussing possible topics for the next GTE in 2018, Norway and CSM proposed to monitor the use and application of the Right to Food Guidelines, adopted in 2004, which are at the core of the reformed CFS, its vision and roles.

The proposal received support from many delegations, but was then objected by the US delegation. In the April OEWG meeting, they expressed that the right to food was a red line for them, and that a decision taken on monitoring the Right to Food Guidelines in the CFS might even have repercussions beyond the CFS. This objection generated a heated debate, as it became obvious that the use of red lines was now as well used for an attempt to undermine the normative basis of the CFS.

After several meetings and long-lasting discussions, the CFS Plenary 44 decided that the GTE in 2018 will be on the use and application of the Right to Food Guidelines, as suggested. In the OEWG on SDGs, a last year’s debate on this topic was repeated in April this year. Last year, the Russian Federation had objected the recognition of the “centrality of human rights” for the CFS, arguing that this would go beyond the mandate of the CFS. After complicated discussions, the CFS decided to keep the formulation as a matter of principle, and the Russian Federation expressed its reservation on this notion.
These debates show that a few but influential actors in the CFS have difficulties in agreeing with fundamental norms that are at the basis of the United Nation System and the CFS, in particular the human right to adequate food, the principles of indivisibility, interrelatedness, interdependence and universality of all human rights, and the human rights approach to food security and nutrition.

d) What role for the CFS to respond to famines, food crises and their causes?
The alarming situation of countries at risk of famines and the worsening situation of food security and nutrition was the motivation for the CFS Chair convening an ad-hoc meeting of the CFS Bureau and Advisory Group in April 2017. The main questions that the CSM and several countries raised in such situations are: What is the role of the CFS in a world of severe food crises and famines? In a world of even growing food insecurity and malnutrition, as the recently released State of Food Insecurity and Malnutrition Report 2017 points out.

The first response to these famines and crises made clear that the CFS is not an implementing body, but should play a key role in response to this kind of situations. What is already existing is a periodic update mechanism of the Rome-based Agencies on the situation and the ongoing humanitarian actions taken.

However, so far no UN-wide global platform does a collective and critical analysis of the policy responses to these crises, assessing if they effectively address the root causes, with the aim to overcome the key problems found from the perspective of ensuring coherence between the humanitarian, development and human rights dimensions. The CFS could and should play this role, in line with its vision and roles of fostering global coordination, convergence, cooperation, coherence and accountability particularly in these situations of famines and severe food crises.

e) The monitoring debate between ambition and damage control
The innovative monitoring mechanism of the CFS has slowly advanced during the past years, but only against many attempts of some members to slow down the process. They essentially disagree with the accountability role of the CFS, established in the CFS reform, that includes the monitoring function. Over a period of several months, discussions in the OEWG on monitoring advanced in spite of the harsh opposition of the US delegation against the Right to Food theme and the monitoring exercise in general.

However, at the end of a series of tense meetings, the topic of this Global Thematic Event was agreed for 2018. Also, the themes for the subsequent Global Thematic Event (GTE) could be agreed: the GTE 2020 will monitor the use and application of the Framework for Action on Protracted Crises, and the GTE 2022 will monitor the Principles for Responsible Agricultural Investment. The monitoring of the specific policy recommendations was as well challenged by some delegations, particularly the European Commission, but was finally kept as part of the CFS monitoring exercise, due to broad support from several Latin American, African and European countries.
f) Can the CFS be policy relevant without policy negotiations?
This seems to be a rhetoric question. However, it is not. The practical example of this tendency to refrain from, or to try to avoid the word of policy negotiations found its 2017 example in the workstream on Urbanization and Rural Transformation. As two countries strongly opposed any agreement on having any policy convergence on this matter, there was no other option for the OEWG Chair than to find a formulation that would allow to further do exploratory work on the matter, but to only define in 2018 if there will be a policy convergence process on this issue or not.
A variation of this tendency was found with the statements of mostly the same actors who continue to suggest that an HLPE report should not necessarily be followed by policy negotiation process. This trend tends to undermine the essential role of the HLPE as the knowledge-based pillar of CFS policy dialogues and convergences processes. The “allergy” of some delegations against policy negotiations finds itself in a sharp contrast to an increasing number of members and participants who claim that the CFS without a new major policy product will lose its relevance.

The budget debate – no solution to the problem
The intense discussions on the chronic budget deficit of the CFS have shown again that a general agreement on the identified problem does not necessarily lead to its solution. The special meeting in March 2017, convened by the CFS Chair on sustainable funding upon request from Afghanistan and the CSM, came to the consensus that a slightly increased contribution of the Rome-Based Agencies would significantly improve the funding situation of the CFS. However, the following weeks and months showed, that there is no political will within these institutions or their governing bodies, to effectively secure a higher percentage of the CFS budget through the RBAs, and to make it less dependent from its few donors.
CSM has always underlined that a donor-driven agenda of the CFS, and a donor-driven implementation of its agenda, weakens the entire CFS. However, it seems that most permanent representations as well as the Rome-Based Agencies are fully used to this phenomenon, it looks rather normal to them. While nobody seems to be happy with it, some donors take advantage, imposing their policy priorities by offering earmarked resources to the Rome-Based Agencies.
This problematic financial deficit setting also opens the door to any kind of private sector funding that wishes to get a share of UN legitimacy and to influence its agenda in their own interest. The CFS must not go this way. Robust safeguards to prevent conflicts of interest need to be developed and put in place. The CFS evaluation echoed this call,
and the CFS response to the evaluation agreed to develop such safeguards.

**h) The debate on the role of the RBAs**
The role of the Rome Based Agencies for the CFS is essential. Without a revised attitude and a renewed commitment of the RBAs, there won’t be the necessary conditions to make the CFS strong again. The engagement of RBAs with the CFS should be assessed on the different levels of their involvement:

- they are part of the Joint Secretariat;
- they are part of the funding structure;
- they are part of the policy process, through the OEWGs and the Advisory Group;
- they can link their own priorities, policies and programs with CFS processes;
- their role in the dissemination, use and application of CFS policy outcomes is absolutely key;
- their role in contributing to the CFS monitoring exercise is essential.

On all these levels, the involvement of RBAs needs to be revisited and strengthened. The case of the roles of RBAs regarding the VGGT can show the achievements and shortcomings in this respect, as well as the potentials and needs for change in the future.

**i) Women’s Empowerment Forum: A step ahead for Women’s rights**
The preparation process for the Forum was not easy, but the background document produced by the Technical Task Team (TTT), the outcomes of the Forum on Women’s Empowerment and their endorsement at CFS 44 represent a breakthrough in CFS history and future strengthening of the women’s rights agenda.

It is certainly of utmost importance that during the whole preparation process, the close interrelation between women’s empowerment, women’s rights and gender equality has been mainstreamed into the preparatory documents and recognized by the outcomes of the Forum itself and by the endorsement of such outcomes of CFS 44th Plenary Session, despite the initially strong resistance of the Russian Federation.

**j) Difficult conditions for the Forestry negotiations**
Due to financial constraints of the HLPE, the final translations of the HLPE report on Forestry and FSN could only be made available beginning of September. Therefore, very limited time was given to the negotiations of the policy recommendation on this matter. Only one round of negotiations was held before the Plenary in October. Despite this tight timeline, the CSM Working Group (WG) successfully advocated key elements to be included into the CFS policy recommendations, such as women’s rights, the recognition of forest dependent communities, including the specific role forests play for indigenous peoples, the importance of the Principle on Free Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC), and the recognition of the essential roles of the human rights instruments. The CSM WG also identified the shortcomings of the policy convergence process and of the outcome document. For these reasons the WG demanded the CFS Plenary to address the issue of the relation between the commercial tree plantation and food security and nutrition in the future work of the Committee.
OVERVIEW OF CFS PROCESSES IN 2016/17 AND CSM ENGAGEMENT WITH THEM

Nutrition

Inter-sessional period 2016/2017

HLPE Zero Draft
The CSM Nutrition Working Group (WG) has been involved in a variety of activities since CFS 43. First, and perhaps the most substantial activity, was the completion and submission of our joint commentary on the HLPE zero draft on Nutrition and Food Systems. This commentary addressed concerns regarding both the form and content of the zero draft. In particular, the issue that many sections of the draft were either missing or incomplete—including the sections on food system typologies, conflict of interest and the policy recommendations—therefore limiting our ability to submit suggestions on these key elements. Furthermore, the draft report was not contextualized within the mandate of the CFS [the progressive realization of the right to food], and it failed to acknowledge a holistic vision for food systems, for example, the perspective that food systems must, not only guarantee healthy diets but must also be environmentally sustainable, protect livelihoods and guarantee women’s rights. Furthermore, this group’s commentary critiqued the zero-draft’s over-emphasis on value chains rather than short circuits and circular economies and challenged the draft’s failure to discuss the negative effects of the industrial food system and the Big Food and Beverage industry on food security.

OEWG Meetings
Furthermore, the working group engaged in three Open-Ended Working Group (OEWG) meetings throughout the year. One of the important issues discussed during the meetings was the workplan of the UN Decade of Action on Nutrition. The group argued that the workplan did not deal with nutrition integrally but rather fragmented nutrition into different silos—precisely what ICN2 aimed to undo—and that the plan lacked a clear coordinating mechanism and holistic monitoring indicators. Another important issue discussed at the OEWG was the role of CFS in the Decade of Action on Nutrition. This group argued that we urgently need to establish which thematic issues in nutrition the CFS is going to focus on to understand how it will contribute to the Decade, rather than simply discussing modalities of working, which to this point have been the focus. Indeed, a general critique that the nutrition working group has vis-à-vis the OEWGs is that they are too focused on procedural issues and ways of working and rarely discuss the actual topic of nutrition.

Inter-sessional events
Members of the CSM nutrition-working group were also present at the three nutrition inter-sessional events. The first event focused on Investments for Healthy Food Systems in which Antonio González of MAELA (Movimiento Agroecológico de America Latina y el Caribe) discussed the importance of investing in agroecological food production and sustainable, local and circular food systems. At the second event on Impact Assessment of Policies to Support Healthy Food Systems, Ana Paula Bortoletto of the Institute for Consumer Protection (IDEC) discussed the importance of investing in agroecological food production and sustainable, local and circular food systems. At the second event on Impact Assessment of Policies to Support Healthy Food Systems, Ana Paula Bortoletto of the Institute for Consumer Protection (IDEC) discussed the importance of investing in agroecological food production and sustainable, local and circular food systems. At the second event on Impact Assessment of Policies to Support Healthy Food Systems, Ana Paula Bortoletto of the Institute for Consumer Protection (IDEC) discussed the importance of investing in agroecological food production and sustainable, local and circular food systems. At the second event on Impact Assessment of Policies to Support Healthy Food Systems, Ana Paula Bortoletto of the Institute for Consumer Protection (IDEC) discussed the importance of investing in agroecological food production and sustainable, local and circular food systems.
Global Target for Stunting: Investing in Food Systems to Prevent Stunting, Vandana Prasad of the Public Health Resource Network (PHRN) presented her experiences.

**CFS 44 Plenary Session, October 2017**

During the CFS Plenary Session the CSM Working Group on Nutrition defended the need of a holistic vision, based on human rights and able to go far beyond diets and micronutrients. The Group welcomed the approved request of the CFS for a report on agroecology, including from the nutrition perspective. For the CSM WG, agroecology is essential towards the future of nutrition and food sovereignty, and towards achieving the objectives of the UN Decade on Nutrition and the Sustainable Development Goals. The CSM WG expressed its appreciation for the work carried out by the HLPE on the Report by briefly commenting on its conclusions, but strongly denounced the delay in the translation of the full report due to the lack of funds. It recalled that if the full translation of the report is not guaranteed in advance, participation and inclusion of all actors in the policy convergence debate cannot be ensured.

You find the complete information on this workstream on the CSM Website:
http://www.csm4cfs.org/working-groups/nutrition/

**SDGs**

**Inter-sessional period 2016/2017**

**OEWGs Meetings**

The CSM SDGs WG this year focused mainly on the preparation of the written CFS contributions to the High Level Political Forum (HLPF) global thematic review in 2017, which reviewed SDGs 1, 2, 3, 5, 9, 14, 17, with a bit of centrality on SDG2 on ending hunger, achieving food security and nutrition, and promoting sustainable agriculture. The WG worked intensively to ensure that the CFS sent a strong message to Governments, on the need to fostering the use and application at country level of CFS integrated policy instruments building on the Voluntary Guidelines to support the progressive realization of the right to adequate food in their national efforts to advance the 2030 Agenda. The SDGs WG also requested Rome based Government Delegations to work for having the CFS contribution reflected in the HLPF Ministerial Declaration, which in the end shortfalls in recognizing the role of the CFS but takes up most of the substantial points of the submission. The group facilitated CSM participation at the side event organized by the CFS on Reaching those left furthest behind: Addressing Hunger and Poverty in Protracted Crises, which presented the CFS Framework for Action for Food Security and Nutrition in Protracted Crises (CFS-FFA).

The CSM did not directly engage with the Expert Group Meeting held in June, neither for a coordinated presence at the July HLPF, but many CSM members attended both the events and coordinated themselves for concerted messages coherent with the CSM views.

The CSM WG also drafted the contribution to the HLPF in 2018, which was presented at CFS 44 for discussion and endorsement. The draft contribution aimed at capturing the main messages coming out from the CFS 44 plenary sessions dedicated to the SDGs discussion, including the assessment of the state of food security and nutrition in the world.

The WG also participated at the definition of the CFS
workplan for 2018-2019, by agreeing that in future, global progress reviews and lesson-sharing discussions will continue to be organized, as well as submissions to the HLPF will continue to be prepared, both under the supervision of the Bureau and the Advisory Group and the technical assistance of the TTT.

**CFS 44 Plenary Session, October 2017**

During the CFS Plenary Session, the CSM Working Group recalled the need to ensure a qualitative space, within global governance platforms such as the CFS and the HLPF, to discuss the systemic and structural obstacles to the implementation of the SDGs. The CSM WG strongly encouraged CFS to capture the sense of urgency that springs from the latest SOFI Report by becoming the central global platform for convening period and ad-hoc reviews of famines and severe food crisis, focusing on the assessment of policy responses and their impact on root causes, ensuring coherence of global policies. The WG also reminded the challenges ahead in the implementation of the 2030 Agenda such as transparent, accountable and meaningful participation of those most affected by food insecurity and the key role that small-scale food producers should play on processes related to the achievement of SDG 2, and all SDGs at national and global level.

You find the complete information on this workstream on the CSM Website:
http://www.csm4cfs.org/working-groups/sdg/

**Urbanisation and Rural Transformation**

**Inter-sessional period 2016/2017**

**OEWGs meetings**

During the CFS year after October, the group was actively engaged in the workstream. CSM participated to the Technical Task Team (TTT), which prepared the ToR for the “Call for Experiences and Policy Approaches in addressing Food Security and Nutrition in the Context of Changing Rural-Urban Dynamics”. The call was opened from February to March 2017 and the WG facilitated wide distribution of the information among CSOs and relevant constituencies, edited and submitted 9 case studies from almost all corners of the world which went in the final document prepared and edited by the TTT.

The CSM working group representatives participated and actively articulated the CSM positions in the OEWG meetings conducted in December 2016, February, June, and July 2017. Besides the background documents prepared, the main discussion topics of the OEWG meetings were the fields to be covered, as well as expected process and outcomes of the work.
stream in the biennium 2018-2019. In these discussions, the CSM working group position was mainly focused on the process related issues – we want to see a policy process discussed and endorsed by CFS stakeholders, as Civil Society wants to see the policy relevant outcomes of the process.

Finally, in spite of the opposition from some states and the PSM, the draft decision box submitted to the CFS 44 did not exclude policy recommendations. However, it only envisages having two inter-sessional events before CFS 45 with the purpose of facilitating an informed discussion around the CFS added value and feasibility of a policy convergence exercise. The topics of the two inter-sessional events are quite interesting: 1) The food security and nutrition impacts of urbanization and rural transformation on lower income groups (smallholders, landless, net food buyers, informal sector traders, low income urban consumers) and how to address them and their root causes; 2) Promoting youth and women engagement and employment in food systems across the rural-urban continuum, including linking producers to markets.

The thematic of the workstream is extremely important for the CSM work, as it gives a platform to start discussing on the nature of “rural transformation” the world is facing today and build the alternatives of the more resilient, based on the territorial approach, rural and urban policies for the “food secure” world. To be well prepared for the inter-sessional events of 2018 the WG has started the CSM consultation process for the development of the consolidated CSM policy positions of the priority topics for 2018.

CFS 44 Plenary Session, October 2017
On Urbanization and Rural Transformation, the CSM WG expressed its dissatisfaction with the way in which the plenary session was conducted, as the OEWG Chair defined format and panellist of the plenary session without appropriate consultation. However, the CSM WG was pleased to note that strong support was expressed in the room for this workstream to deliver a policy outcome. The CSM WG also stressed the importance of public policies as a key tool to overcome the urban-rural dichotomy, the need to ensure a central role in the decision-making process for small-scale food producers, to integrate the “grassroots” knowledge into the high-level institutional knowledge sharing processes on this topic, and also highlighted the importance of local markets, agroecological practices and Community Supported Agriculture as crucial means to ensure an improved urban-rural linkage, especially for the rural youth.

For more information on the CSM WG on Urbanization and Rural transformation please visit: http://www.csm4cfs.org/working-groups/urbanization-and-rural-transformation/

Women’s empowerment

Inter-sessional period 2016/2017

After some years since its creation in 2011, the CSM WG on Women was re-activated during 2017 to engage in the process towards the CFS Forum on Women’s Empowerment on 25 September 2017. For that purpose, the CC members of the Women Constituency sent out a call for participation to CSM participating organisations in January 2017, and many responded. Today, the CSM WG on Women counts with the active participation of more than 90 international, regional and national women’s organisations and platforms worldwide from the different CSM constituencies and sub-regions.

The WG actively engaged in drafting the contributions to the CFS Background Document that aimed at informing the CFS Forum on Women’s Empowerment. The WG also submitted case studies and experiences linked to the thematic areas identified in the document and contributed in sha-
ping the agenda and format of the forum. The WG was able to strongly influence some parts of the document by:

- strengthening its focus on the existing normative international policy frameworks such as CEDAW and General Recommendation 34 and the need to closely look into the implementation gap;
- allowing the document to address women’s empowerment with a wide angle and a holistic approach that includes women’s rights and social, economic and political factors;
- proposing concrete questions and steps for the future role of the CFS within this framework.

The Working Group also successfully advocated within the Advisory Group and Bureau meetings, as no OEWG was foreseen for this workstream, to have a full and dedicated day for the Forum, and an additional plenary session discussion to endorse the outcomes.

CFS Forum on Women’s Empowerment
On 25th of September the CFS Forum on Women’s Empowerment took place. A large delegation of the CSM WG attended the Forum and was very successful in impacting the Forum’s Outcome reported in the CFS Chair’s Summary. Among the key points obtained are:

- The recognition that women’s rights, gender equality and women’s empowerment are strongly interrelated. The three elements need to move ahead simultaneously towards the achievement of food security and nutrition;
- The need to integrate a feminist perspective since the early drafting stage of a policy process;
- The need to recognize the invisible work and the unpaid care work of women and girls;
- The Forum demonstrated that women are not only able to critically analyze the persistent barriers and challenges they face as political subjects but are also able to propose concrete alternatives that do not oblige them to adapt to an agenda that doesn’t comply with the full realization of their rights. Agroecology and food sovereignty are at the center of these concrete alternatives.
- The Forum put existing international policy frameworks at the center of the work, as they can guide and orient, without extending CFS mandate, the work of this committee in the future. CEDAW and particularly the General Recommendation 34, are key examples of such a synergy that also respond to the functions of convergence and coherence in the CFS.
- It was reaffirmed that the political will of governments and CFS members is fundamental to use and apply existing normative policy frameworks that contribute to the realization of women’s rights, equality and empowerment.

CFS 44 Plenary Session, October 2017
The CSM WG on Women strongly welcomed the CFS Plenary’s adoption of the Forum’s Outcomes that will from now on inform CFS work by mainstreaming women’s rights, gender equality and women’s empowerment in all levels. The outcomes also confirmed that General Recommendation 34 of CEDAW is one of the tools that should inform this process, together with the leading role of the women’s organisations themselves. The CSM WG also reminded the Plenary that they will not accept any step back from this important achievement. The WG highlighted the capacity of the CFS to have a lively and vibrant debate among all its members and participants by courageously addressing controversial issues and naming root causes and drivers of change in an intellectually honest way, as it
was done in the September’s Forum. The challenge now is to effectively implement the breakthrough achieved in this process.

You find the complete information on this workstream on the CSM Website: http://www.csm4cfs.org/working-groups/women/

**Monitoring**

**Inter-sessional period 2016/2017**

CFS 43 in 2016 saw a huge step forward in the development of the innovative monitoring mechanism, with the adoption of the Terms of Reference (ToR) for monitoring events, providing a clear framework for how events should be organized. It also held the first Global Thematic Event monitoring the use and application of the Tenure Guidelines, including the 2 pilot monitoring events completed by German and France at national level, and a CSO synthesis document.

Throughout the year, the WG co-organized 2 events that continued the monitoring discussion with CFS actors:

- Joint event on the “Right to Food and Accountability to affected populations” with Norway, Brazil, South Africa and Switzerland: http://www.csm4cfs.org/right-adequate-food-event-24-january-2016/
- Joint event with Germany on “Bringing home the results from Home”: http://www.csm4cfs.org/bringing-home-results-rome-strengthening-use-application-cfs-policy-outcomes/

The OEWG on monitoring had a very contentious year, with many unforeseen meetings, and blockages by some governments, as it debated the methodology for monitoring CFS policy outcomes - with the open question of whether or not to include policy recommendations and the future of the OEWG itself. The discussions concluded with the following elements:

- The OEWG on monitoring will only have a one-off meeting next year to discuss the preparations on the Global Thematic Event on the Right to Food Guidelines at CFS 45, and to discuss the monitoring of the specific policy recommendations;
- The Plenary shall “recognize the importance of following up on previous decisions of CFS on monitoring in the context of the CFS evaluation Plan of Action”, which means a plenary commitment to discuss the further development of the innovative monitoring mechanism as part of the CFS response to the evaluation report;
- The final decisions of the CFS Plenary to hold the three global thematic events (on RtF Guidelines in 2018, Framework for Action on Protracted Crises in 2020, and RAI in 2022).

**CFS 44 Plenary Session, October 2017**

During the CFS Plenary the CSM WG welcomed the approval of the Global Thematic Event on Monitoring the Right to Food Guidelines at CFS 45. The CSM called upon member states, regional groups and RBAs to support the process by organising national or regional monitoring events in the first months of 2018. The CSM WG also recalled in its Plenary Statement that the CFS is still learning how to improve and continue the monitoring work, creating a stronger accountability and supporting the use and application of CFS policy outcomes. It remarked the need to keep working on a monitoring framework for the CFS “more specific” policy recommendations. In this sense, it was strongly highlighted that the work of the OEWG on monitoring is a fundamental component to the structure of the CFS and is the necessary inclusive and participative space where to continue building incrementally the CFS innovative monitoring mechanism.

You find the complete information on this workstream on the CSM Website: http://www.csm4cfs.org/working-groups/monitoring/
CFS Evaluation

Inter-sessional period 2016/2017

CSM contributed to the CFS evaluation process through many efforts such as support to country visits, by facilitating the organizations of meetings of the evaluation team with civil society organizations, and responses on questions of the Evaluation Team and comments on the first draft of the Evaluation report. After the release of the independent CFS Evaluation report, in April 2017, the CSM Coordination Committee discussed its results and contributed again to the first rounds of discussion about the responses of the CFS to the evaluation report. The inter-sessional period 2017-2018 will finalise the discussions on the remaining recommendations, and will start the implementation of those responses that were accepted by the Committee. See for the more qualitative analysis of the evaluation process the previous chapter of this report.

CFS 44 Plenary Session, October 2017

During the CFS Plenary, the CSM recalled the strong engagement and substantial participation of the CSM to the entire Evaluation process. CSM welcomed the conclusions of the Co-facilitators on the CFS Response who explicitly stated that there won’t be a “reform of the reform”. The consultation report aims to further strengthening the roles and functioning of the CFS in line with its mandate and vision. The CSM WG reminded the CFS that its reform spirit aimed at making the CFS a truly responsive place to the global challenges of today such as the famines and severe food crises, as well as the agrobusiness megamergers that are affecting millions of people’s food security and nutrition. CSM recalled once again the principle of the CFS Reform to give special space to the voices of those most affected by food insecurity who are often the same time those most contributing to food security and nutrition. The CSM statement also stressed the important role played by the RBAs, especially in supporting the use, application and monitoring of CFS decision.

MYPOW

Inter-sessional period 2016/2017

As agreed during the CSM Forum 2016, the CSM submitted three proposals for CFS priorities for the MYPOW process 2018/2019: agroecology, market concentration/megamergers and the situation of plantation workers. The CFS ranking exercise in November/December 2016 showed that very few CFS members supported the market concentration and plantation workers proposals. The agroecology proposal, however, clearly won the ranking exercise due to the overwhelming support from member states. When the discussions of the OEWG on MYPOW started in February 2017, there was harsh opposition of some few member states and the Private Sector Mechanism to the agroecology theme. As described in the previous chapter, it took a long time and several additional meetings, including so called

All submissions and contributions can be found on the respective part of the CSM Website:
http://www.csm4cfs.org/working-groups/cfs-evaluation/
Friends of the Chair meetings, until the agroecology HLPE report was finally accepted in the OEWG.

**CFS 44 Plenary Session, October 2017**

During the CFS Plenary Session, the CSM WG on MY-POW welcomed the decision to request an HLPE Report on agroecological approaches and other innovations for sustainable food systems, reminding the crucial role that agroecology plays in addressing several of the root causes of food insecurity and malnutrition. The CSM raised its concern on the use of so-called “red lines” to either prevent the CFS to discuss a controversial issue or to even challenge its explicit mandate. The CSM statement also stressed the importance of following up on the implementation and mainstream of the Women’s Empowerment Forum’s outcomes in all CFS future and current work. It recalled that the monitoring is one of the 6 functions of the CFS and the OEWG is therefore a fundamental component to enable the performance of such function. The WG also encouraged the CFS to consider the 2nd HLPE Note and the plenary debate on the Critical and Emerging Issues when discussing the new ToRs of the next CFS MYPoW. Finally, the WG concluded its statement by highlighting the need to close the funding gap of the CFS and find a sustainable and permanent solution to its financial deficit.

You find the complete information on this work-stream on the CSM Website: [http://www.csm4cfs.org/working-groups/my-pow/](http://www.csm4cfs.org/working-groups/my-pow/)
Forestry

Inter-sessional period 2016/2017

The CSM WG on Forestry was created in 2017 to facilitate civil society participation to the policy convergence process on sustainable forestry and food security and nutrition in the CFS, which started after the launch of the HLPE Report on this topic on 27 June. Since then, the CSM WG intensively worked on a vision statement and a comprehensive comment on the HLPE recommendation, which were presented on 19 September in the CFS consultation and an additional CSM Informational Meeting attended by CFS members and participants.

Policy Negotiations

The Forestry process was difficult: the rushed pace of the negotiations, the low level of participation and non-inclusive nature of the negotiation methodology led to a negotiation process full of tensions. The CSM Forestry WG negotiated with great commitments by advocating the following key points:

- The need to strongly ground the CFS Policy recommendations on the Right to Food and on a Human Rights Framework;
- The need to tackle and name the drivers of deforestation such as industrial agriculture, wood and energy;
- The centrality and key role of the forest-dependent communities that have a socio-political, cultural, spiritual, economic and environmental relationship with forests;
- Their central role needs to be also recognised in the implementation phase of the recommendations;
- The need to critically assess and review the role of commercial tree plantations with regards to food security and nutrition;
- The need to recognise and protect forests’ workers’ rights.

CFS 44 Plenary Session, October 2017

The CSM WG, after recalling the tensions generated by the negotiation methodology, urged the Committee to assess and improve the policy convergence processes in the CFS. The WG welcomed that the CFS policy recommendations recognize that peoples and their rights are at the centre of the relations between forests and food security and nutrition, and that they also recognize the diversity of relationships with the forests and views of what forests and forest eco-systems are. The WG particularly welcomed the plenary agreement that a further discussion on the relation of commercial tree plantations and food security and nutrition will take place.

You find the complete information on this workstream on the CSM Website:
http://www.csm4cfs.org/working-groups/forestry/
GSF

**Inter-sessional Period 2016/2017**

The Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition (GSF) is the main reference framework of the CFS and comprises all decisions of the CFS on the more comprehensive and the more specific policy outcomes. Its first version was negotiated in 2011-2012 and adopted by the CFS in October 2012. Between 2016-17, the OEWG on the GSF conducted a periodic update of the GSF, the final updated version is available online on the CSM dedicated page. CSM’s contributions to this process aimed successfully to ensure that none of the important achievement of previous negotiations was lost and that additional efforts are taken to better disseminate, use and apply this highly valuable instrument towards much stronger policy coherence with the right to adequate food.

**CFS 44 Plenary Session, October 2017**

During the Plenary, the CSM WG on the GSF called upon the members of the RBAs to enhance their efforts for a better use, application and monitoring of the CFS policy outcomes, to improve policy coordination, convergence and coherence as well as right to food accountability. The CSM WG also reaffirmed its strong commitment in contributing to bring home the results from Rome.

You find the complete information on this workstream on the CSM:
http://www.csm4cfs.org/working-groups/global-strategic-framework/

---

**CSM Side events at CFS 44**

**Reclaiming healthy and sustainable diets as a public good**
Public policies and investments on nutrition as critical instruments to guarantee human rights and redress the livelihoods, environmental, health and fiscal implications of food systems (CSM Working Group on Nutrition)

**Women’s roles and rights in situations of food crises, famines and conflict**
How to collectively reflect on the crucial role of women in response to crisis and conflicts, and on women as agents of change. What is the role that CFS can play in the international arena to address the root causes of such famines and conflicts, and move ahead the women’s rights agenda (CSM Working Group on Women, CSM WG on Protracted Crises, and CSM ad-hoc WG on Food Crises)

**Global Hearing of the Landless**
How to effectively secure and institutionalize the Land Rights of the Landless Poor? (CSM Landless Constituency)

**Agribusiness Mega-Mergers’ Threat to World Food Security**
Updates, scenarios and how the CFS can respond (Facilitated by ETC Group)

**Visions for the CFS 2022**
How do we envision the CFS in 5 years? What are the ways to get there? (Facilitated by the emerging CSM Working Group on Global Food Governance)
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 established 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 articulation 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 society 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, Indigenous Peoples, Pastoralists, Food and Agricultural workers, Landless, Women, Youth, Consumers, Urban Food Insecure and 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 sub-regions: North America, Central America and Caribbean, Andean Region, Southern Cone, West Europe, East Europe, North Africa, Central Africa, East Africa, West Africa, South Africa, South Asia, Southeast Asia, Central Asia, West Asia, Australasia and Pacific.

The 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 they are the subjects of their own development and also the most important contributors to food security and nutrition worldwide.
• …respects pluralism, autonomy, diversity and self-organization 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 million 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.

The majority of people come from small-scale food producer constituencies: far more than 330 million people are affiliated to participating organizations from the constituencies of Smallholder and Family Farmers, Fisherfolks, Indigenous Peoples, Pastoralists, Food and Agricultural workers.
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 the 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 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 2016/2017

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 Multi-Year Program of Work (MYPOW). Working Groups are open to all participating organizations of the CSM and ideally comprise organizations from all global constituencies and sub-regions. Each of the WG is led by one or two coordinators who are members of the CC and is usually supported by technical facilitators and resource persons.

For information on the different CSM Working Groups, please consult the following link in the CSM Webpage: http://www.csm4cfs.org/policy-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 2015-2017 was composed by 20 women and 19 men. Gender and geographic balance within its composition are important criteria in the CSM. The CSM Coordination Committee was renewed in 2017. See the composition of the outgoing CC of the period 2015-2017 in the following chart:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituency</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smallholders and Family Farmers</td>
<td>Javier Sánchez</td>
<td>La Via Campesina (LVC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chukki Nanjundaswami</td>
<td>La Via Campesina (LVC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Clementino</td>
<td>COPROFAM - Coordinadora de los Productores Familiar del Mercosur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Esther Penuelas (2016)</td>
<td>AFA – Asian Farmers’ Association for Sustainable Rural Development FIMARC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rony Joseph (2017)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastoralists and Herders</td>
<td>Hindou Oumarou Ibrahim</td>
<td>WAMP – World Alliance of Mobile Indigenous Peoples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maria Teresa Alvarez</td>
<td>WAMP – World Alliance of Mobile Indigenous Peoples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisherfolks</td>
<td>Navteegh Jeffer</td>
<td>WFP – World Forum of Fisher Peoples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edith Addu Lukanga</td>
<td>WFP – World Forum of Fish Harvesters and Fish Workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous Peoples</td>
<td>Taina Hedman</td>
<td>ITC – International Indian Treaty Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anant Fraser</td>
<td>ITC – 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>Adwoa 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>Landless</td>
<td>Kuri Gathuru</td>
<td>HIC – Habitat International Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jamal 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 Dwollar</td>
<td>WMM- World March of Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Azra Sayeed</td>
<td>IWA – International Women’s Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>Israel Baiz</td>
<td>ITC – International Indian Treaty Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goly Papa Bakary</td>
<td>LVC- La Via Campesina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Shalmali Guttsal</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 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 towards CFS processes and a political steering role for the whole CSM, but many of the CC members also 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 of the other organizations their own Constituencies and Sub-regions.

The following section presents a synthesis of these reports on key activities and obstacles faced by the Coordination Committee members for the reporting period 2016-2017.

**Activities report of CSM Coordination Committee Members**

To fulfill their role the CSM Coordination Committee members engage in a number of activities and efforts to ensure a bi-directional communication flow from the local to the global level, and to facilitate civil society and social movements participation in CSM and CFS processes. The following paragraphs summarize the activities reported by CC members in the last year.

Several CC members attended CFS inter-sessional meetings and CSM activities, travelling to Rome, delivering and defending the positions prepared by the CSM working Groups in discussions with CFS members and participants. Some of these CC members have been actively engaged in the facilitation or coordination of the Working Groups.

The most common means of communication used by the CC to disseminate and share information on CSM and CFS processes were existing channels such as organizations’ email-lists as well as sub-regional email lists and topic-specific email lists (women groups, fisherfolks groups). Information was also disseminated through existing organizational structures such as through organizations’ boards and communication offices. Several members of the CC also used the organization’s website, social media like Facebook, and newsletters to share news about the CSM and CFS. WhatsApp was used in many ways for internal communication.

The CSM Secretariat’s monthly CSM Updates were considered to be very useful and in most cases, CC members circulated them within their constituencies and sub-regions.
Based on the CC reports, regional meetings and organizations’ general assemblies represented an ideal space to share information about the role and relevance of the CSM/CFS. These spaces were also essential to inform the members about CFS policy outcomes and raise awareness about their importance. Strong energy was put to popularise the VGGTs and the recent policy recommendations on Smallholder to Markets, sometimes in combinations with the FAO Voluntary Guidelines on Small-Scale Fisheries (SFF). Analysis of relevant CFS policy outcomes was also shared within the organizations’ boards and during organization’s events that touched upon related CSM topics.

Efforts to raise awareness about the CSM/CFS among different civil society actors were also visible in a number of international fora like the CFS Workshops on Smallholders to Markets held in September 2017 in Addis Ababa and Abidjan, to which CC members from these regions supported the participation of small-scale food producers and other CSOs. Some members of the CC did extensive work to build links with networks, spaces and organizations that are engaged with Food Security and Nutrition issues. Some examples include the effort to raise awareness about the CSM/CFS as well as about CFS policy outcomes with regional networks in Africa like the Platform of African Farmers Organizations (PAFO) or Europe, such as the European Economic and Social Committee.

Most members of the CC continuously informed members of their organizations about the CSM Policy Working Groups inviting them to take part. Many also tried to introduce members to the CSM website and to train them about the structure and functioning of the CSM. However, in general, it seems like most of the energy was concentrated on informing organizations about the work done by the CSM and the policy instruments adopted by the CFS (through trainings, workshops, specific meetings). This also helped to raise awareness about what the CSM is and what it does.

A few members of the CC also mentioned the work done to influence governments and regional institutions to implement adopted CFS policy instruments.

Among the major challenges a few CC members highlighted technical obstacles like poor internet connection that often slows down or impedes their work. However, the main challenges faced by the CC remain 1) how to better engage civil society organizations and foster their participation in the CSM and 2) how to bring CSM achievements in the CFS to the local level and raise awareness about CFS policy outcomes.

Regarding the challenge number 1), several activities have been accomplished as mentioned in the CC activities above. A member of the CC tried to map out CSOs’ interests in the sub-region in relation to the CSM work. Such mapping exercise is an initiative that could be replicated in the future to engage more organizations in the process.

The challenge number 2) was met with a great effort by CC members and their organizations to popularise the CSM achievements and CFS policy instruments through workshops, training sessions and with the creation of more accessible manuals and training materials. Good examples, among others, is the VGGTs popular manual that is used at the local level for land struggles and the Smallholders to Markets analytical guide.
Reports from the CSM Constituency Meetings in 2017

Report from the Constituency meeting of the Indigenous Peoples in Kuna Yala (Autonomous territory of the Kuna People), Panama – February 21-22, 2017

The Meeting was organized by the Kuna People in collaboration with the Civil Society Mechanism and the International Indian Treaty Council. The objective of the meeting was to hold a Global Consultation of Indigenous Peoples to evaluate and strengthen the participation of Indigenous Peoples in the Committee on World Food Security (CFS).

In Kuna Yala, participants analysed those spaces in which Indigenous Peoples are involved, such as the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, the Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (EMRIP), the Special Rapporteur on Indigenous Peoples’ Rights, and the Civil Society Mechanism of the Committee on World Food Security. Participants stressed the need to promote, strengthen and consolidate the numerous linkages in those areas of the UN system where Indigenous Peoples work, which would be a significant step to strengthen the CFS.

The meeting assessed as particularly relevant for Indigenous Peoples the Voluntary Guidelines on Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests; the Principles for Responsible Agricultural Investment; the Global Strategic Framework; and Water; as these recognise the human rights of Indigenous Peoples. Participants agreed that it was vital to pool efforts to strengthen the Indigenous Peoples’ visions in future CFS output documents, through their increased energy and widened participation.

Indigenous Peoples consider the CFS to be highly valuable, and it should therefore be strengthened through indigenous experience and knowledge, by enabling the widened participation of indigenous experts, wise elders, youth and women from all indigenous nations. The Constituency Meeting renewed the commitments to strengthen and contribute to the CFS on forthcoming relevant issues such as the process on Monitoring and Accountability, Agroecology, Nutrition, Forestry, Climate Change, Women, Megamergers, Biodiversity, and SDGs, by also connecting these to the processes taking place in New York and in Geneva, to which Indigenous Peoples participate.
Report from the Constituency meeting of the Landless in Tunisia, 21-23 March 2017

The Meeting in Tunisia gathered a group of networks and organizations’ representatives that discussed the further development of the Landless Constituency within the Civil Society Mechanism (CSM). After two days of thorough discussions, participants came out with results, outcomes and recommendations. With the aim to foster social, cultural and economic rights related to lands and secure tenure and their impact on Landless people, participants shared struggles, knowledge and experiences with regard to landlessness. Participants’ contributions were focused on diagnosing the magnitude and implications of landlessness in order to crystallize future plans and activities among groups and bodies addressing the rights of Landless people by developing a map of activities, bodies and plans at the international level that can impact the decision-making process in enacting land laws, policies and regulations.

The workshop was an important step ahead for a common understanding, including a definition in progress, and a concrete workplan of the CSM landless constituency. Participants confirmed the importance of ownership and secure tenure rights of lands for the sake of using lands for agricultural purposes and as means of sustenance. Farmers secure access to and free use of lands contributes to the sustainable development, reduces poverty and helps in achieving food security.

As a specific follow up, the Meeting suggested to hold Side event at the CFS which was then supported by the CSM Coordination Committee and finally approved by the CFS for October 2017. The Side Event aimed to transmit the call from the Tunis meeting to recognize the growing landlessness as a root cause of food insecurity, inequality, disparity, injustice and violence which together can be seen as one of the biggest challenges for humanity today. Representatives of landless movements from different regions described the dimensions of landlessness, their causes and effects, and presented their political demands towards the international community, and particularly the CFS.

Report from the CSM Constituency meeting of the Women in Rome, Italy 25-26 of September 2017

The CSM Women’s Constituency meeting took place on 26 and 27 of September 2017. The meeting started by making an evaluation of the outcomes of the CFS Forum on Women’s Empowerment that took place the day before and assessing the internal preparatory days. The participants took also advantage of the moment to discuss the steps forward towards the CFS 44 Plenary Session and to prepare the CSM Side event on women’s roles and struggles in context of conflict and crises.
The CSM Women’s meeting intended to introduce all participants, by exchanging and sharing their key demands, experiences and expertise. The meeting offered a knowledge sharing space that allowed connecting the local dimension of the struggles with the global one taking place within the CFS. It gave an opportunity to get familiar with the reformed CFS multi-actor architecture and the CSM nature and principles, as a convergence space for social movements, civil society and indigenous peoples’ policy demands towards the CFS. It aimed at preparing, both substantially and strategically, a critical analysis of the current political debate within the CFS on women’s rights issues, the challenges faced, and the expectations and demands of women’s grassroots organization toward this specific policy workstream.

The Constituency meeting agreed to draft a Vision document highlighting the key points that emerged in the meeting and a paper on feminism and agroecology that could inform the work of the CSM WG on Agroecology. The meeting also prepared the renewal process of the Constituency that will be concluded by the end of January 2018.

**Report on the CC Renewal process 2017**

The renewal process of the CSM Coordination Committee took place in the months from May to July, with some few cases finalising their processes only August and December of this year. The renewal processes were conducted by the CC within their sub-region and constituency in an autonomous and self-organised manner, in accordance with the requirements and technical instructions established in the CSM Internal Guidelines.

Below a table with the new CSM Coordination Committee appointed for the period October 2017/October 2019. The CSM currently counts on 38 members of the CC, 19 women and 18 men.
See in the following chart the new composition of the CSM Coordination Committee for the period 2017-2019:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Constituency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ramona Duminicioiu</td>
<td>La Via Campesina (LVC)</td>
<td>Smallholders and Family Farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kannaiyan Subramaniam</td>
<td>La Via Campesina (LVC)</td>
<td>Smallholders and Family Farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberto Broch</td>
<td>COPROFAM</td>
<td>Smallholders and Family Farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rony Joseph</td>
<td>FIMARC</td>
<td>Smallholders and Family Farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>María Teresa Alvarez</td>
<td>WAMIP</td>
<td>Pastoralists/Herders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindou Oumarou Ibrahim</td>
<td>WAMIP</td>
<td>Pastoralists/Herders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christiane Louwa</td>
<td>WFFP</td>
<td>Fisherfolks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editrudith Lukanga</td>
<td>WFF</td>
<td>Fisherfolks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adwoa Sakyi</td>
<td>IUF</td>
<td>Agricultural and Food Workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulomee Mistry</td>
<td>IUF</td>
<td>Agricultural and Food Workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christiane Costa</td>
<td>HIC</td>
<td>Urban Food Insecure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuria Gathuru - Passed away on 15 November 2017, a new member will be appointed</td>
<td>HIC</td>
<td>Urban Food Insecure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabel Alvarez</td>
<td>Urgenci</td>
<td>Consumers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danilo Perez</td>
<td>Consumers International</td>
<td>Consumers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saúl Vicente Vazquez</td>
<td>IITC</td>
<td>Indigenous People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali Ali Shatu</td>
<td>MBOSCUDA/IPACC</td>
<td>Indigenous People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margarita Gomez</td>
<td>CLOC</td>
<td>Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasmin Choudhury</td>
<td>WFF</td>
<td>Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophie Dwoollar (renewal process to be finalized)</td>
<td>World March of Women</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azra Sayeed (renewal process to be finalized)</td>
<td>International Women Alliance</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhoda Gueta</td>
<td>Asian Peasant Coalition</td>
<td>Landless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamal Tabla Alamleh</td>
<td>Land Research Center</td>
<td>Landless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joana Dias</td>
<td>Redsan - CPLP Actuar</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martín Drago</td>
<td>Friends of the Earth</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Sub-region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nettie Wiebe</td>
<td>National Farmers’ Union</td>
<td>North America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio Gonzalez</td>
<td>MAELA</td>
<td>Central America and Caribbean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriela Cruz</td>
<td>WFF</td>
<td>Andean Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodolfo Gonzalez Greco</td>
<td>CLOC - LVC</td>
<td>South Cone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thierry Kesteloot</td>
<td>Oxfam Solidarité</td>
<td>West Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elene Shatberashvili</td>
<td>Biological Farmer Association</td>
<td>East Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Said Khairallah</td>
<td>Federation National du Secteur Agricole (FNSA)</td>
<td>North Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathanael Buka Mupungu</td>
<td>PROPAC</td>
<td>Central Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justus Lavi</td>
<td>Kenya Small Scale Farmers Forum (KESSFF)</td>
<td>East Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadjirou Sall</td>
<td>ROPPA</td>
<td>West Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurniawan Sabar</td>
<td>Institute for National and Democracy Studies (INDIES)</td>
<td>Southeast Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariam Aljaajaa</td>
<td>Arab Network for Food Sovereignty</td>
<td>West Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Hutchby</td>
<td>Poutini Waïora/IITC</td>
<td>Australasia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilles Parzy-Tehau</td>
<td>Poet.com</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Financial Report 2016/2017

In 2016 the overall expenses of the CSM amounted to 630.773 Euro, which represented 87% of the planned annual budget. The difference between the actual expenses and the planned budget was mainly due to the late availability of resources that were planned to be used for some specific activities, particularly the Constituency meetings of the Indigenous Peoples and the Landless. They were then postponed to the first months of 2017, as well as one of the meetings of the CFS OEWG on Monitoring.

### BUDGET FOR THE CSM activities in 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Nr.</th>
<th>Total Budget (Euros)</th>
<th>Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Participation in the CFS AG meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td>€ 82.600</td>
<td>€ 73.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. CSM policy working groups &amp; participation in CFS inter-sessional activities</td>
<td></td>
<td>€ 30.162</td>
<td>€ 24.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Annual CSM CC meeting, Forum &amp; participation in Annual CFS Plenary</td>
<td></td>
<td>€ 151.920</td>
<td>€ 134.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Secretariat</td>
<td></td>
<td>€ 141.000</td>
<td>€ 139.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Accountability, monitoring and contingency costs</td>
<td></td>
<td>€ 8.000</td>
<td>€ 4.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTIAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>€ 686.082</td>
<td>€ 594.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration fee 5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>€ 34.334</td>
<td>€ 36.701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>€ 721.016</td>
<td>€ 630.773</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2016 Financial contributions to the CSM

The majority of the resources was provided by Governments and International Institutions (90%), with a 10% provided by participating organizations to the CSM. These figures do not include the in-kind contributions that many of the participating organizations provide through staff time dedicated to CSM Working Groups and self-funded travel to Rome.

#### DONORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DONORS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governments, Intern. Instit., Development Coop. Agencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>€ 285.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>€ 133.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>€ 37.633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>€ 50.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>€ 10.581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFAD</td>
<td>€ 40.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>€ 565.532</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### NGOs and CSOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NGOs and CSOs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oxfam Solidarité</td>
<td>€ 11.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICCO</td>
<td>€ 10.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SdI</td>
<td>€ 11.287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISEREOR</td>
<td>€ 8.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosa Luxembourg</td>
<td>€ 4.475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIDSE</td>
<td>€ 3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>€ 17.473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>€ 65.242</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preliminary CSM 2017 Financial report for the period January to September ’17

The resources raised by the CSM up to September amounted to 686,027 Euro, equal to 89% of the planned annual budget for 2017. As in previous years, the majority of funds were provided by governments and international institutions (91%). As in 2016, the late approval and accessibility of a major part of the resources (approximately 283,000€ could only be received between July and August), had an impact on CSO participation in the CFS meetings that took place in first half of the year, particularly by reducing the number of CSM delegates during the period January-March to a maximum of 1 person per OEWG meeting.
Based on the analysis of the CFS processes presented in the first part of this report, the CSM will have to find strategic responses to many challenges. The CC meeting and the CSM Forum in October 2017 considered these and other reflections when defining the priorities for the CSM Workplan 2018.

a) The intensity of the deliberation on the CFS evaluation will continue in 2018. The provisional meeting schedule for the evaluation discussions in the coming inter-sessional period shows how time and energy-consuming these discussions will be. The near future bears the risk of an increasingly inward-looking CFS. The CSM will have to contribute to these discussions. But how can we set the priorities in a way that the self-referential deliberations in the CFS get exactly the appropriate attention they need, and effectively lead to a strengthened CFS?

b) The use, application and monitoring challenge: How to better use at home what was agreed in Rome? This discussion has been significantly pushed by the CSM in 2017, together with some governments. A huge opportunity to advance these efforts is now given with the decision on the GTE 2018 and the possibility to hold national and regional monitoring events on the use and application of the Right to Food Guidelines. CSM participating organizations will be strongly encouraged to promote such events in their countries and regions, and to contribute to the global independent report of the CSM that will be presented to the CFS 45. CSM participating organizations should also be supported in using much more the policy instruments agreed in the CFS, for their struggles on the country, regional and global levels.

c) How to make the CFS a truly responsive place to the global challenges of today and tomorrow? This question refers to global urgencies such as the famines and severe food crises, the escalation of wars and conflicts, as well as to global challenges with huge implications, such as the debate on megamergers in the agribusiness sector. This question is coupled with the broader question on how to make the people’s voices better heard and understood in the CFS? The way, how social movements can participate and challenge the CFS in the coming period, needs to be further explored.

d) The upcoming CFS thematic agenda: of course, the CSM will also have to relate and respond to the agenda items on the CFS 2018 agenda. Among the main topics are: nutrition, monitoring, urbanization and rural transformation, and agroecology.

e) The financial problem: the CFS budget will continue to be insecure, and therefore as well the agreed MYPOW. The financial risks are particularly with the HLPE and the CSM, both entirely funded through voluntary contributions also in the future. Another challenge will be to get the robust safeguards against conflict of interest on CFS funding in place, as it was agreed now in the CFS evaluation discussions.

f) Finally: how to further develop our visions for the CFS, and our own role as CSM in this context? Given the difficult context with often changing parameters in the CFS, it is of utmost importance for the CSM to collectively discuss about our objectives, priorities and strategies for the CFS.
LIST OF ACRONYMS:

AG - ADVISORY GROUP
CC - COORDINATION COMMITTEE (CSM)
CFS - COMMITTEE ON WORLD FOOD SECURITY
CSO - CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANISATION
FAO - FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANISATION
FFA - FRAMEWORK FOR ACTION FOR FOOD SECURITY AND NUTRITION IN PROTRACTED CRISSES
FPIC – FREE PRIOR AND INFORMED CONSENT
FSN – FOOD SECURITY AND NUTRITION
GSF - GLOBAL STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK FOR FOOD SECURITY AND NUTRITION
GTE – GLOBAL THEMATIC EVENT
HLPE - HIGH LEVEL PANEL OF EXPERTS
HLPF – HIGH LEVEL POLITICAL FORUM
ICN2 - SECOND INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON NUTRITION
IFAD - INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT
MYPOW - MULTI-YEAR PROGRAM OF WORK
NGO - NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANISATION
OEWG - OPEN-ENDED WORKING GROUP
PSM – PRIVATE SECTOR MECHANISM
RAI - RESPONSIBLE AGRICULTURAL INVESTMENT PRINCIPLES
RTF - RIGHT TO ADEQUATE FOOD
SDG - SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS
TT/TTT - TECHNICAL TASK TEAM
TORS - TERMS OF REFERENCE
VGGT - VOLUNTARY GUIDELINES ON THE RESPONSIBLE GOVERNANCE OF TENURE OF LAND, FISHERIES AND FORESTS IN THE CONTEXT OF NATIONAL FOOD SECURITY
UN - UNITED NATIONS
WFP - WORLD FOOD PROGRAM
WHO - WORLD HEALTH ORGANISATION
WTO - WORLD TRADE ORGANISATION