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CSM FORUM and CFS 42!
10 - 11 of October 2015 CSM Forum
12-15 October 2015 CFS 42

JOIN THE E-CONSULTATION!
FROM 2 to 31 of OCTOBER

The Zero Draft of the HLPE Report on Sustainable Agricultural Development for food security and nutrition, including the role of livestock is online!
CSM Forum and CFS 42

CSM FORUM

The CSM Forum will take place on 10-11 of October in the Red Room, at Fao Headquarters in Rome. Self-funded participating organisations attending the CSM Forum and the CFS 42, will be able to pick up a unique security building pass for both events at FAO visitor’s entrance during the following hours and days:

Thursday 8 October 14.30 – 17.00
Friday 9 October 14.30 – 17.00
Saturday 10 October from 8.00 am
Sunday 11 October from 8.30 am

Building passes must be kept at all time.

Please find the draft agenda of the CSM Forum 2015 available here

CFS 42

The Plenary Session of the CFS 42 will take place from 12 to 15 of October 2015 at FAO Headquarters. If you are unable to attend the CSM Forum but only the CFS 42 you will be able to pick up your security building passes during the following hours:

Thursday 8 October 14.30 – 17.00
Friday 9 October 14.30 – 17.00
Sunday 11 October from 14:30 to 17:00
Monday 12 October from 8.00 am

Find the provisional CFS timetable at this link (currently available only in English)
Find the provisional annotated agenda at this link (currently available only in English)
Find all session documents at this link (available in all languages)
Find the side events timetable at this link (currently available only in English)

CSM will hold 4 side events. Below all relevant details are highlighted:

1. **MONDAY 12 OCTOBER**
   CSM Water Working Group
   *The right to water for the progressive realization of the right to adequate food - the role of the CFS*
   12.30 - 14.00
   Philippines Room

2. **TUESDAY 13 OCTOBER**
   CSM Working Group on Protracted Crises
   *Framework for Action for Food Security and Nutrition in Protracted Crises: the way forward*
   8.30-9.30
   Iraq Room
3. **TUESDAY 13 OCTOBER**

*USC Canada, ETC Group, MAELA, La Via Campesina, IPC Working Group on Agroecology, Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy*

*Cultivating Agroecology for Food and Agriculture. A priority to CFS*

18.00 - 19.30

Philippines Room

4. **THURSDAY 15 OCTOBER**

*IPC Network (including La Via Campesina, ROPPA, WFF, WFP, MAELA, IITC, WAMIP, IUF, Urgenci) with the support of Terra Nuova, Crocevia and The Quaker United Nations Office - QUNO*

*What trade policies to increase food security and food sovereignty, strengthen local food systems and protect and strengthen small food producers*

13.30-15.00

Iraq Room

Please find [here](#) the Calendar of CSM meetings during the CFS week (12-16 October)

---

**Information on CSM CC Meetings and Information Session**

**Information Session for new CC members (7 Oct)**

**Participants:** The information session is mainly directed to the new CC members, but can also be attended by members that were elected during the last period and feel the need to better understand the procedures. The group that facilitates the training will be composed by people with experience in the CSM.

**Elements for its agenda should be:**

- **Why are we here?** An exchange about background and motivation of the participants
- **The CFS** – history, mandate, structure, work and political processes since the Reform
- **The CSM** – history, mandate, structure, work and political processes
- **The role and work of CC members,** including in terms of time and commitment for being fully involved and responsible on CSM and CFS processes;
- **The particular challenges CC members face as facilitators for internal interaction with constituencies, sub-regions, working groups,** and for external interaction with CFS members and participants.

**CC Meeting (8-9 October)**

**Participants:** The participants of the meeting are the CC members and the members of the secretariat. A limited number of self-funded observers from CSM participating organizations can be admitted, but their interventions might be limited by the moderators.
Elements for the agenda:

a. Constitution of the new CC for the period 2015-2017

b. Presentation and discussion of reports from the outgoing CC and AG

c. Political Assessment of the CFS: major developments in 2014/2015, and expectations on the new CFS Chair, Bureau and Advisory Group

d. CC preparation for facilitation of CSM Forum and civil society engagement during CFS 42

e. Election of a new AG, a new Finance Working Group and the new Coordinators of WG

f. Discussion on specific topics related to the overall development of the CSM, including:
   a. Assessment of the reporting and renewal process 2015
   b. Discussion on constituencies and sub-regions
   c. The way to build the landless constituency; possibly discussion also of other proposals for rebuilding processes in other constituencies and sub-regions
   d. Discussion of the draft position on the role of the CFS in the follow-up to SDGs
   e. The way to build a strategic plan for the CSM
   f. The way how the CSM selects its side event proposals: discussion, revision and eventually approval of draft workplan and budget for 2016

g. Exchange with the new CFS Chair

| CSM position regarding the World Food Day Celebrations in Milan |

Most of you already know that this year’s World Food Day (WFD) Celebrations on October 16 will take place at the EXPO in Milan and not in the FAO building in Rome. The CSM Advisory group members repeatedly requested information on this event since April, and particularly about the CFS engagement. This event will also celebrate the 70th Anniversary of FAO with participation of the UN Secretary General. The CSM AG members informed the CFS Bureau and Advisory Group that the CSM Coordination Committee will decide about its participation only after receiving the clear information about the CFS involvement in the event. Such information was now provided by the CFS Chair during the Bureau-Advisory Group meeting on September 7, 2015: there will be no active participation of the CFS in the Milan event, not even of the CFS Chair herself in the agenda. Several countries expressed their disappointment. The CSM had questioned this decision already in autumn last year and suggested to invite the UN Secretary General to the CFS 42 in Rome.

Now, the CSM Coordination considered the issue and took the following decision by consensus: As the CFS will not have an active and meaningful participation in the WFD celebrations in Milan, there is also no mandate for the CSM to be there as CSM. The CC is convinced that it was a mistake to shorten the CFS 42 plenary session by one and a half day in favor of the Milan event. In that sense, there will be no engagement of civil society in the name the CSM during the Milan event.

The CC leaves it open to civil society organizations to decide whether they want to join the event or not as individual organizations. Organizations that are interested to join the train and event in Milan were requested through a special edition of the CSM Update to express their interest to the following email address: wfdmilan@gmail.com
They were asked to submit the name, surname, title, institution, address, email, and a digital photo. According to information provided by the CFS Secretariat, up to 30 CSO participants can join; the Italian government covers the cost for train ticket and entrance to the event. Registered organizations were sent to the CFS Secretariat. Registrations are now closed.

The CC also decided that the CSM will express and explain its position also during the CFS 42 plenary session from 12-15 October.

**UPDATES ON CFS PROCESSES**

**Joint Meeting of the CFS Advisory Group and Bureau Meeting, 7 September**
**Contribution of the CSM Advisory Group**

**Workstream Updates**

- **On Side Events:**
  CSM appreciates the broad variety of side events scheduled for CFS 42. Due to the reduced time of CFS 42, only 4 out of 5 CSM side events were approved. This decision of the CFS Chair was understood and accepted by the CSM Coordination Committee. However, the CSM would have suggested to not postpone all livestock related side events to 2016. They are of fundamental interest for food security and nutrition, particularly for pastoralists all over the world. And the contents of these side events could have well served as inputs to the upcoming HLPE report on sustainable agricultural development, including livestock.

- **Communications & Outreach:**
  We do not fully understand why the draft publication on a OECD and FAO publication on responsible agricultural supply chains is included in this paragraph on CFS outreach and is on the CFS workspace for comments. The nature of this paper is not the one of a CFS product, as it was already stated by the CFS Chair in the Joint Meeting of the CFS Bureau and Advisory Group on 28 November 2014. If we start to include materials produced by AG members and others that are related to CFS decisions, we might overload the workspace. Otherwise, we would also request that the materials produced by civil society organizations related to CFS decisions should equally be included into the workspace.

**CSF Budget and Resourcing**

- Regarding the figures provided on the CSM, we would like to offer the following update and clarification:
  a. CSM overall funding gap for the biennium 2016-2017 has been reduced, due to an important support from the EU announced for 2016. The total deficit is now reduced from 900,000 to 720,000 USD.
  b. The funding gap of the CSM for 2016 is now at 270,000 USD, and for 2017 at 450,000 USD.
- If a prioritization process of the MYPOW is needed due to financial constraints in the overall CFS budget, we believe that the OEWG on MYPOW should take these discussions forward after CFS 42.
- If funding constraints remain for the 2016 budget, CSM suggests to postpone the Evaluation of CFS effectiveness to 2017. The figure in the table also needs to be updated, as the cost indicated in the revised concept note for the evaluation is now at 398,000 USD (not 300,000 any more).
- Regarding the table of the CFS Budget, we repeat our suggestion to include the CSM budget into the CFS Planned Total Costs 2015, given its role as an essential and independent part of the CFS since its reform.
- The background note on 2014-2015 does show the list of CFS funders, but does not indicate the precise contribution of each of them. Therefore, we would like to request the CFS Secretariat a detailed list of the funders, how much was their contribution and if this contribution was tied to any specific workstream of the CFS.
Nominations of the Drafting Committee

- During the last AG/Bureau Meeting, CSM expressed its interest and availability to participate in the CFS 42 Drafting Committee. We would like to know if this was discussed by the Bureau, or can be discussed in its next meeting tomorrow. If a full participation was not welcomed, CSM could also be participating as an observer in this Committee.

CFS Advisory Group Reporting Exercise

As the report shows, CSM has been active and committed to all CFS processes by facilitating an extremely broad participation of civil society organizations from all constituencies and continents.

- In our view, there is the need for a better mutual understanding and stronger interaction between all CFS Constituencies, and we have adopted therefore a pro-active, explanatory approach to other members and participants.
- However, we are concerned about some voices that suggest a reduction of the participation space for civil society organizations. We believe that CFS members and participants should give a clear signal that the space for civil society organizations, as granted through the CFS reform, shall not be reduced.
- The CSM Constituency of small-scale farmers is built by global and continental producer organizations that together represent more than 250 million farmers. So, it is certainly not true that farmers are not represented in the CSM. In a recent conversation between CSM Advisory Group members and the Secretary General of the World Farmers’ Organisation (WFO), CSM has again expressed its continued invitation to the WFO to join the CSM. All civil society organizations that work on food security and nutrition are welcome in the CSM as an open and inclusive space and to participate according to the principles and rules that govern this mechanism.
- Regarding the demand for a parity of seats: CSM and PSM had a meeting today. The roles and nature of the two mechanisms is very different and should not be confused. From the very beginning of the CFS Reform that made the CFS to the most inclusive intergovernmental and international forum on food security and nutrition, the inclusion of the voices of those people who have not been heard in national and global politics on food security, but have been the most affected by hunger and malnutrition, was one of the fundamental cornerstones of the new CFS. The CSM constituencies are built exactly by the organizations of those rights holders who contribute most to food security and nutrition, but are affected by food insecurity and malnutrition. The CSM space as such does not represent them, but the global, regional and national organizations of smallholder farmers, pastoralists, fisherfolks, food and agricultural workers, women, youth, landless, urban food insecure, consumers and NGOs articulate themselves through the CSM to the CFS, by representing more than 300 million organized people from all over the globe. They certainly have a totally different role and deserve a totally different priority attention by Governments and the United Nations than the private and commercial interests of companies and business associations articulated through the PSM.

We are confident that CFS members and participants understand this fundamental difference and particular the substantial innovation of the CFS Reform to include those whose voices have been, and continue to be, mostly excluded from political decision making on food security throughout history and in many countries.

CFS Evaluation

- The CSM is ready to collaborate in all steps of the process, including by offering insights in its own evaluation conducted in 2014, and appreciates the inclusion of CSM inputs on the objective and the mandate of the evaluation (paragraph 8).
- We still believe that the envisaged cost of almost 400.000 USD is exaggerated and should be reduced to a more reasonable amount.
- The footnotes number 3 and 4 should be corrected, in line with what was agreed in the draft MYPOW 2016-17, by adding to each of these footnotes the following quote: “However, this description of outcomes does not replace the agreed language approved by CFS in 2009.”
• The Advisory Group should be involved in the review of the ToRs for the Evaluation Manager and the Evaluation Team. We therefore suggest to include the Advisory Group in the table of the evaluation timeframe (page 5), second row, second column, by adding: in consultation with the CFS Bureau and Advisory Group
• We suggest that the evaluation team includes an expert with a high degree of experience and understanding of small-scale food producer organizations and other civil society groups working on food security and nutrition.
• We also suggest to include in the Terms of Reference of the Evaluation Manager a new bullet point under Competencies: “ability to listen, understand and process the large diversity of views, perspectives and knowledge building processes in the different CFS constituencies”
• In any case, the evaluation team should be able to highlight both the convergent and the divergent point of views. There will be very different opinions expressed, and they should be equally visualized.

**Composition of the Task Teams**

• The CSM requested during the last Joint Meeting of the Bureau and AG in July a debate on the composition of the CFS Task Teams. We appreciate that this is possible today, although it might not possible to conclude it today or this week.
• We understand that the basis for the discussion is the Annex to the information note provided by the Secretariat, called: Purpose and format of the CFS Bureau Working Groups and Task Teams.
• This Annex was welcomed by the CFS Bureau in July 2012 and reflects very clearly the spirit of the CFS Reform. It clarifies the role and the composition of Task Teams of the Secretariat. The document states that “Task teams are composed by representatives of willing organizations that are members of the CFS Advisory Group”. It also states that “the final content of Task team documents is the responsibility of the joint Secretariat”
• This disposition reflects the recognition that the technical expertise and the particular knowledge of Advisory Group members can contribute significantly to the technical aspects of policy convergence and coordination, as the approved note from July 2012 says.
• The acknowledgment and the use of participatory and inclusive knowledge building processes is one of the innovative aspects and added values of the CFS reform and is also reflected in the foundations and methodologies used by the HLPE.
• CSM has contributed to Task Teams with its particular technical expertise and has brought aspects and knowledge to these teams that were not introduced by other members of the Task Team. This includes the contributions in the monitoring Task team on existing monitoring mechanisms and methodologies; the contributions on labor standards and their application to the TT on the social protection; the experiences with local food systems and local procurement in the TT on protracted crises; or the case studies on the importance of informal and invisible markets that was further recognized by the HLF on connecting smallholders to markets as a data gap in the Rome based agencies.
• We know that our contribution in Task Teams can make a substantial difference, and this is true as well for other AG members. Therefore, we do not see a reason for not applying the note that was approved by the Bureau in July 2012.
• Task Teams should be kept open to Members of the CFS Advisory Group, as a normal practice, and as a matter of principle in a CFS that seeks to use the specific expertise and the particular knowledge of its Advisory Group members.

**Any Other Business**

**Milan World Food Day Celebrations**

• The Coordination Committee of the CSM will decide about its participation in Milano based on the information that is provided today to the Joint Meeting. A key criterion for this deliberation is the question, how the CFS is involved in this celebration. The decision will be taken as soon as possible and then communicated to the CFS Secretariat.
The Annual Forum of the CSM will be held on 10 and 11 of October. We want to already now invite CFS members and participants to participate in the public part on Saturday morning (10 October) and also want to already announce to the regional groups that we will contact you for meetings with civil society organizations from your region in the afternoon of Sunday, 11 of October.

**Remarks on the High Level Forum on Connecting Smallholders to Markets**

- The CFS is a democratic space characterised by the diversity of its participants. This is why we value it, and why it is gaining ground within the United Nations system.
- The issue of how to connect small holders to market is of great importance to us. We have indispensible experience that we can contribute to the debate as we represent the small holders in question. We produce approximately 80% of food consumed around the world through markets that are mostly informal, ‘invisible’, and not well known by institutions, but that comprise the basis for all food provision systems at all levels.
- We welcome the CFS Chair’s summary of the High Level Forum. We also have an analysis of the issues raised in the Forum, and we will be prepared to communicate this during the CFS plenary in October. We will also make suggestions regarding how to conduct and structure the process in the best way possible; the process that will culminate in the conclusions to be presented to the CFS plenary in 2016.

---

**Bureau Outcomes of 10 September 2015**

Agenda (see list of attendees below):

1. CFS budget/resourcing CFS 42
2. Drafting Committee composition
3. Report from Advisory Group members on their activities
4. Evaluation of CFS
5. Taskteam Composition
6. Election of Vice-Chair
7. AOB:
   - Update on the Special event on Resilience
   - Update on level of country participation

**CFS budget/resourcing**

Members decided to submit the full MYPoW to CFS 42 for endorsement, notwithstanding the present resourcing gap. Members were encouraged to follow up on funding opportunities with capitals. Following their request, the Chair agreed to write a letter to capitals of the Near East and the Latin America and the Caribbean Regions, and is available to do it for other regions upon request.
It was decided that funding would also be addressed during CFS Plenary, in the opening of the agenda item on MYPoW and acknowledged that there was a need for a more structured, predictable way to sustain a reasonable resource base for CFS. The Bureau agreed on the need for caution in commencing workstreams that may not be funded to completion; acknowledged work might be delayed, and encouraged continued cost savings where feasible.

2. CFS 42 Drafting Committee composition

The Bureau agreed that a decision to revise the composition of the CFS Plenary Drafting Committees requires a decision in Plenary. Given the short timing and the range of issues to be considered, it was not recommended to table the issue at CFS 42. It was suggested that the issue be brought to the attention of the next Bureau.

The Chair noted that this topic will be included in her transition report to the incoming Chair and Bureau.

3. Report from Advisory Group members on their activities

The Bureau recognized the interesting and informative nature of this reporting exercise and agreed it was a useful document for the next Bureau and Advisory Group to reflect upon, in relation to both the suggestions for improvements and also the potential evolution of the reporting exercise. The next Bureau and Advisory Group might like to consider new questions in order to strengthen the learning opportunities behind this exercise and consider whether the exercise might be extended beyond the Advisory Group.

4. Evaluation of CFS

The revised version of the Evaluation Concept Note was approved by the Bureau, noting some minor further refinements provided via comments at the Bureau and Advisory Group meeting. Pending available budget, the process will go ahead; evaluation will be considered a priority workstream. The recruited evaluation manager will be encouraged to look for ways to complete the evaluation under budget; however, the Bureau underscored the importance of a quality evaluation, as this will be the first since the reform.

5. Taskteam Composition

It was recognized that Technical Task Teams should first follow the principle of inclusivity in line with the CFS DNA but also needed to be flexible, manageable and resource-aware. Each should be specific depending on the tasks, topics, timing and expertise needed. Their composition should be demand-driven rather than supply-driven. There are different ways to access the best expertise and technical support that could achieve a balance between inclusiveness and efficiency. It was decided that the composition of each Technical Task Team should be case by case, based on a proposal from the Secretariat, who was best placed to identify the areas of additional expertise needed given its accountability for delivering the best quality outputs, in line with the principles above.

6. Election of Vice-Chair

MrLupinoLazaro (Philippines) was elected by acclamation Vice-Chair of the Committee. His term will run until the appointment of a new Vice-Chair by the newly elected Bureau at the first meeting immediately following CFS 42, on 29 October 2015.
7. AOB

Update on level of country participation
Bureau members gave an update on the level of attendance during CFS 42 of their delegations and called for further updates from delegations in order to facilitate the organisation of high-level bilaterals. CFS 42 will welcome, as every year, a number of ministers.

Update on the Special event on Resilience
The Secretary gave an update on the preparation of the Special event on resilience, advising of the panellists and moderator for the event. The background document for the event is a joint RBA Resilience policy, and is already available as a under session document.

---

Update on CSM Water Working Group

On September 9th, the CSM Working Group on Water attended the last Task Team before the Policy Round Table that will take place during the CFS 42. Members and participants of the Task Team were asked to comment on the entire document. The Water WG reiterated their core points:

- Human Rights Approach, Water is food and the Right to Food is a recognized right overcoming the limitations of the right to safe drinking water and sanitation
- Public policies, water is common good and not a market good
- Transboundary water resources and their link to Human Rights obligations
- The importance to establish and list clears responsibilities among all stakeholders.
- Participatory mechanisms and the role of local authorities on research and the management of water
- Agroecological approach that automatically includes the concept of resilience
- Access to clean drinking water for agricultural workers at their workplace
- Gender approach
- The importance of traditional knowledge and the relation with territories
- Protection and support of vulnerable and marginalized communities and the need to strengthen the parts related to smallholders.
- In the future work of the CFS water should be streamlined and incorporated as well to CFS products such as the VGGTs.

---

Update on CSM Monitoring Working Group

Call to action

of the Monitoring Working Group of the Civil Society Mechanism to the Committee on World Food Security (CFS)

For a monitoring mechanism that allows to assess the progress made in coordinating actions and ensuring policy convergence in order to guarantee the realization of the right to adequate food!
Background

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

Within the framework the CFS Open Ended Working Group on Monitoring (OEWGM), CSOs have worked hard to develop practical and viable ideas and proposals. These proposals have been taken to the discussions of the Working Group and have strongly resonated amongst governments. However, we note with great concern that the OEWGM has practically neglected to advance in the construction of the mechanism. This stagnation is reflected in the draft Decision Box that will be presented to the Plenary at CFS 42 and is not backed by CSOs. Accordingly, the work of the CFS in this context is basically reduced to the implementation of global surveys on CFS effectiveness and in-depth country level assessments on the basis of a methodology of surveys conducted by consultants. CSOs have emphatically stressed that surveys are a very limited tool, as they do not capture the qualitative wealth of CFS’s work. Independent surveys without being part of a monitoring mechanism make no sense.

The fact that the discussion on specific proposals for a mechanism made to the OEWGM has been basically blocked is unfathomable. By delaying the development of a CFS monitoring mechanism, the CFS is unable to truly fulfill its mandate as “the foremost inclusive international and intergovernmental platform for a broad range of committed stakeholders to work together in a coordinated manner and in support of country-led processes towards the elimination of hunger and ensuring food security and nutrition for all human beings.” Without a monitoring mechanism, which allows for reflection, discussion and assessment of the progress made in the coordination of actions by all actors at different levels and which ensures policy convergence in order to guarantee the realization of the right to adequate food as well as accountability, the CFS will remain truncated and will fail to fulfill the great expectations behind its reform.

Given the fact that the completion and credibility of the CFS reform is now at stake, we believe that it is time to mobilise and share this discussion with a wider audience.

Take action

- Send letters to your governments in their capitals with a request to amend the draft Decision Box for Monitoring CFS Decisions and Recommendations, to be presented to plenary at CFS 42, by adding the CSO proposals. Please see model letter attached.

- Spread the message that the CSOs do not back the draft Decision Box that will be presented to the upcoming CFS plenary and request support for the amendments proposed. See model letter attached.

- Join the Annual Forum of the CSM in October in Rome and participate in the discussions about how to start building the CSO part of the monitoring mechanism as proposed by the WG.

Contact

Jorge Stanley Icaza – Indigenous Caucus- manigueuigdina [at] yahoo.es
Sofia Monsalve – FIAN – Monsalve [at] fian.org
Template Letter to be sent to Capitals

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

Within the framework the CFS Open Ended Working Group on Monitoring (OEWGM), CSOs have worked hard to develop practical and viable ideas and proposals. These proposals have been taken to the discussions of the Working Group and have strongly resonated amongst governments. However, we note with great concern that the OEWGM has practically neglected to advance in the construction of the mechanism. This stagnation is reflected in the draft Decision Box that will be presented to the Plenary at CFS 42 and is not backed by CSOs. Accordingly, the work of the CFS in this context is basically reduced to the implementation of global surveys on CFS effectiveness and in-depth country level assessments on the basis of a methodology of surveys conducted by consultants. CSOs have emphatically stressed that surveys are a very limited tool, as they do not capture the qualitative wealth of CFS’s work. Independent surveys that are not part of a monitoring mechanism make no sense.

The fact that the discussion on specific proposals for a mechanism made to the OEWGM has been basically blocked is unfathomable. By delaying the development of a CFS monitoring mechanism, the CFS is unable to truly fulfill its mandate as “the foremost inclusive international and intergovernmental platform for a broad range of committed stakeholders to work together in a coordinated manner and in support of country-led processes towards the elimination of hunger and ensuring food security and nutrition for all human beings.” Without a monitoring mechanism that allows for reflection, discussion and assessment of the progress made in the coordination of actions by stakeholders at different levels and which ensures policy convergence in order to guarantee the realization of the right to adequate food as well as accountability, the CFS will remain truncated and will fail to fulfill the great expectations behind its reform.

Given the fact that we have patiently contributed to the discussions at the OEWGM for four years despite our proposals not being taken seriously and that the completion of the CFS reform is now at stake, we call on your government to support in plenary the addition of the following highlighted text to the draft Decision Box:

e) Recalls the decisions on CFS monitoring taken at CFS 41 to continue developing an innovative mechanism built on existing structures as recommended in paragraph 43 b (v) of the Final Report and, subject to available resources, invites volunteer member countries to pilot the implementation of voluntary in-depth country level assessments of CFS effectiveness, with support from the CFS Secretariat, and to discuss the results with the OEWG on Monitoring. The terms of reference and methodology for these pilots should be developed in collaboration with those countries that express their interest to volunteer, and learn lessons before applying the model more broadly.

f) Agrees to hold global events on monitoring during CFS sessions, starting with a thematic event on the experiences and lessons learned and the assessment of progress made in the use and implementation of CFS products at CFS 43 in 2016. The first event will be on the Voluntary Guidelines for the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security. The events should be organised by the OEWG on Monitoring, supported by the CFS Secretariat.

g) Encourages CFS interested parties to continue to share their experiences and best practices and to assess the progress made in the use and implementation of CFS policy recommendations and requests the OWEG on Monitoring, in collaboration with the CFS Secretariat, to develop the basic terms of reference for the organisation of events at regional and national levels.

Thank you.
Sustainable agricultural development for food security and nutrition, including the role of livestock

HLPE e-consultation on the V0 Draft of the Report

From 02 to 31 October 2015

In October 2014, the UN Committee on World Food Security (CFS) requested the High Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition (HLPE) to conduct a study on Sustainable Agricultural Development for Food Security and Nutrition, including the role of Livestock. The findings of this study will feed into CFS 43 Plenary session (October 2016). As part of the process of elaboration of its reports, the HLPE is organizing a consultation to seek inputs, suggestions, and comments on the present V0 draft. This open e-consultation will be used by the HLPE to further elaborate the report, which will then be submitted to external expert review, before finalization and approval by the HLPE Steering Committee.

HLPE V0 drafts are deliberately presented early enough in the process - as a work-in-progress, with their range of imperfections – to allow sufficient time to give proper consideration to the feedback received so that it can play a really useful role in the elaboration of the report. It is a key part of the scientific dialogue between the HLPE Project Team and Steering Committee, and the rest of the knowledge community. In that respect, the present V0 draft report also identifies areas for recommendations at a very early stage, and the HLPE would welcome suggestions or proposals.

Please download the Draft V0 of the Report here:

To participate in the discussion, please visit the dedicated HLPE e-consultation website: http://www.fao.org/fsnforum/cfs-hlpe/Sust-Agr-Dev-Livestock-V0

Comments can be submitted online until 31 October 2015, by mail to FSN-moderator@fao.org, or directly to the HLPE Secretariat at cfs-hlpe@fao.org.

Contributions are welcome in English, French and Spanish.

In order to strengthen the report, the HLPE would welcome submission of material, evidence-based suggestions, references, and examples, in particular addressing the following important questions:

1. The report is wide-ranging and comprehensive in analyzing the contribution of sustainable agricultural development to ensuring food security and nutrition (FSN), with a particular focus on the livestock sector because of its importance for both nutrition and sustainable futures. Do you think that the report is striking the right balance between agricultural development overall and the livestock sector specifically with respect to their relative contribution to FSN?

2. The report is structured around context, trends, challenges and pathways/responses. Do you think that these are comprehensive enough, and adequately considered and articulated? Does the report strike the right balance of coverage across the various chapters? Are there important aspects that are missing?

3. The report uses a classification to distinguish between four broad categories of livestock systems, in order to better identify specific challenges and sustainable development pathways for each of them. Do you find this approach useful for identifying specific policy responses and actions in different socio-economic and environmental contexts?
4 The report has referenced key projections and scenario studies in identifying the drivers and trends through to 2050. Are there other studies that the report needs to reference, which offer different perspectives on the future outlook for the agriculture (including livestock) sector, in particular those that focus on nutrition and diet?

5 The report has identified a wide range of challenges likely to be faced in the coming period to which policy makers and other stakeholders will need to take into account so that SADL can contribute to FSN. Do you think that there are other key challenges/opportunities that need to be covered in the report, including those related to emerging technologies, the concentration and intensification of production in livestock, and the implications for feedstuffs (crops and oilseeds), and international trade?

6 A decision-making approach that could be useful for policy makers in designing and implementing policies and actions has been proposed in Chapter 4 of the report. Is this a useful and pragmatic approach?

7 Chapter 4 also contains case studies/examples of evolutions of agricultural development policies and actions in different contexts/countries. Could you offer other practical, well-documented and significant examples to enrich and provide better balance to the variety of cases and the lessons learned in agricultural development, including the trade offs or win-win outcomes in terms of addressing the different dimensions of sustainability and FSN?

8 The social dimension of sustainable agriculture development has often been less well described and understood, including due to lack of data. Examples and experiences on such issues (livelihoods, gender, share and situation of self employed versus wage workers, working conditions, etc.) would be of particular interest to the team.

9 The upstream and downstream sectors are playing an increasingly important role in respect of the orientation of agricultural development, food choices and diets. Can you provide examples of the role these sectors play in sustainable agricultural development and FSN?

10 What are the key policy initiatives or successful interventions to improve the sustainability of food systems, in different countries and contexts that merit discussion in the report? Is there evidence about the potential of economic incentives, and which ones (taxes, subsidies etc.), regulatory approaches, capacity building, R&D and voluntary actions by food system actors?

11 The design and implementation of policies for FSN requires robust, comparative data over time and across countries. Where are the data gaps that governments, national and international organizations might need to address in the future in order to understand trends and formulate better policies?

12 Are there any major omissions or gaps in the report? Are topics under-or over-represented in relation to their importance? Are any facts or conclusions refuted or questionable? If any of these are an issue, please send supporting evidence.

We thank in advance all the contributors for being kind enough to read and comment and suggest inputs on this early version of the report.
On 1-2 September a training workshop took place for the agricultural and food workers constituency in Rome, involving 12 participants from Asia, Latin America, Africa, North America and Europe. Both current CSM CC constituency members and the new CC members were present. The objective of the meeting was to have a basic training for agricultural and food workers constituency on what is the CFS & the CSM; the process of consultations and negotiation, and how to involve more unions in future CSM/CFS work and use the adopted CFS documents in our work. Due to financial constraints the working languages were only English and Spanish. At the beginning of the meeting the CSM Secretariat made a presentation on what is the CFS and the CSM, the structures and processes and how to get involved followed by questions for clarification and discussions. This was followed by a presentation from the HLPE Secretariat coordinator, who explained what HLPE is and how it works. During the meeting, the participants were introduced to the key CFS adopted documents; GSF, rai, social protection and VGGT and what has been achieved in the documents for the agricultural and food workers. In order to better understand the CFS, a special session on the agenda was the meeting with CFS Secretariat where participated of CFS Secretary and Assistant to the CFS Chair and another meeting session with governments; meeting with the Permanent Representative of Italy to the UN in Rome and Permanent Representative of Brazil to the UN in Rome. Participants were informed of the topics which are discussed in the CFS and looked at the CFS Multi-Year Plan of Work (MYPoW) for 2016-2017 and draft decision box on water. It was emphasized that workers would continue to defend in the Decision box the human right to water and access to clean potable water for agricultural workers at the workplace. They have also identified possible priority areas for agricultural and food workers constituency for the next 2 years of CFS agenda. During the following sessions participants split into working groups and discussed what CFS adopted documents could be the most useful for their organisations’ work, how they can be used in the workplace, at national and regional level and what assistance is needed from the IUF. In the working groups the coordination inside CSM was also discussed and how to share the work in different working groups in the future, as well as the relation with other constituencies and networks. IUF Asia/Pacific region will assist in the discussion on nutrition, taken into account the high number of malnourished workers in tea plantations, CONTAG will follow the discussion on connecting smallholders to markets, UATRE will assist in following the discussion on urbanization and rural transformation, UFCW will assist with the discussion on livestock. IUF will also continue to work on the periodic update of the GSF, monitoring and will ask the IUF’s women’s committee to nominate a person who can assist with the discussion on women’s empowerment. Participants have asked IUF to produce short informative leaflets on GSF and rai which trade unions can use in their work and request to organise similar meeting once per year.

The CSM Renewal Process is closed. The new CC will take charge on October 8th during their first meeting and present itself to the CSM Forum 2015.