

2010

Civil Society Mechanism  
for the Committee of  
World Food Security

**CIVIL SOCIETY CONSULTATION  
TO THE 36<sup>TH</sup> SESSION OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON WORLD FOOD  
SECURITY  
FINAL REPORT**

Meeting of civil society organizations and NGOs in preparation for the  
36th Session of the UN Committee on World Food Security (CFS),  
October 8-10, 2010, Rome, Italy.

## Table of Contents

1. Context .....	3
2. Civil Society Consultation .....	4
2.1 Methodology for Selecting Participants.....	5
3. The Civil Society Mechanism (CSM) .....	7
3.1 Context .....	7
3.2 The Civil Society Coordinating Committee (CC) .....	8
3.3 Endorsement of the CSM .....	11
3.4 Moving Forward .....	12
4. Breakout Groups .....	12
4.1 Regional/Sub-Regional Working Groups.....	13
4.2 Constituency Working Groups .....	13
4.3 Policy Roundtable Working Groups .....	16
5. Conclusions and Next Steps .....	16
5.1 Financing .....	17
5.2 Work plan with expected outcomes for 2011.....	17
6. Acknowledgments.....	18
Appendix 1: Sub-regions/Regions .....	20
Europe and North America .....	20
South Asia/ Southeast Asia & Oceania.....	23
Africa .....	26
Central Asia .....	28
Latin America.....	31
Appendix 2: Constituencies.....	33
Smallholder Farmers (FR).....	33
Fisherfolk.....	34
Agricultural Workers .....	35
Women.....	35
Youth .....	37
Urban Poor .....	39

Pastoralists .....	40
NGOs .....	42
Indigenous Peoples (SP) .....	44
Appendix 3: Policy Roundtables.....	46
1: Global Strategic Framework.....	46
2. Land Tenure and International Investment .....	48
3. Mapping Food Security Initiatives.....	49
4. Protracted Crisis .....	50
5. Managing Vulnerability .....	51

### **List of Tables**

Table 1: Description and Responsibilities of the Coordination Committee.....	9
Table 2: Description of Sub-Regions and Constituencies .....	10
Table 3: Key Points on the CSM .....	12

## 1. Context

In the wake of the 2007-2008 food price crisis, in the face of increasing climatic variability and with more and more people leaving the fields for the cities, individuals working towards food sovereignty, food security and enhanced nutrition around the world prioritized coming together to ensure that the voices of those who plant the seeds, tend to the animals and catch the fish, the voices of those who feed the world, – our voices – are heard and respected in global food and agricultural governance and decision making.

Last October (2009), the CSO Forum on People's Food Sovereignty (the CSO Forum)<sup>1</sup> brought together representatives from peasant and small-scale family-farmers organizations, rural women, artisanal fisherfolk, indigenous peoples, rural youth, pastoralists, landless people, the urban poor and NGOs, to develop joint analyses and strategies to overcome the tragic situation of hunger in the world. The aim of the CSO Forum was to make the voices of those most affected by the food crisis heard by government representatives gathered in Rome for the World Summit on Food Security.

This year, we have come together at a time when 1 billion people are undernourished and more than 1.5 billion people are overweight<sup>2</sup>, highlighting issues of distribution and problems of consumption. We have gathered at a time when the world's marginalized food producers and consumers are increasingly feeling the impact of food insecurity, increased unemployment and further destruction of their food systems. We are meeting at a time when neoliberalism and privatization remain the dominant frameworks guiding the development of policies and policy implementation, ensuring profits before people.

We have come together because we understand that despite the challenges and hardships we face, an important opportunity has presented itself. Because of the work done by people's movements, social movements, CSOs, and associations of small producers, among others, we are seeing an opening-up for participation in multi-stakeholder processes.

The Committee on World Food Security (CFS), established as a result of the food crisis of the 1970s upon recommendation from the 1974 World Food Conference, serves as a forum in the United Nations System for review and follow-up of policies concerning world food security, including food production and physical and economic access to food. In 2009, the FAO undertook reforms to the CFS with the

---

<sup>1</sup> A copy of the final report can be downloaded here:

[http://cso4cfs.files.wordpress.com/2010/10/final\\_report\\_pfs\\_forum\\_2009.pdf](http://cso4cfs.files.wordpress.com/2010/10/final_report_pfs_forum_2009.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs311/en/>

goal of focussing the Committee's vision and role in the coordination of efforts to ensure universal food security.

At the 35th session of the CFS in 2009, members agreed on a wide-ranging reform with the aim of making the CFS the foremost inclusive international and intergovernmental platform dealing with food security and nutrition.<sup>3</sup> The reforms of the CFS are outlined in the reform document which presents the structure for a food security policy body with important implications for agricultural and food governance.

The Reform of the CFS was the result of 8 months of negotiation between the Committee's Bureau and an interim Contact Group, which was composed of civil society representatives. The full and active participation of civil society ensured that their right to self organise in future interactions with the CFS was officially recognized in the CFS reform document. As a result, civil society organisations were called to "autonomously establish a global mechanism for food security and nutrition which will function as a facilitating body for CSO/NGOs consultation and participation in the CFS" (CFS: 2009/2 Rev.2, para.16).

It is in this context that the **Civil Society Consultation** was organized in preparation for the 36<sup>th</sup> Session of the **UN Committee on World Food Security (CFS)**. The 36<sup>th</sup> Session marks an important moment in the history of the CFS as it is the first session of the renewed Committee and thus our first opportunity to assess whether civil society will indeed be able to participate in discussions and negotiations in a meaningful way.

## **2. Civil Society Consultation**

For the last decade, civil society, people's/social movements and NGOs have been working not only to have civil society recognized as official participants in the CFS process but also to ensure that they are able to organize autonomously and give priority to those most affected by hunger. In particular, since the 2002 *World Food Summit: Five Years Later*, the International Planning Committee for Food Sovereignty (IPC) has been working towards such efforts, acting as a facilitating network to bring local struggles of marginalized groups into global debates.

In line with this work, the four civil society Advisory Group representatives to the CFS Bureau organised the Civil Society Consultation, providing an opportunity for civil society participants to review and adopt the Civil Society Mechanism and to review and clarify processes, procedures and discussions to be undertaken at the 36<sup>th</sup> Session of the CFS. It also provided space to plan and strategize participation

---

<sup>3</sup> The CFS Reform Document is available here: <http://cso4cfs.files.wordpress.com/2010/04/final-cfs-document1.pdf>

and ensure that interventions made by civil society were politically strategic. Thus, participants and observers gathered in Rome at the consultation to achieve four main objectives:

- 1) Review and adopt the Civil Society Mechanism (CSM);
- 2) Move forward processes and plans to appoint focal points to the Coordinating Committee of the CSM in sub-regions and constituencies by January 1, 2011;
- 3) Prepare strategic civil society interventions for the 36<sup>th</sup> Session of the Committee on World Food Security (CFS); and,
- 4) Agree on next steps.

This report is structured around these objectives. Each will be described and reviewed in following sections. The goals of this report are:

1. To support the institutional memory and work of the CSM and others;
2. To act as a guide and reference tool to advance the CSM; and,
3. To support the work of the Coordinating Committee.

Because this report aims to be of **practical use**, and given that many potential users and readers live in areas with restricted or limited Internet connectivity, we have done our best to be as succinct as possible and to include only the most important information. Correspondingly, we have not included many reference texts (e.g., CFS Reform Document) but provide links to these documents whenever possible.

## **2.1 Methodology for Selecting Participants**

There were two categories of participation for the Consultation: **delegates** and **observers**. Approximately 100 seats were allocated to delegates and there was space for an unlimited number of self-funded, non-voting observers. The number of voting delegates invited for constituencies and sub-regions was proportionate to the number of seats proposed for the Coordination Committee of the Civil Society Mechanism in the Draft 2 proposal.<sup>4</sup> For instance, smallholder farmers were allotted more seats in relation to the other constituencies, who were in turn given more seats than those representing sub-regions, as it is called for in the CSM proposal (explained below).

A process was established to select delegates. Key Contact Points (individuals) within organisations and networks from the established constituencies<sup>5</sup> and sub-regions (see Table 2, p.10) with a strong record of concern and action for food

---

<sup>3</sup> Draft 2 of the CSM proposal is available here: <http://cso4cfs.files.wordpress.com/2010/04/csm-draft-2-en.pdf>

<sup>5</sup> The 11 constituencies represented in the Consultation were chosen based on those recognized in the CFS reform document and outlined in the CSM draft proposal. After the CSM's first year of operation, there will be an opportunity to revise and reconsider the list.

security and nutrition issues were identified by the four civil society representatives to the Advisory Group based on the following criteria:

- Contact Points have a good knowledge of civil society organisations/networks in their sub-region.
- Contact Points are willing and able to ensure that there is a fair and balanced representation by region, constituency, organisation and gender.
- Priority is given to peoples' organisations and social movements, i.e. self-organised networks of people most directly affected by, and concerned with, food security and nutrition.
- Contact Points should come from for sub-regional networks that have their own identity at regional or sub-regional level and are not just breakdowns of global networks. In cases where sub-regional network could not be identified, national Civil Society Organisations were selected.
- Where there is no Contact Point from a self-organised organisation or network, or they are unknown to the Coordinating Committee, Contact Points who have a good knowledge of civil society in the sub-region, and can help ensure participation of a broad range of peoples' organisations and social movements in the Consultation.
- There needs to be at least one organisation or network per constituency and sub-region. Two organizations or networks can be selected in order to ensure broad representation.

The selected Contact Points were in turn responsible for nominating individuals to attend the Consultation as delegates. Contact Points were asked to:

- Try to ensure that there is participation from a range of organisations, constituencies, regions and that there is a gender balance, giving priority to women where possible.
- Consider the Organising Principles stated in the Draft 1 proposal of the Civil Society Mechanism<sup>6</sup>, particularly the desire to ensure that a wide range of voices and views can be heard during the Consultation.
- Take into account the selection criteria for Coordination Committee members in the draft Terms of Reference.<sup>7</sup>
- If possible, try to contact the other contact points for your constituency or sub-region in order to coordinate.

Those individuals selected through this process received an invitation letter to attend the Consultation as delegate participants, meaning they were entitled to vote on the decisions made at the Consultation. Further to this, nominated participants from developing countries were eligible to receive funding to support the cost of participating.

---

<sup>6</sup>Draft 1 proposal of the Civil Society Mechanism is available here:

<http://cso4cfs.files.wordpress.com/2010/04/civil-society-mechanism-draft-1-final.pdf>

<sup>7</sup> A draft Terms of Reference for the Coordinating Committee can be found here:

<http://cso4cfs.files.wordpress.com/2010/04/csm-coord-cttee-tor.pdf>

Due to last-minute confirmation of funding, translated documents were not available on time and invitations were sent out later than originally expected. As a result, the following regions/constituencies were not adequately represented (also in part to visa issuance problems):

- Landless
- Consumers
- Andean Region
- Southern Africa

### **3. The Civil Society Mechanism (CSM)**

#### **3.1 Context**

The Reform Document of the Committee on World Food Security invited civil society organizations and NGOs to autonomously establish a global mechanism to facilitate their participation in the CFS. Over the last year (2009-2010) the International Planning Committee for Food Sovereignty (IPC), Oxfam and Action Aid worked to develop such a mechanism.

The role of the Civil Society Mechanism (CSM) is to facilitate the participation of Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) and NGOs in the CFS, including input in negotiations and decision-making. The CSM also provides a space for dialogue between a wide range of civil society actors. Three drafts of the mechanism were widely circulated and made available online for input and comments. Transparency of the drafting process was of utmost importance, and therefore, decisions taken by the drafting committee for each comment were recorded and made publicly available. The third and final draft of the CSM reflects the results of a broad consultation process by and among civil society organisations.

*From the CFS Reform Document:*

*“Civil society organizations/NGOs and their networks will be invited to autonomously establish a global mechanism for food security and nutrition which will function as a facilitating body for CSO/NGOs consultation and participation in the CFS. Such mechanisms will also serve inter-sessional global, regional and national actions in which organizations of those sectors of the population most affected by food insecurity would be accorded priority representation. Civil society organizations/NGOs will submit to the CFS Bureau a proposal regarding how they intend to organize their participation in the CFS in a way that ensures broad and balanced participation by regions and types of organizations keeping in mind the principles approved by the CFS at its Thirty-Fourth Session in October 2008 (CFS:2008/5; CL:135/10; paragraph 15).”*

CFS:2009/2 Rev.2, para 16

### 3.2 The Civil Society Coordinating Committee (CC)

The CSM is made up of a Coordination Committee (CC). The CC will be comprised of 40 members (Focal Points) from 11 constituencies and 16 sub-regions (see table 2, pg. 10). From this group, 4 civil society representatives to the CFS Advisory Group (AG) will be chosen by and amongst the CC members. It is the responsibility of the AG members to ensure that the views of civil society are heard and to facilitate two-way communication between the CSM and the CFS Bureau.<sup>8</sup> Small-scale farmers make up the largest constituency on the CC as they represent the majority of hungry people in the world and produce the largest proportion of the food in the world. Gender and geographic balance among the Focal Points in the CSM Coordination Committee will be ensured and 50% of the Focal Points of the Coordination Committee are to be women.

Each Focal Point will hold the function for 12 months during the interim period of 2010-2011 after which new members will be selected for a period of 2 years thereafter.

The Coordination Committee is the backbone of the CSM. One of the Coordination Committee's roles is to work hard to facilitate the participation of those in sub-regions and constituencies. In no way is the CC to be seen as a committee of people representing the views of their organization. Rather, they play a communicative and networking function.

---

<sup>8</sup> "The Role of the Advisory Group is to provide input to the [CFS] Bureau regarding the range of tasks which the CFS Plenary has instructed it to perform" (CFS:2009/2 Rev.2, para.32). The CFS Bureau is the executive arm of the CFS. It is made up of a Chairperson and twelve member countries. For more information, see <http://www.fao.org/cfs/cfs-home/cfs-about/en/>.

**Table 1: Description and Responsibilities of the Coordination Committee**

**Coordination Committee**

19. The Coordination Committee is responsible for ensuring that the functions of the CSM are carried out as effectively as possible and according to the organizing principles.
20. A Coordination Committee for the CSM will be established, composed of constituency and sub-regional focal points as follows: 4 focal points from smallholder family farmer organizations and 2 from each of the other constituencies mentioned above, and 1 focal point from each sub-region (suggested breakdown: North America, Central America and Caribbean, Andean Region, Southern Cone, Western Europe, Eastern Europe, West Asia, South Asia, South East Asia, Central Asia, Oceania and Pacific, Southern Africa, West Africa, East Africa, Central Africa, North Africa). As mentioned above, priority is given to small-scale farmers because they represent 80% of the hungry people in the world and produce the largest proportion of the food in the world.<sup>1</sup>
21. Each focal point will hold the function for 12 months during 2010/11 and for a period of 2 years thereafter.
22. Gender and geographic balance among the focal points in the CSM Coordination Committee has to be ensured. International movements, CSOs NGOs and their platforms or networks participating in the CFS should aim for 50% women participation. This can be achieved by asking each constituency to nominate one man and one woman from two different regions to occupy their 2 slots in the Coordination Committee. Over time each constituency has to demonstrate that they have chosen focal points from all the regions.
23. Each constituency and sub-regions will decide through a process of internal negotiation what process they will establish for Coordination Committee member selection, while adhering to regional and gender balance as outlined above and to the principle of transparency. It is suggested that each constituency/sub-region might establish a council of focal points representing the major organizations/networks in that constituency/sub-region and that members of this council might sit on the Coordination Committee in rotation for a period of 2 years each. The process of Coordination Committee member selection and outcomes will be documented and made available to all CSOs and others.
24. The process in the first year may not be as inclusive as we hope it will become, but it should be transparent. The methodology for selecting Coordination Committee members will be improved according to the evaluation of the first year and with the experience of subsequent years.
25. The Coordination Committee will meet face to face at least once a year and virtually once every quarter.
26. The Coordination Committee will make decisions on the functioning of the CSM such as: criteria for participation in the CSM, quotas for participation in the CFS Plenary, selection of civil society members of the Advisory Group, providing support to the CSO Advisory Group members, and assisting in the organization of the civil society forums related to the CFS.
27. Decisions will be made through systematic consultation with participants in the CSM. The Coordination Committee will reflect on the kinds of issues for which broader consultation are most important in the interest of empowering the CSM as a whole. Decisions will be made by consensus wherever possible. The Coordination Committee will determine which kind of decisions require consensus and which should be made through voting if no consensus emerges, and to adopt what voting modalities. The Coordination Committee's decisions on this question will be taken at the outset of its operations and will be made public. It should be noted that silence will not be taken for consent, and the views of all Committee members will be clarified when seeking consensus. In any case, all divergent positions will be noted and reported.
28. When the CSM provides advice to the CFS through its Coordination Committee, it will seek to communicate the range of divergent positions that are held by participants in the CSM.
29. The Coordination Committee will be responsible for dialogue with the CFS Bureau regarding the allocation of civil society seats in the annual CFS plenary sessions. It should be noted that membership in the Coordination Committee does not guarantee automatic participation in the annual CFS plenary sessions.

Source: Proposal for an International Food Security and Nutrition Civil Society Mechanism for Relations with the CFS (CFS: 2010/9).

The mechanisms by which each sub-region and constituency selects their focal points to the Coordination Committee is to be determined by each group in recognition of the diversity of histories, realities and experiences of each group. These processes are reviewed in following sections of this report and each process, as submitted by each group, is attached as an Appendix.

**Table 2: Description of Sub-Regions and Constituencies**

<b>Sub-Regions (Total of 16, x1 focal point each)</b>	<b>Constituencies (Total of 24, x2 focal points each)<sup>9</sup></b>
North America	Smallholder family farmers (4)
Central America and Caribbean	Artisanal fisherfolk
Andean Region	Herders/pastoralists
Southern Cone	Landless
Western Europe	Urban poor
Eastern Europe	Agricultural and food workers
West Asia	Women
South Asia	Youth
South East Asia	Indigenous Peoples
Central Asia	Consumers
Oceania and Pacific	NGOs
Southern Africa	
West Africa	
East Africa	
Central Africa	
North Africa	

The roles of the Coordination Committee as outlined in the Terms of Reference are:

- Ensuring that the functions of the CSM are carried out as effectively as possible and according to the organizing principles contained in the CSM proposal.
- Facilitation of participation of CSOs in the CFS, including overseeing the work of civil society members of the CFS Advisory Group and the Secretariat of the Mechanism, as well as ensuring accountability of finances of the Mechanism.
- Ensuring, to the best of their ability, effective two-way communication with CSM members and supporting efforts to participate effectively in policy dialogue at all levels.
- Decision making with respect to the functioning of the Mechanism, including: criteria for participation in the Mechanisms, quotas for participation (including speaking) at the CFS Plenary, selection of civil society members of the Advisory Group, providing support to the CSO Advisory Group members, and assisting in the organization of the civil society forums related to the CFS.

<sup>9</sup> All constituencies will be represented by 2 Focal Points, with the exception of smallholder family farmers who will have 4 Focal Points.

- Dialoguing with the CFS Bureau regarding the allocation of civil society seats/speaking slots in the annual CFS plenary sessions with an understanding that membership in the Coordination Committee does not guarantee participation in the annual CFS plenary sessions.
- Communicating the range of divergent positions help by participants in the Mechanism when providing views to the CFS and at the Advisory Group.

To summarize, key points about the CSM include:

- 1) The organizing principles that are laid out in and structure the mechanism include: inclusiveness; transparency; ability to self-organize; and, openness.
- 2) The mechanism will be made up of a Coordination Committee (CC) which is comprised of Focal Points selected from 11 constituencies and 16 sub-regions to form the 40 member committee.
- 3) This mechanism is not about representation. That is, it is not about creating positions to represent a single organization's point of view. The goal and purpose is one of communication and reaching out. Focal Points will work on communication and discussion and will not be there as organizational talking heads.

Some limitations raised by participants at the Civil Society Consultation:

- 1) The inclusivity and accountability mechanisms within the CSM still need work.
- 2) Note that a major barrier to inclusivity is money. The CSM has proposed a budget to the CFS and is waiting to see what funding can be secured to support this process.
- 3) There will be a need to continue reviewing constituencies and making sure no one is falling through the gaps.
- 4) Efforts need to be made towards clarifying the decision-making processes within the mechanism. For example: What is consensus?
- 5) Work also needs to be done to further ensure gender balance and to further work on definitions of gender within the mechanism.
- 6) Resources are needed to ensure that documents are translated in time.
- 7) There is a need to make sure that this work is continuing at the national and regional levels and that it is not restricted to what happens once a year at the CFS in Rome.

### **3.3 Endorsement of the CSM**

At the Civil Society Consultation, the CSM proposal was presented and subsequently endorsed, with the acknowledgement that after one year of operation, an evaluation and assessment of the Mechanism will take place. Many delegates expressed their support for the Civil Society Mechanism, citing it as a positive first step and highlighting changes and considerations to consider over the next year.

### 3.4 Moving Forward

An official presentation of the Civil Society Mechanism was made during the 36<sup>th</sup> Session of the CFS. The Mechanism was well received by participating member governments, and civil society was commended for a job well done. That being said, it is the responsibility of governments to sanction their moral support with financial contributions to ensure that the CSM can be fully operational at the national, regional and global level for the 2010/2011 calendar year. This includes financial pledges by states to support the proposed budget for the CSM.

The presentation marks the recognition of CSOs in the decision-making process at the CFS, and particularly the recognition of those most affected by hunger and those who produce the majority of the world's food.

We need to build on this momentum and keep moving forward so that in one year's time, as we prepare for the 37<sup>th</sup> Session of the CFS in 2011, the CSM will be the foremost inclusive and relevant Mechanism to facilitate civil society participation in food and agriculture governance.

The endorsed CSM should not be seen as final or static, but a work in progress and an important step in the direction towards the meaningful participation of civil society in the CFS. As noted previously, the Mechanism will undergo formal review in one year, at which point changes and improvements will be made.

## 4. Breakout Groups

**Table 3: Key Points on the CSM**

- This is the mechanism through which Civil Society interacts with the Committee on World Food Security (CFS)
- 40 Focal Points make up the Coordination Committee (CC)
- Focal Points are the people selected from constituencies and regions to sit on the Coordinating Committee
- Composition of the CC is based on two pillars:
  1. Constituencies
  2. Sub-regions
- 4 Advisory Group Members are chosen by and among the CC members
- The role of Focal Points is NOT one of representation but rather of facilitation and communication

At the Consultation, there were three working group breakout sessions:

- i. Constituencies
- ii. Sub-Regions

iii. Policy Roundtables

The purpose of the first two breakout groups was to establish processes through which Focal Points would be selected to sit on the Coordination Committee of the Civil Society Mechanism as of January 1, 2011. The aim of the Policy Roundtables was to coordinate and strategize interventions to be made by civil society at the 36<sup>th</sup> CFS Policy Roundtables. What follows is a summary of the process undertaken by participants at the Civil Society Consultation.

#### **4.1 Regional/Sub-Regional Working Groups**

During the Consultation, participants (delegates and observers) from each sub-region convened into working groups to determine which sub-regional networks need to be involved in the consultation process and to decide upon a process to put into action to select the Focal Point to sit on the Coordination Committee. The Focal Points must be selected before the end of the year. Due to restricted space, established regional networks, limited translation services and small numbers, many sub-regions grouped together to work on processes together and in total there were 5 regional or sub-regional groups:

- Africa
- Central Asia
- Europe and North America
- Latin America
- South and South East Asia

Groups were assigned a list of questions asking them to consider the context, key actors to be involved, strengths, weaknesses and barriers, and available resources. They then developed processes for the selection of the Focal Point (each region is able to forward one nominee). Note that Focal Points did not have to be in attendance in order to be appointed.

#### **4.2 Constituency Working Groups**

During the Consultation, participants representing the constituencies convened into working groups to discuss and decide upon the process to select their 2 Coordination Committee Focal Points (with the exception of smallholder family farmers who are to select 4 Focal Points). Ideally, the Constituency Working Groups identified a person or group of people who would be responsible for facilitating the selection process. Selected Focal Points must respect gender balance (1 man and 1 woman). Note that Focal Points did not have to be in attendance in order to be appointed.

As described above, 16 sub-regions and 11 constituencies have been identified by the Civil Society Mechanism (CSM). These groups are responsible for determining the processes by which they will select the Focal Points to facilitate the consultation process in their respective constituency or sub-region until the end of

the year 2010. **Each of the processes, as written and submitted by each group, is posted in the Appendix of this report.** What we provide here is a summary of the established processes to give an overview of the mechanisms and implications that these processes have for the CSM.

It is important to reiterate the difficulty of such a task. First, each sub-region and constituency is at a different stage of organizing. In some regions and constituencies the process is new and in others it is far more established. Also, time constraints pose a real challenge to the process. Groups had limited time to develop these processes and have a short period of time within which to implement them (December 2010 deadline). There is pressure to move these processes forward and this might be at the expense of the quality of the proposals. However, as we explain below, there is awareness and acceptance that these processes are meant to get things moving and hold only for the first year. Therefore, above all, it has been most important that the processes developed by the sub-regions and constituencies are transparent and as inclusive as possible.

A review of all of the proposals found that groups were using diverse approaches, but that the principles that are proposed and which have been outlined in the CSM are strongly confirmed and upheld in these working groups. It was also very apparent that there are strong, established networks that will be able to support these processes within the constituencies and regions. Each of the processes accepts the diversity of actors and there is a willingness to develop common positions together while respecting diversity. Groups have made a concerted effort to give emphasis and priority to those actors most affected by hunger and in doing so, give power and a voice to them.

All groups have accepted that we will learn while we are doing and learn from what we are doing. We all recognized that we are in the midst of a stage of learning and improvement.

There is the recognition in the value of organizing the CSM around constituencies and regions. But more discussion is needed to better build upon their respective value and complementarities to further improve the CSM.

Some other key areas that need further attention include:

- While there is a willingness (unanimous) to guarantee transparency and diversity and ensure that the decisions are taken in a timely fashion, the models for decision-making are not always clear. It is important that the processes for decision-making are clearly articulated and thought through.
- There is some confusion about the Coordination Committee and what their role will be.

- As discussed above, it is important that the Coordination Committee members be seen as communicators and facilitators rather than representatives. It is therefore, the individuals' characteristics and scope of their reach/networks that counts when appointing someone as a Coordination Committee Member.
- It is important to reiterate who will be selected to sit on the Advisory Group to the CFS. Through the CSM, 4 people will be selected to sit on the Advisory Committee. It is the Coordination Committee that will choose these people from within the Coordination Committee.
- One recommendation that was forwarded in advance of the breakout groups was to consider implementing rotating councils. The idea is to set up a Council that is balanced from a regional and gender perspective within each constituency. The two constituency Focal Points selected to sit on the Coordination Committee will rotate every 2 years. This means that behind the two Focal Points there is a council that helps to guarantee continuity and training for future Focal Points. It also provides support for the Focal Points.
- We need to further clarify what we mean with food sovereignty and the Right to Food (RTF), in order to strengthen both coherence and inclusiveness.
- Processes within constituencies and sub-regions that are not present and that are less coordinated need to be established from within those groups.
  - It has been proposed that the Advisory Group take the responsibility to follow-up with the constituencies and sub-regions.
- It is important that the process is documented so that there is at least a record. This serves at least two functions: to look back at lessons learned; and, to help guarantee the transparency of the process.
- There is a necessity to inform and sensitize others, especially those absent from the meeting, to the Civil Society Mechanism.
- We need a short summary translated into at least 3 languages that clearly explains the process, to help us to get more people involved at the regional and national level.
- We recognize the work of the last year and want to take further advantage of the collective work that we have accomplished thus far. For example, we have a website that can be used to share information (<http://cso4cfs.org/>).

As we move forward, it will be important to keep each of these points in mind. Moving forward means that before December 31, 2010, regions and constituencies will identify Focal Points and in January 2011, the Coordination Committee will become operational for one year. After which, the entire process will be evaluated and changes based on our experiences can be implemented.

### **4.3 Policy Roundtable Working Groups**

In preparation for the 36th session of the Committee on World Food Security, break-out working groups were formed to discuss and prepare joint positions on the 5 policy roundtables.

1. Global Strategic Framework
2. Land Tenure and International Investment
3. Mapping Food Security Initiatives
4. Protracted Crisis
5. Managing Risk & Vulnerability.

Participants and observers selected and engaged in these groups based on their own interest.

Each group developed interventions to be presented at the 36<sup>th</sup> Session of the Committee on World Food Security. Attention was paid to ensuring that the speakers came from a diversity of constituencies and sub-regions. The position papers, listed in Appendix #3, are the result of these consultations, and were distributed during the CFS while providing a basis for civil society interventions during each of the CFS roundtables.

At the CFS, 5 speaking slots were allocated to civil society for each session. These working groups gave the participants the facility to properly organise themselves and prepare statements in a strategic way. In some instances, the groups did not plan for all 5 interventions, leaving one available in case there was a need to intervene or comment specifically on something that arose during the sessions.

## **5. Conclusions and Next Steps**

The 2010 Civil Society Consultation has been widely regarded as a success: the largest measures of success being the endorsement of the CSM proposal and initial efforts to operationalize the Coordination Committee in developing processes of consultation and appointing Focal Points to carry out the responsibility of selecting interim Coordination Committee members. Organisation of the Consultation was also a key factor in its success. With a directed and results-oriented programme, constructive discussions led to positive outcomes and a united front for civil society's first engagement as official participants in the CFS.

Moving forward, the following steps must be highly prioritized, to maintain the momentum and ensure that the Civil Society Mechanism is fully operational by January 2011.

### **Selecting the Coordination Committee Members (CC)**

With the majority of Focal Points appointed, consultations among all regions and constituency's will be taking place until the end of the year, December 2010.

### **Selecting the Advisory Group Members (by and among the CC)**

Once the Coordination Committee members for the 2011 work year are instated, 4 Advisory Group members will have to be nominated by and among the CC members. This should be done no later than January 2011.

### **Setting up the Rome-based Secretariat**

The 4 *ad interim* AG members, with support from the IPC Secretariat must draft Terms of Reference, advertise the post, conduct interviews and appoint the Rome-based Secretariat, ideally by the end of the year, December 2010.

## **5.1 Financing**

### **Secure funding from member governments**

After the official presentation of the CSM proposal at the 36th Session, member governments acknowledged the hard work and value added of civil society participation leading up to, and during, the CFS. Norway took the lead in encouraging their fellow member governments to accompany their moral support with financial contributions.

### **How will finances be managed and accounted for?**

Several governments, including the US have asked for a detailed account of how the finances will be managed and accounted for, before they are able to move forward on providing financial support. Since this should be completed before the end of the year to secure financing for January 2011, the 4 *ad interim* AG members will be responsible for establishing a proposal.

### **Budget Allocation**

A proposed budget has been created and put forth for the consideration of the member governments as an annex to the CSM proposal. It is important that the budget goes into greater detail in regards to the specific amount that should be allocated for each Coordination Committee member and what is to be allocated to the Advisory Group members.

## **5.2 Work plan with expected outcomes for 2011**

A detailed work plan for the upcoming 2011 year must be submitted by all Coordination Committee and Advisory Group Members, outlining their outreach work and financial means within their respective constituencies and at the National and Regional levels, with expected outcomes. This should be submitted no later than February 2011. An overall work plan on the planned objectives and activities of the CSM should be submitted by the interim AG members by December

2010, to be discussed and approved by the Coordination Committee, no later than February 2011.

## **6. Acknowledgments**

All those involved in the preparation of the Consultation, including the Organising Committee Members, Methodology Group, and logistical coordinators worked tirelessly, despite the last minute confirmation of funding, to ensure that participants from various constituencies and regions were able to be in Rome to participate in and contribute to this extremely important process. For this, the following people need to be thanked:

Aksel Naerstad	Luca Bianchi
Alessandra da Costa Lunas	Luca Tommasini
Alessandra Sgrò	Mamadou Cissokho
Alexandra Spieldoch	Marco d'Aleo
Antonio Onorati	Margaret Nakato
Ashley von Anrep	Maryam Rahmanian
Beatriz Gascó Verdier	Nora McKeon
Chris Leather	Rhoda Gueta
Davinder Lamba	Sarojeni Rengam
Estrella Penunia	Saúl Vicente
George Dixon Fernandez	Solenne Piriou
Herman Kumara	Stefano dell'Anna
Jo Kim	Teresa Maisano
Lalji Desai	Thierry Kesteloot

A special thanks to the Consultation's Rapporteur, Jessica Duncan (Centre for Food Policy, City University, London).

This report was co-written by Jessica Duncan and Ashley von Anrep with editing support and feedback from Thierry Kesteloot and Nora McKeon.

This Consultation was only made possible due to the effort and contribution of a group of dedicated interpreters. Because of their hard work, the Consultation was communicated into French, Spanish, Portuguese and English. A well-deserved and special thank-you goes out to the team:

Audrey Mouysset

Benoit Castin

Carla Diaz Juhl

Catherine Bescond Sands

Consuelo Giansante

Gwen Billet

Jaciara Topley Lira

Joel Lopez Ferreiro

Juan Torres

Judith Hitchman

Katie Whiddon

Kidi Nerea Gomez de Segura Abrantes

Martine Ferré

Rodrigo Ginés Salguero

The Consultation was made possible through the generous monetary and in-kind donations of the following governments and organisations. For their continued support, we would like to thank:

The Governments of **France, Germany, Norway, Switzerland** and the **United Kingdom**.

Agency for Cooperation and Research in Development (ACORD International)

International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)

International Planning Committee for Food Sovereignty (IPC)

Interchurch Development Organisation for Development Cooperation (ICCO)

More and Better Campaign

Oxfam GB

Oxfam Sol

## Appendix 1: Sub-regions/Regions

Notes:

- Note that the following sub-regions were not represented: Andean Region, West Asia, and South Africa.
- These processes have been attached as they were sent to the Rapporteurs. They have not been altered out of respect for the autonomy of each group.

---

### Europe and North America

**Focal Point(s):**

1. **Stineke Oenema (ICCO)– Concord European Food Security Working Group**
2. **Annelies Schorpion - European Coordination of La via Campesina**

The European and North American groups merged into a single working group. Ca. 40 people attended the meeting.

#### **1. The state of the art of civil society networking in Europe.**

Many civil society formal and informal networks and platforms were identified with a clear focus on food and agriculture related matters, including the following:

- Concord European Food Security Working Group bringing together EU development and humanitarian NGOs (including regional networks like Cidse)
- A number of federative organizations (e.g. European Coordination Via Campesina) that expand outreach capacity throughout the region.
- The Nyeleni Europe initiative involving the food sovereignty European platform
- In North America (in USA, in particular) the US NGO Working Group on the Food Crisis, which has just evolved into a food sovereignty movement, Interaction (platform of US development and humanitarian NGOs), and the Global Policy Forum grouping CSOs that interface with the UN.
- Opportunity to liaise with Eastern Europe (and also Central Asian) organisations is presented by FAO regional conferences and parallel civil society consultations
- IPC and More and Better campaign, though global, also offer good networking opportunities in the regions

Though several initiatives and opportunities were highlighted, challenges need to be addressed in order to strengthen civil society capacity. Some of them received more attention:

- A clear weakness in networking capacity was identified in Eastern Europe, both new accession countries and non-EU member countries,

- Some of the constituencies (i.e. indigenous peoples, pastoralists, fisherfolks) have more problematic capacity to network with other organizations and communities and to negotiate with governments and regional institutions
- Food industry workers are also often isolated from the wider context
- Potential conflicts between NGOs and small food provider organizations were also indicated as concern
- Spaces for democratic participation are still limited and this affects advocacy; this might force civil society organizations to limit their action and their effectiveness within institutional formats
- Autonomy from governments is sometimes limited and existence of people's organizations is per se not obvious in certain countries
- Consumer perspective still weakly represented in this context
- Gap between civil society organizations and movements focused on domestic food issues and those engaging on international goals (both in the US and in Europe))

To counter these actual and potential weaknesses:

- Inclusivity was recognized as crucial key word and commitment; alliance building is also essential. Need to continue the mapping exercise to include more organizations.
- The Nyeleni Europe process represents an opportunity to disseminate the message and to bring constituencies such as consumers and environmentalists on board; need to exploit all relevant physical gatherings to reinforce the mechanism. Assembly scheduled for August 2011 will bring together many groups and movements.
- The IPC work has to be valorized to get together organizations, movements and initiatives.
- Efforts oriented to integrate more organizations should be made by existing networks and platforms to increase the outreach capacity.
- Common work on CFS should be popularized and used to empower organizations at more regional and national levels, since it is not very known outside this context.

## **2. Selection of regional members in CC**

### ***Which organizations to involve***

Small food providers and their organizations were clearly identified by all participants as a core constituency and larger alliances with other social sectors have to be established and reinforced at all levels

Youth perspective is sometime neglected and needs to be strengthened. Agricultural workers, environmental organizations, fisherfolk, smallscale cooperatives, pastoralists were also mentioned. Important to identify social sectors involved in strong struggles at local level but that don't have the strength to emerge. Fair representation in the CC of all constituencies is important and this will enable weaker constituencies to emerge.

### ***Criteria to guide the selection of CC members***

- Priority for self-organized or self supporting constituencies (i.e. social organizations)
- CC members have to behave as facilitators and not representing specific constituencies or organisations;
- CC members should have facilitation skills and willingness to listen to others points of view
- Transparency in selection mechanisms for CC members also crucial; the same should apply to the selection process at regional level
- Independency vis-à-vis private sector and philanthropic foundations is also relevant

### ***Focal points to guide the process***

The Concord European Food Security Working Group volunteers its chair (Stineke Oenema of ICCO), supported by the overall membership of the Group and the secretariat of Concord, as one focal point.

The European Coordination of VC expressed its availability to represent small farmers and the Nyeleni Europe process: needs to consult internally for its focal point nomination.

More and Better (Aksel Naerstad) also gave its availability specifically to increase the outreach potential in non EU countries.

For East Europe the focal points to facilitate CC member identification are Wilhelm Schuster (Ecoruralis, Romania), Svetlana Boincean (IUF, Moldova) and Mariam Jordjadze (Georgia). They will indicate what support they need to carry out the process by the end of the year.

### ***Methodology and calendar***

Focal points will interact with the organizations and networks present here and others who join the process during the selection process. National platforms can help in mapping and outreach. The mailing list developed by the regional IPC focal point will be an essential starting point.

Information technologies to be used to share and disseminate information and documents; CSM4CFS webpage to be expanded to host specific regional contents and to post member names and contact details

Timely translation of documents is crucial to keep all organisations in the loop.

The sequence of the process will be:

- Publication on web site of criteria for selection and of names/contacts of organizations present at this meeting: immediate
- Constitution of an initial mailing list: by end October
- Mapping of existing networks/organizations in the various constituencies - mid October – mid November
- Nomination process – mid November – mid December
- Selection – by end December

The meeting of the European Food Security Working Group scheduled for 8 December might be used as a nucleus for bringing together a broader set of actors to discuss the process.

## **North America**

There is a great deal of work to be done. The two organizations present (Save the Children US and WOCAN) engage to report back to the networks mentioned above and to see how to take the process forward.

---

## **South Asia/ Southeast Asia & Oceania**

### **Focal Point(s):**

1. **Sarojeni Rengam (ARWC) – Overall Coordinator**
2. **Sahidur Rahaman (IFSN) - South Asia**
3. **Ujjaini Halim(WFF)– South Asia**
4. **Meenakshi Munda (APIYN)- South Asia**
5. **Esther, Joan Salvador (ARWC) – Southeast Asia**
6. **LVC – Southeast Asia**
7. **Andre Leu (IFOAM) – Oceania**

### **1. *State of CS networking and advocacy in the region***

#### **Strong points**

- Many networks (PCFS, SAAPE, ICSF, WFF, WFFP etc.)and platforms (ASEAN, SAARC etc.) exist in these sub-regions which are already doing good work on food security/sovereignty issues
- The need for promotion of food sovereignty is highly felt in these sub-regions as Asia is the home of largest number of hungry people in the world and peoples' perspectives from Asia should be highlighted in global discussions
- NGOs/CSOs/CBOs in these sub-regions are able to work with a clear and focused objective (related to promotion of food sovereignty) to achieve their goals.

#### **Gaps, challenges**

- Overwhelming hunger in Asia
- Corporate agenda determining food related policies and agricultural policies, promoting corporate agriculture and land grabbing
- Regional corporate houses have emerged strongly and are undermining rights of poor, India and China have emerged as two important actors in this regard
- Climate change is a big issue of concern, so are other issues like water sharing at regional levels
- Process of destruction of small scale food production has intensified in recent years which has further increased rural-urban migration and cross boarder migration and intensified poverty f vulnerable groups.

- Corporate agenda/languages like PPP, CSR etc. negatively affecting empowerment process of marginalized communities
- In some countries NGOs/CSOs are facing very difficult situations as their governments are not open to criticisms and NGOs/CSOs often have to face severe consequences for their works to promote rights (right to food, food sovereignty)
- Public Private Partnership is a new threatening trend emerging in many countries which is actually intensifying privatization of common property resources and destroying livelihoods of poor (restricting poor's access to resources)
- Price hike is a big concern and we have to develop our strategy on how to address this crisis in Asia.

### **Steps to be taken**

- There are different ideologies, strategies and positioning of NGOs/CSOs/CBOs in these sub-regions, what is needed is to develop a collective common position through:
  - Broad-based consultations
  - Mapping of organizations who are working for promotion of food security/sovereignty
  - Enhance information sharing and communication at all levels
  - Looking at (involving) multi actors in the process
  - Asserting our common democratic spaces in dialogues (particularly when government or corporate houses try to divide us)
- We should learn from each other's experiences, share our experiences among us and should focus on mobilizing and empowering communities
- We should document best practices (if possible with the technical help of academicians, universities)
- Support CSOs to increase their visibility at global level.
- People who would be at forefront should represent constituencies (adequate translation etc. need to be made available to them to make them feel comfortable in the process)
- Constituency representatives need to be capacitated in order to enable them to represent their constituency effectively

### ***2. Selection of regional members of Coordination Committee***

- All participants would be responsible to disseminate information on this process among other organizations, networks (who are working on similar

issues in these sub-regions) constituency-wise. Sarojini will develop an e-group for sharing information among the participants.

- Where ever possible sub-regional consultations would be organized for broad-basing the process
- Various constituencies will nominate organizations to be included in the consultation process and for identifying cc members
- Focal points are identified for South Asia, South East Asia and Oceania which will facilitate these consultations and they are as follows:  
South Asia: Sahidur Rahaman (IFSN, Bangladesh), Ujjaini Halim(WFF,India),  
Meenakshi Munda (APIYN India)
- South East Asia : Esther, Joan Salvador (ARWC), and one person from LVC
- Oceania: Andre Leu (IFOAM)
- Sarojini will also play important role in overall facilitation.
- Focal points will be responsible to facilitate the consultations by establishing communications with the nominated organizations and all the nominated organizations and focal points will form a Council which will be known as Reference Group
- The Reference Group will discuss the issue of final selection of cc members from the respective sub-regions. Reference Group will be in a facilitating role

**Time line:**

- Information to be shared with other CSOs/NGOs: by 20<sup>th</sup> October
  - All nominations to be submitted by 15<sup>th</sup> November
  - Reference group to be set up by 15<sup>th</sup> November
  - Then this group will decide about final nominations to cc from their respective regions by 31<sup>st</sup> December
  - If possible sub-region-wise meetings would be organized for Reference Group members (depending on availability of resources)
- The entire process should be well documented to maintain transparency (by focal points)
- In future selection of cc members should be done through intensive consultations at various levels, which could not be done this time for time constraint

## Africa

### Focal Point(s):

1. PROPAC – Central Africa
2. WFF – East Africa
3. Remadel & IPC – North Africa
4. La Via Campesina - Southern Africa
5. ROPPA – West Africa

It is proposed that for each subregion within Africa, a reference group be formed to identify and select their representative on the Coordination Committee.

These reference groups will be initiated by the organisations present here, and then wider participation sought. It is acknowledged and accepted however that due to the time constraints, this group cannot expect to ever become fully balanced in representation and participation, and the groups should not take too much time in seeking to become so. The reference groups will exist solely for the purpose of selecting the representatives for this first year's Coordination Committee, and will not have any life beyond that. This first year is an experimental process.

### Process

#### **1. Constitute the group**

- Organisations present here will elaborate the list of regional organisations and networks mentioned during this discussion in order to identify the groups who need to be part of this process. The reference group will elaborate criteria of relevance to food security and representativeness to be applied in developing the list.

- Organisations present here will select one organisation to be responsible for taking the lead

- The formation of the reference group will be communicated as widely as possible to all the organisations and networks identified with an open invitation to be part of the reference group

#### **2. Invite nominations**

- The (now extended) reference group will develop

- criteria for the selection of the representative, and
- TOR for the role of representative (including making clear the level of work involved and limited resources available)

- Call for nominations will be widely communicated, sharing the criteria and TOR

#### **3. Select representative**

- The reference group will select the representative for the subregion from the nominations received, according to the criteria

- This will be done by the end of December

### **Lead organisations**

Central Africa:

- PROPAC ( propac-cm@yahoo.fr , cnopcameroun@yahoo.fr )

East Africa:

- World Forum of Fish Harvesters and Fish Workers ( mnakato@worldfisherforum.org )

North Africa:

- Remadel ( remadel\_maghreb@yahoo.fr ) & IPC focal point ( karimakrout@yahoo.fr )

Southern Africa:

- La Vía Campesina ( renaldo.unac@gmail.com )

West Africa:

- tbc

### **Annexe: list of organisations/networks from discussion**

International:

- International Federation of Agricultural Producers (IFAP)
- International Union of Food Workers (IUF)
- World Forum of Fish Harvesters and Fish Workers
- Rural Women's Network
- International Food Security Network (IFSN)
- World Alliance of Mobile Indigenous People (WAMIP)
- Habitat International Coalition (HIC)
- International Indigenous ICT Task Force (IITF)

Continental:

- Pan-African Farmers Forum
- pan-African youth movement
- Organisation de femmes autochtones d'afriques
- Vía Campesina Africa
  - region 1: headquartered Moz
  - region 2: headquartered Mali
- IPACC (Indigenous Peoples of Africa Coordinating Committee)

Maghreb:

- Remadel
- U Magri

West Africa:

- ROPPA
- RECAO (Réseau des chambres d'agriculture de l'Afrique de l'Ouest)
- REPAOC (Réseau des plates-formes nationales d'ONG d'Afrique de l'Ouest et du Centre)
- MIJARC (Mouvement international des jeunes rurales catholique)
- Tin Hinan
- ORB/AOC (Observatoire regional du betail et de la viande en Afrique de l'Ouest et du Centre)
- UFROAT (Union des Femmes Rurales Ouest africaines et du Tchad)
- reseau des consommateurs
- reseau des cooperatives
- ECOWAS women's network
- fisherfolks

Central Africa:

- PROPAC
- chambres d'agriculture
- food security network
- Dynamic Africa
- women's networks
- women farmers

East Africa:

- east african agricultural and food union
- NBD (Nile Basin Discourse) - 10 countries (east, north and central) - environmentalists, community, professional
- EAFF
- Mawed
- pastoralists

Southern Africa

- SACAU
- 

**Central Asia**

**Focal Point(s) – To be determined**

The group was facilitated by Maryam Rahmanian, report by Catherine Razavi Iran, with the help of our friend Akylbek Rakaev from Kirgizstan.

We discussed about two subjects in the region of Central Asia, Iran and Afghanistan.

A. State of Civil society networking and advocacy in the region

- B. Selection of regional members of coordinating committee (deadline is 31 December 2010)

**A. State of Civil Society Networking and Advocacy in the region:**

We have to work hard to find out several NGOs and indigenous organisation in the region of Central Asia, Afghanistan and even in Iran working specifically in the subject of “Food Security and Food Sovereignty”. That shows us that for the future we have to work hard in our region. That is why we have to work first at the national level and network very deeply again at national level for the coming years. For a while we should just agree with the NGOs working on environmental issues and then we are going to lobby for finding more specific NGOs.

Uzbekistan and Turkmenistan are not very open yet for NGOs and indigenous organisation. But we still can find if not very specialized NGOs with the subject of food security and food sovereignty NGOs working in general with natural resources, environmental and environmental protection. Kazakhstan, Kirkstan and Tajikistan should be the countries that at the beginning we have to focus on.

Regarding for example Pastoralism in Kirkstan we can't say that we are a network but we are for a while a project. That means as soon as the project is finished and the budget is finished the movement could disappear. That is why now we have to work very hard of organizing ourselves in a very strong network. It could be a very hard work but we have to have an overall goal for the near future.

We need to start seriously in our countries to built capacity building and then public awareness with the NGOs and indigenous people in the issue of Food Security and Food Sovereignty. For a while 90% project are based and organized by the government. The strong point in Central Asia is the common Russian language that in the future can facilitate the networking and website. With Iran and Afghanistan as well fortunately there is common language.

Fortunately Kazakhstan has got some network but we have to be in touch with them as soon as possible. But we have to be aware that agencies are taking the lead for the issues of agriculture and don't make the mistake and take them as Civil Society Organisation. We have to be aware that the Russian culture is more promoted than the local culture and local language. Maybe in the future we have to go more deeply in our culture especially regarding Pastoralism, Food Security and Food Sovereignty.

As we understood we have for the beginning to focus only on Kazakhstan, Kirkstan and Tajikistan. Even in Kirgizstan I hardly understood by my colleagues said Akylbek.

In Central Asia political division is the base of working together, in Arabic countries the religion is the base of working together. And this the question raised by our colleague of Kirkstan “how to consolidate the relation of farmers and pastoralists in the future. We have to think about it very seriously. And maybe this work will help us to find a good solution in the research of networking for Food Security and Food Sovereignty.

In our countries conservationists and environmentalists doesn't not yet believe in the very crucial role of Civil Societies, indigenous and local people and don't involve them in the process of decision and implementation only as a most of the time workers for their project. We have to take in account this and work hard for it. We have to work and lobby with experts and decision makers for different groups: women, poverty, land less and formulate with themselves an adequate and functional solution for networking. We should not be in a hurry for having a good base for the future. We have to be in touch with other part of the world for example like Africa where networking is strong today and learn more from them. We have to work at different level local, national and regional; the challenge is very big dissipation of lack of budget and legal framework, people working in the issue of Food Security and Food Sovereignty. We need a large network for the dissemination of the information around our countries.

The question was raised how to consolidated the regional network? Maybe through press release, internet, yahoo group and somehow in some country through human rights of the civil societies and indigenous people.

We have to find very dedicated persons for being able to lobby with our governments in the subject of the inclusion of Civil Society in the CFS and MFS.

**B. Selection of regional members of coordinating committee (deadline is 31 December 2010)**

The selection of regional members of coordination committee will be a very difficult task for our Central Asia region. Each sub-region should present just one member with a very democratic and transparent process. We should make a list of them and have criteria. We are going to take in account the same criteria and TOR of the group, and disseminate them. We have always remembered only the person of the civil society should be taking in the process. Indigenous and local people are considered as a CS.

Long term objectives could be and should be the setup of a regional platform on Food Security and Food Sovereignty. Different National network should be able to establish such platform at regional level. As we said before we have to start with Kazakhstan, Kirgistan and Tajikistan in Central Asia and with as well Iran and Afghanistan. The most important is to find a common interest and challenge between local level and as well between national level to being able to setup a strong and sustainable regional network. We are going to need a minimum budget for the organization of this regional network.

We need time and try to find out from which way we are going to process. Maybe we have to be in touch with ECO and other organisation where we can raise the very crucial issue of Food Security and Food Sovereignty.

For example in Russia Food Security is more oriented for production of grain and food. We should put mid-term goal for setting up a national network with our new approach on Food Security. Then think about regional network.

The person who will be in charge of setting up the network should be very committed and believer.

Adding here the selection criteria

The task for organizing in Central Asia, Afghanistan and Iran with the deadline of 31 December 2010 will be:

1. List of all organisations in the region which have somehow worked on Food Security
2. Information in Russian and Farsi in a kind of Cover letter explaining the goal of this network, CFS, CMS, criteria etc..... Maryam Rahmanian will do that and will send us what document we need for translation in Russian and Farsi.
3. We are going to have several conference calls after having find people of our lists.
4. Then make a group and start to have a council and then we will be able to choose people for the coordination committee. We are going to have rotation approach.

---

## **Latin America**

### **Focal Point(s):**

1. **Liseth Ordriñez – CICA**
2. **Maria Noel Salgado – Movimiento Agroecológico de América Latina**
3. **Mario Ahumada – CIP America Latina y Caribe**

Es fundamental el respeto y reconocimiento al proceso de participación que el CIP Regional de América Latina y los diferentes movimientos sociales regionales y organizaciones nacionales han venido desarrollando en la región. Existe una plataforma de articulación de numerosas y diversas organizaciones, la cual ha llevado sólo en este último año diversos procesos de consulta como es el caso de la II Conferencia para la Soberanía Alimentaria de la Sociedad Civil previa a la Conferencia Regional de la FAO en abril del 2010 en Panamá, asimismo la **Conferencia de las OSC sobre las Directrices para la Tenencia de la Tierra y de los Recursos Naturales**, en Brasilia, Brasil. En donde se determinaron propuestas significativas por un gran número de movimientos y organizaciones.

Con el fin de ampliar aún más la participación y facilitar la incorporación de otros movimientos y organizaciones sociales, se acordó realizar un proceso de consulta para la identificación, incorporación y participación en el mecanismo de la sociedad civil de movimientos y organizaciones sociales que aún no se incorporan. En la reunión ya identificamos otras plataformas regionales que trabajan el tema de Soberanía Alimentaria, derecho a la alimentación, derecho nutricional, derecho territorial, por ejemplo:

- CIP América Latina y El Caribe
- Foro Social de Las Américas
- COPROFAN, REAL MERCOSUR
- CLOC, MAELA, AMIGOS DE LA TIERRA, REDLAC, RAPAL
- Red por una América Latina libre de Transgénicos
- Red por el Derecho a la Alimentación
- Consejo Internacional de Tratados Indios
- Consejo Indígena centroamericano
- Etc.

A su vez, también organizaciones nacionales como por ejemplo:

- FBSSAN de Brasil, CONSEA de Brasil, ANA de Brasil, ASA de Brasil
- RED AGROECOLOGICO DE URUGUAY, RED DE EDUCACIÓN AMBIENTAL de Uruguay
- CNFR/AMRU de Uruguay
- ASOCIACIÓN DE PRODUCTORES ECOLOGICOS DE BOLIVIA
- FUNDACIÓN LA ESPERANZITA DE NICARAGUA
- AGROSOLIDARIA DE Colombia etc:

Nominar

EN CUANTO A LA ELECCION DE LOS PUNTOS FOCALES DE LAS TRES SUBREGIONES, COMO NO HABIA UNA SUFICIENTE REPRESENTACIÓN, EL GRUPO DE TRABAJO DE AMERICA LATINA ACORDO NOMBRAR A 3 PERSONAS RESPONSABLES PARA QUE REALIZEN UNA CONSULTA POR INTERNET A LAS DIVERSAS ORGANIZACIONES NACIONALES Y REGIONALES, QUE LOGRE COMO RESULTADO SELECCIONAR A LOS 3 MIEMBROS DEL COMITÉ DE COORDINACIÓN ANTES DEL 31 DE DICIEMBRE.

PARA ELLO SE ESTABLECIO LO SIGUIENTE:

1. Ratificar las Redes que ya están establecidas, sus procesos de consulta
2. Trabajar en los procesos de participación nacional.
3. Tomar en consideración el Foro Social de las Américas, Mercosur, y otras ya mencionadas
4. CIP América Latina y el Caribe
5. Establecer una Ficha de organizaciones

Las personas serán las siguientes: Mario Ahumada, Lisseth Rodríguez y María Noel Salgado, las cuales tiene la tarea de hacer las respectivas consultas vía internet y trabajarán hasta el 31 de diciembre con la colaboración y apoyo de todos los presentes.

## Appendix 2: Constituencies

Notes:

- Note that the following constituencies were not represented: Landless and Consumers.
- These processes have been attached as they were sent to the Rapporteurs. They have not been altered out of respect for the autonomy of each group.

---

### Smallholder Farmers (FR)

Focal Point(s):

1. IFAP
2. La Via Campesina

Cet atelier avait pour mission de désigner quel processus doit être mis en place pour désigner les 4 personnes qui représenteront la diversité paysanne au niveau planétaire au sein du CSA .

La discussion s'est déroulée autour de deux points :

2. Quels critères de sélections ?
3. Quel mécanisme de désignation ?

Une large discussion s'est développée autour des critères afin que tous les paysans soient bien représentés dans leurs diversités.

Il est acté que la Via Campesina et le FIPA, les deux organisations paysannes organisées au niveau international désignent les 4 représentants. Cela ne leur donne pas toutefois carte blanche dans leur choix. Un comité des organisations paysannes constitué des membres ici présents, validera in fine les personnes proposées par les deux organisations.

Vu la volonté de représenter tous les paysans et paysannes, seuls deux critères sont retenus :

4. l'équité genre : deux femmes, deux hommes
5. s'assurer d'une représentation continentale équilibrée pour mettre en œuvre ce critère, il est validé que chaque continent via une consultation régionale désigne qu'au moins 'une organisation paysanne soit mandatée pour représenter le continent

Un critère mode et système de production lié à l'agro-écologie, au refus des OGM a été largement débattu, mais ce critère était d'ors et déjà discriminant entre les deux organisations paysannes internationales, et il a été décidé de ne pas le mettre en avant.

Par contre il est fortement recommandé et le comité des organisations paysannes en tiendra compte, que les représentant-e-s retenu-e-s, ne sont là ni pour leur propre structure ou région mais pour avoir un rôle de facilitateur entre les différentes organisations et espaces géographique pour porter une parole commune au sein du CSA. Il est précisé aussi que pendant l'année d'expérimentation, il faudra s'attacher à soutenir et à mettre en avant toutes les organisations souvent invisibles d'autant plus qu'elles ne sont pas adhérentes de la Via Campesina ou du FIPA

---

## **Fisherfolk**

Focal Point(s):

1. Margaret, WFF
2. Herman Kumara, WFFP

### **Proposed Process to Select the ICC Members:**

- Core team of 4 members will take the necessary steps to identify new regional organizations, other than WFF/WFFP by 20<sup>th</sup> October.[Natalia/Ujani/Margaret/Herman]
- Post the information to the relevant, identified organizations about CFS and get their consent to take part the process by 25<sup>th</sup> October,
- Form fisher folk council to take part the CFS process by 30<sup>th</sup> October.
- Identify potential nominees based on the criteria of the CFS CSO mechanism by 5<sup>th</sup> November.
- Elect two ICC members based on the proposals by 1<sup>st</sup> December.

*The process will be facilitated by Margaret of WFF and Herman of WFFP.*

### **How to address the issues:**

- We would encounter problems once we are attempting to broaden the Platform,
- SO far fisher folk organizations are not well recognized. So, need to attempt hard to get the attention at the global level.
- Poor working relationship among the fisheries organizations due to communication problems. Also, inadequate resources to overcome those issues.

### **What do the group expect from the ICC members:**

- Make the fisher people's issues more visible in CFS process.
- Represent common issues of the global level and represent all the artisanal fisher people's issues.

- Effective representation of different sectors.

**What Support do we need to perform the services of the CC members:**

- Continuous support from the field.
- Information flow and analysis of the issues coming from the grass root groups.
- Fisher folk Council in place with 2 fisher folk CC members.
- Resource will be required to facilitate meetings of CC members with council at least once a year.

---

**Agricultural Workers**

Focal Points:

1. Svetlana Boicean, UITA/IUF
2. Alessandra da Costa Lunas, CONTAG
3. Pogurio Chennaiah. CAWI

**Participants:**

Alessandra: COPRORAM/CONTAG, Brasil

Roberto Pinauin: Coalisao Internacional

Svetlana: IUF

Quara Anulco

**Representative organizations that will work as the focal point:**

UITA/IUF – CONTAG

International Coalition: Asia Pogurio Chenniah

Until the end of the year we will mobilize other organizations for the consultations process

See what organisations meet the criteria:

6. Carry out work with agricultural workers
7. Their work has the priority of food security and sovereignty

---

**Women**

Focal Point(s):

1. Joan Shivachi and Saro Vijaya Rengam, Asian Rural Women’s Coalition
2. Gretrude Kenyangi, Support for Women in Agriculture and Environment
3. Jeomsook Goo, La Via Campesina
4. Isabel Seivane, World March of Women
5. Alexandra Spielloch, WOCAN

**Participants:**

Caludia-Colombia (2)

ARWC (2)

Gertrude-Uganda-support for women in Agriculture

Khoo-Korea

Myra-Tuscany, Italy (organic agriculture, ICEA)

Francesca-Florence

Concesa-Brazil, WMW

Isabel-Spain, women food producers integration to the global feminist movement

Focus on item #2 (selection processes for the ICC)

How are we going to have the process of consultation to selection for the 2 ICC members. This should be done by December 31.

(review of criteria)

Note: These 2 ICC members should facilitate information to the broader number of women. Nora said that it's a service position so the ICC members will need to consult and make sure that all the women will be able to participate in the process.

Gertrude: There are four continents.

Claudia: There are 2 big groups that are her: WMW that can facilitate flow of information to other women in the world.

Saro: In the regional consultation: we created a focal people that can facilitate nomination to the reference group and will decide among themselves who will sit in the ICC.

Regional participation should be ensured in the reference group then they can decide among themselves who will sit in the ICC.

Since we are talking about Food and security there are already organizations that are there. We make sure that representation of the food producers such through organizations that work internationally for that.

All of us will take responsibility to identify women from our regional constituency. Focal point would be

Criteria shouldn't be the continents, we should take into consideration based on the constituency.

8. We want to make sure that all regions are represented here, following the same criteria.

Focal points: Joan and Saro (ARWC), Gertrude (Africa), Goo (La Via Campesina), Isabel (WMW), Alexandra (WOCAN)

How are we going to limit the number of women?

How are we going choose? We have to have some process to make sure that we talk about this so it will not look something artificial, especially that there are women that are not here.

In Latin America was to choose some temporary candidates that will be there for two months and then we send the info and will choose who will be in the ICC.

9. People who are here will facilitate the nomination not the nominees—women who would actually know the CSO mechanism, what is the CFS, agenda of the CFS because it's the input of the CFS process. We have until November to decide on this. The nominees will decide among themselves who will go to the ICC by rotation.

We should clarify that the person we are nominating should still follow the criteria.

We want women to be involved in this process especially the food producers.

In selecting who will be the first to sit: we provide a profile of all these women and then they will choose among the profile and choose who will vote.

The focal points will facilitate this process.

The women's constituency said that it should be 50%.

The idea was to strengthen women's representation, if you are talking of food producers for example there women because they are working on the ground so they are bringing the perspective of women in these constituencies. All the other NGOs, regional processes, should ensure that women also participate. We want to make sure of the participation of women in all the constituencies.

This group should strengthen the gender analysis of the CSO mechanisms

Final Process:

All the women who are present during the discussion have the responsibility to send out the information to as many women as possible. The focal points identified will gather all the nominations to the **reference group** (note that the criteria of the ICC members should be followed). The reference group will select among themselves who will sit in the ICC (2 persons) in a rotation term (example 2 years each.) We have to make sure that all the regions are represented in the reference group with emphasis on food producers, etc.

A list serve will be set up for the group.

---

## **Youth**

Focal Points:

1. George Dixon Fernandez, Coordinator
2. Gonzalo del Castillo, Latin America
3. Claire Quintin, Europe
4. Rabi Aryal and Meenakshi Munda, Asia
5. Melanie Fave. Africa

We have to identify which organizations which has to be involved and consulted in finding CC members

We want to communicate to all participant Youth organizations on Civil Society Forum 2009.

organizations of young producers, rural youth, marginalized youth  
Existing youth platforms/networks in different continents  
Organization which work with access to land

Proposed other networks and platforms to be consulted

**America:** Ibero-American youth space, Youth latin American platform, Youth Agrarian Federation, IPC latin America

**Asia:** JHORD, APIYN, Payaram foundation, ASA, Asian Youth Council, Faith based Youth organizations

**Africa:** Comac, African Youth Movement, Panafrican Youth federation

**Europe:** Reclaim the field, Youth of Via Campesina, Young Friends of the Earth, European Youth Forum/Council

**Global:** MIJARC, YMCA international, Scouts associations, WAGGGS/WOSM, Youth at the UN YUNGA, ICMYO, Youth sections from producer organizations

**Selection Process:**

We want few focal points from various continents and to ensure an inclusive process

Mandate of focal points is to spread the message maximum, and to collect the nominees from different organizations and regions. The focal points will have only a facilitation role.

Focal points from each continents who is in charge for contacting other organizations

**Coordinating focal point:** George Dixon Fernandez

**Focal point L-A:** Gonzalo del Castillo

**Focal point Europe:** Nyeleni-Europe – represented by Claire Quintin

**Asia:** Rabi Aryal, Meenakshi Munda

**Africa:** Melanie Faye

The nominated persons and focal points will form a reference groups and propose 2 people who will be nominated as CC for the next 1 year

CC members mandate from the constituency perspective:

- Represent not her/his own organization but all youth
- try to get on top of the issue of Youth; emphasise role of youth as the future in agriculture and try to raise the issues which should be improved for youth, access to land especially
- we want self organized youth representatives (youth speaking for youth), maximum age for the representatives is 35

What can the CC expect from us?

- contribute with information both practical and political from a youth situation
- website/ mailing-list; representatives send questions to the movements and the movements can reply with information on key issues that they are concerned with

---

## **Urban Poor**

Focal Point(s):

1. Davinder Lamba, HIC

### Participants:

Davinder Lamba, Habitat Internacional Coalition (HIC) / Mazingira Institute (Kenya)

Daniel Gómez, FIAN

Maria Inés García-Reyes from Fedevivienda (Colombia)

The group recommends the creation of a reference group and a three step process for the selection of the members of the Coordinating Committee (CC) from the urban poor constituency.

The reference group shall comprise five or more organizations / networks. Those organizations / networks that were part of the urban poor constituency at the Civil Society Forum 2009, will be urged to constitute the reference group, among others.

The first step of the process will be to prepare a memorandum elaborating the nature of the business to be addressed and the time frame for execution. The second step will be to constitute the reference group, and to make the call for

individuals, available and willing to serve on the CC, and who have the required competence and skills. The third step will be the selection of the individuals by the reference group and communication of the outcome.

HIC, the focal point for the Urban Constituency will act as the facilitator and assume the responsibility for the task, through Davinder Lamba, HIC President.

## Pastoralists

Focal Point(s):

To be identified during the Global Gathering of Women Pastoralists, (GGWP) in

NAME	COUNTRY	GROUP
Saoudata Aboubacrine	Mali	Tin Hinan
Akylbek Rakael	Kyrgyzisthan	KSBA
Lalji Desaj	India	Marag/WAMIP
Paola de Meo	Italia	Terra Nuova ( NGO)
Maryam Rahmaniam	Iran	Cenesta ( NGO)
Khadija Razavi	Iran	Cenesta ( NGO)
Fernando Garcia-Dory	Spain	Spanish Shepherds Federation
Reno Alphonse Barbier	Mali	CNOP
Eugenia Gallese	France	GRDR ( ONG)

Regional and Global networks identified so far:

- WAMIP is the only grassroots worldwide pastoralist organisation.
- LIFE Network is international, but formed mainly by technicians, academics, NGOs, etc., it works on livestock but is not on pastoralism.
- Billital Maruve: pastoralist organisation of Burkina-faso, Mali, Niger APS , all Africa ( ? check) , onli Peul
- ORB - Organisation Régionale du Bétail, West and central Africa
- Tinhinan
- European Shepherds Network, not legally established yet, but carrying coordinated actions.
- Sami Parliament : 16 countries

- Pastoral Parliament, Pakistan, India and Nepal, very well organised, no external funding

There is a mention to other organisations not considered because formed mainly by NGOs not pastoralists, like the almost extinct World Herders Council, the European Foundation for Culture Nature and Pastoralism, Fundacion del Sur...)

We start a discussion on how would give shape to the CSM to serve pastoralists interests. This constituency group will have to choose two representatives before December 31<sup>st</sup>, first for one year and then each 2 years.

There is an introduction of the role and function of the pastoralists representatives in the Coordination Committee: it's not a representation, but a mediator.

Some questions to arrive to know who could have that role, when thinking on candidates

- Do they have the capacity for this task?
- If not, which capacities or support would they need?
- To follow the criteria established for CSM
- How could get feedback from the communities?
- That person should have communication capacities, speaking a main language, should be a pastoralist from a community, background of the person.
- Terms of reference
- Having followed the process of CFS
- Having the support of certain technical structure to deliver the information etc

We agree that the ideal occasion to identify those representatives will be the next Global Gathering of Women Pastoralists, (GGWP) in Gujarat, from 21<sup>th</sup> to 27<sup>th</sup> November.

We agree on trying to nominate after the 1<sup>st</sup> year of functioning, a council formed by pairs of representatives by regions and gender that would rotate every 2 years.

We will make sure that in the GGWP there will be space and time to explain the CSM, and for the election

---

## NGOs

Focal Point(s):

1. Chris Leather - Coordinator
2. Flavio Valente - Latin America
3. Jean Blaylock - Africa
4. Vora Gana Seck - Africa
5. Alberta Guerra - Europe
6. Bastien Laigle - Global
7. Laura Lorenzo - Europe
8. Thiak karyawasam - Southeast Asia
9. Steven Myers - US
10. Georgina Peard - Global
11. Ditdit Pelegrina - Asia
12. Shahidur Rahman - Asia
13. Ayenew Tessera - Africa
14. Jennifer Thompson - Europe
15. Livia Zoli - Europe

NGO's have a different make up than other groups; varied typologies; this needs to be reflected in the representation

Support group needed to the representatives for regions and thematic groups

Mapping effort is essential; should be done before selecting the representative if possible

Initial mapping effort should happen, and then a more comprehensive effort should be part of the work programme

Initial lists already exist and should be utilized

Figure out how to involve other or "new" constituencies, such as environmental groups

How will communication between the focal points and the rest of the groups work? Is a council needed? A support team?

Addressing transition of representatives within a longer term view will need to take into account the frequent turn-over in NGOS

One option is to identify a group of people from whom the successors could be chosen

Need to decide if it is the "person" or the "role" within the representing organization that we are choosing in the event that the representative changes jobs during his or her term; would they keep their role within the CSM anyway or would the role stay with the organization in question?

Should consider some sort of transition period with the incoming and the outgoing representatives so the incoming representatives are up to speed when they assume the role. Should try to take advantage of existing resources as much as possible, for example, nutrition experts could transition in and out of a rotating support group

How will thematic groups be represented? What about national groups versus international NGOs? Or coalition organizations that represent multiple NGOs? Southern groups? When there are only 2 spots?

Representatives present at the meeting are primarily northern based ngo's/representatives

How will we effectively involve and represent southern-based NGOs?

Thematic groups might not be the best way to represent southern ngos as they are not always organized in this manner

If representatives come from northern NGO's they will need to figure out how to liaise with southern ngos

Some groups, eg Concern, are already involved in thematic groups such as nutrition and could provide a nutrition lense

Which constituencies will regional representatives come from?

Major critieria for southern based ngo (or anyone really) should be the capacity to engage (not just willingness)

Should agribusiness-like NGO's be excluded from representation?

#### Roles and Responsibilities:

Chris Leather, Oxfam will continue to lead with the support of several others

Gene from Acord will support Chris (or be the focal point?)

Flavio – facilitate regional representation/mapping from Latin America

Diti (C-Rice?) – facilitate regional representation/mapping from Asia

NAG (Nutrition Action Group) – Jen from Concern will help integrate nutrition groups/lens into the mapping

Action Aid: Rutchi and Livia – general support

Laura will help with mapping the NGOS

Cita – help with faith based group mapping

Basian – help with mapping and involvement of the International Forum of Platforms

Karim – help with inclusion of Northern Africa

Ethiopia rep will help with inclusion of Ethiopian NGOS

Other questions/issues to take into consideration:

Should there be rules about northern and southern NGOS? Should there always be one of each? Should there be some sort of rotating rule?

Does the representative need to come from an NGO that has several country connections/programs (eg with a broad reach?); if yes, how many is the minimum?

Does the representative need to come from an NGO network so their reach/network is also very broad and they are already positioned to be communicating with a wide range of stakeholders?

How do you address the overlap with the outreach and mapping efforts of other representative leads? Eg, wouldn't the regional organizations get represented in the regional groups? How reduce overlap and make outreach and consultation effective?

---

## **Indigenous Peoples (SP)**

Focal Point(s):

1. Saúl Vicente Vasquez – UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Peoples
2. Soudata Aboubacrine – Tin Hinan

En el Foro de la Sociedad Civil, efectuada en noviembre del año 2009 en Roma Italia, se conformo un CAUCUS DE PUEBLOS INDÍGENAS, en el Foro de Pueblos Indígenas por la Soberanía Alimentaria, los cuales establecieron los respectivos representantes por región de América Latina, América del Norte, Europa, Asia, Oceanía, África, etc.

El CAUCUS DE PUEBLOS INDIGENAS, funciona como todas los CAUCUS existentes en las diversas instancias de las naciones unidas. Como en el Convenio de la Diversidad Biológica, en el Marco de cambio Climático, como en su momento en el Consejo de Derechos Humanos y en el Grupo de Trabajo sobre poblaciones indígenas en Ginebra.

La conformación de este CAUCUS INDIGENA, fue informado en las Naciones Unidas específicamente en el FORO PERMANENTE DE LOS PUEBLOS INDIGENAS en Nueva York, en mayo de este año. En donde se solicito a la FAO y al FIDA para trabajar con

los Pueblos Indígenas. De igual manera se informó sobre la aprobación del documento sobre LA POLITICA DE LA FAO para Pueblos Indígenas, un trabajo que venía empujando el CAUCUS DE PUEBLOS INDÍGENAS.

EL GRUPO DE TRABAJO DE PUEBLOS INDÍGENAS, estableció que fuera el CAUCUS de PUEBLOS INDÍGENAS, la instancia que nominaría a los 2 representantes indígenas en el Comité de Coordinación, para ello se dejó como facilitadores a los hermanos SAUL VICENTE Y SAOUDATA, ambos consultarán con los miembros del Caucus Indígena y nos informarán sobre las decisiones antes del 31 de diciembre del 2010.

Se solicitará a la FAO y al FIDA, para que garantice el trabajo y proceso del CAUCUS de PUEBLOS INDIGENAS.

LOS DESIGNADOS ANTE EL COMITÉ DE COORDINACIÓN TRABAJARA BAJO LAS SOLICITUDES, EXIGENCIAS SURGIDAS DE LAS DECLARACIONES DE LOS PUEBLOS INDÍGENAS SOBRE SOBERANIA ALIMENTARIA DE LOS FOROS Y CONSULTAS REALIZADAS, ASI MISMO COMO DEL PROGRAMA DE TRABAJO SOBRE SEGURIDAD ALIMENTARIA QUE YA TIENE ESTABLECIDA EL FORO PERMANENTE DE LOS PUEBLOS INDÍGENAS.

## Appendix 3: Policy Roundtables

### 1: Global Strategic Framework

#### Conclusions from the Working Group of the CSO Consultation to Prepare CSO Positions for the Round Table on the Global Strategic Framework

Civil society expects the member States in the reformed CFs to immediately engage in the process of elaborating, negotiating and approving the Global Strategic Framework on Food and Nutritional Security.

1. Food security cannot be separated either from the right to food or the rights of agricultural and food workers to decent work and living wages.

We are concerned about the absence of reference to fundamental rights:

- total absence of any reference to the Universal Right of all human beings to adequate, affordable nutrition and the obligation of governments to ensure that the right is defended and fulfilled.
  - the concept note does not reflect a broader range of rights based frameworks in particular the ILO Conventions.
  - the rights for those who produce the world's food. Agricultural and food workers are those who help to feed the world yet they and their families are amongst the most malnourished and food insecure. Surely it is one of the cruellest ironies that this who feed the world, agricultural and food workers and small farmers have the least resources to feed themselves and their families.
  - Agricultural workers should be guaranteed the right to a living wage, which would provide income to support themselves and their families. Yet agriculture is often excluded from coverage of national labour law in particular occupational, health and safety regulation. Safe food means also safe working condition for those who produce it.
2. Missing references :
    - Need to recall the resolution of the ILC 2008 committee on rural employment for poverty reduction
    - the Memorandum of Understanding between the ILO and FAO signed in September 2004
    - the reform of the Food Aid Convention
    - analyses and positions already elaborated by civil society, including those most affected by food insecurity, for example the working document on "*Policies and Actions to eradicate hunger and malnutrition*"

It is crucial to note that the documents listed in the concept note are different in nature, and should serve different purposes for the elaboration of the GSF. For example, whereas the CFA is a range of policy options compiled by UN agencies, the Voluntary Guidelines on the Right to Food stem from the legal Right to Food which governments are bound to respect, protect and fulfil. The Right to Food and

its Voluntary Guidelines should thus provide the basis for a set of core principles for the GSF, which should guide any policy options it includes. The Right to Food and its Guidelines should also, therefore, represent an accountability tool against which actions under the GSF, and by extension the CFS as a whole, should be assessed. The UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food should therefore be afforded a specific role in the process to elaborate the GSF led by HLPE.

**3.** The governments must sovereignty negotiate and decide, at global level, what they must do together to place people, and the promotion of the human right to adequate food for all, and related rights, above sectoral and private interests. Governments must also have the political capacity to jointly decide what actions and processes must be stopped to eradicate hunger.

At the same time, governments, at national level, have the obligation to sovereignty decide how they will establish their own strategies to eradicate hunger and malnutrition, while promoting the right to adequate food and related rights, with the participation of their own people.

But we have no doubt that it is clear to all CFs State members that national governments alone will not be able to achieve the expected results, if policy coherence , public regulation and technical and financial cooperation are not thoroughly revisited at the international level and be truly supportive of the country led strategies. And this can only be done through bold collective political decisions.

**4. Elaboration of the Global Strategic Framework should include a broad participatory process that will strive to “ensure the voices of all food producers; the most affected by food insecurity – are heard”.** We the civil society organization representatives of the most affected by food insecurity find unacceptable that civil society constituencies are not mentioned to participate and are concerned by the timing and the process of elaboration of the GSF. Also

- The need to involve the High Level panel of Experts and the UN special Rapporteur on the Right to Food in the elaboration of the GSF Draft zero.
- The schedule and time should ensure that there is enough consultation and time to modify and respond among the stakeholders, especially those constituents that represent food producers. Therefore we ask the consultation process to start in February and is extended until the end of June of 2011
- The CSM should be the official mechanism for which civil society should be consulted. We not only need time to enable the consultation process to take place among small scale food producers; but also effort should be made to ensure that funds are put in place to ensure we engage in the process
- Lastly the civil society organisation is eager to have the Global strategic framework, in place and thus urge that the time proposed for the presentation of the GSF which is October 2012, is adhered to .

Civil society, CSOs and social movements are willing and eager to continue providing our active contribution to this process, at all levels, based on our concrete experiences. We will also take all steps necessary to continue to hold our governments to account, both at national and international level.

---

## **2. Land Tenure and International Investment**

### **Conclusions from the Working Group of the CSO Consultation to Prepare CSO Positions for the Round Table on Land Tenure and International Investment in Agriculture.**

10. We ask the CFS to recall the importance of the International Conference on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development (ICARRD), and urge States to implement the commitments they made in the ICARRD final declaration in relation to secure access to and control over land and natural resources for small scale food producers/providers, genuine agrarian reform and sustainable rural development policies, all of which realise the rights of women, youth, peasants, small-scale family farmers, fishers, pastoralists and indigenous peoples. We further recommend to the CFS that the ICARRD declaration be developed into a framework for agrarian reform and rural development policies.
  
11. We call on the CFS to support the FAO Guidelines for land and natural resource tenure, with attention on the following:
  - reiterate the importance of basing the guidelines on existing binding instruments of international human rights law;
  - establish an open-ended inter-governmental working group, to review the zero draft of the guidelines which will be presented by FAO in early 2011 and to adequately build consensus on the text of the guidelines;
  - these guidelines are a crucial step in strengthening the existing regime for protecting the rights of local food producers and providers; other measures and initiatives should follow in the establishment of such a regime, for example, on regulating the operations of finance capital, regulating international trade, etc.
  
12. We call on the CFS to not endorse the Principles for Responsible Agricultural Investment that Respects Rights, Livelihoods and Resources (RAI): the RAI is not an adequate instrument to regulate private investment; moreover, RAI principles have been formulated through an exclusive process without the participation of communities and constituencies most affected by agricultural investments, especially private investments. What is needed instead are nationally and internationally enforceable laws and

public regulations on all investments pertaining to land, including provisions on extra-territorial obligations of states to regulate and make private companies accountable for their operations abroad.

13. Given the urgency of the problems of dispossession, evictions and displacement arising from large-scale private investment, we ask the CFS to initiate urgent precautionary action to prevent the worsening of poverty and hunger: we call for a moratorium on large-scale land acquisitions (lease and purchase) by private companies, and on all private investments that result in the expropriation of land and natural resources from local communities and food producers/providers. We urge the CFS to adopt a resolution to this effect.
  
14. We ask the CFS to start an open and inclusive discussion on what types of agricultural investment are needed to support agro-ecological food and agricultural production with due attention to all different types of food producers (indigenous peoples, nomadic pastoralists, artisanal fisherfolk and peasants), particularly taking into consideration the needs of women and youth.

---

### **3. Mapping Food Security Initiatives**

#### **Intervention developed at the Working Group of the CSO Consultation and delivered at the 36<sup>th</sup> Session of the CFS.**

We welcome this initiative for mapping tool, it has great potential for our work in food and nutritional security. We do want to see this mapping tool to be done in a transparent and participatory manner as much as possible.

We see the importance of the mapping tool to identify gaps and redundancies in actions taken to implement national food and nutritional security policies and strategies and to take correction if needed. At the same time, we see that the mapping tool should serve as a planning tool for the elaboration of rights based national strategies towards the eradication of hunger and malnutrition, and be used as a monitoring tool. This mapping should also be used to identify ways in which the international community could collaborate to financially and technically support the implementation of these strategies, as well as take joint policy measures to increase international policy coherence to avoid negative impact on the capacity of national governments to implement their own strategies.

We want this mapping tool to be seen not as a voluntary national initiative, but as a concrete demonstration of the commitment of each and every State, northern and southern, to be fully transparent and accountable with their own people and the international community. The eradication of hunger and malnutrition is a global priority, and the efforts towards achieving this goal should be as transparent as possible.

We want this mapping tool to be done in a participatory manner, involving key stakeholders especially farmers organizations and CSOs, working on right to food issues. Since we are the most affected by food insecurity, we are also want to be seen as the main users of this tool, so our involvement is highly necessary.

---

#### **4. Protracted Crisis**

##### **Conclusions from the Working Group of the CSO Consultation to Prepare CSO Positions for the Round Table on the Protracted Crisis**

1. The recommendation to support deeper analysis of people's livelihoods and coping mechanisms is welcome. However, there is also a need to **analyse the root causes** of protracted crisis to identify the policies, actions and actors and duty bearers contributing to the crisis. Preferably preventing crises from escalating into prolonged crisis by involving all stakeholders of society (not just governments) and especially Civil Society.

- Impartial definitions, criteria and analysis are vital in the identification of protracted crises. Criteria or definitions need to cover regional crises or sub-national crises. Some protracted crises are excluded from the list of 22 countries, for example the situation of the Palestinian people.
- The analysis should not only consider the local or national causes of crises but also look at how international policies and actions contribute to chronic hunger and food insecurity. For example, the impacts of climate change and the responsibilities of industrialised countries should be recognised.

2. **Respect the rights of people** affected by protracted crises and they should be involved in decision making to ensure their sovereignty over resources and livelihood. People affected by protracted crises should be put at the centre and actively involved in defining the solutions.

3. In order to promote food and livelihood security in protracted crises, **the policies and actions which contribute to crisis must be changed**. We welcome the fact that the SOFI report and the background paper emphasize the need to support people's livelihood in protracted crises. However, we also recommend :

- Invest in small-scale sustainable food production at the community level building upon local knowledge and expertise. All governments should spend a significant share of their budgets to support small-scale sustainable food production as African governments committed to do in the Maputo

declaration. It should be noted that many African governments have not yet met their Maputo commitment.

- Governments in countries responsible for carbon emissions leading to climate change need to reduce their emissions and provide finance to help developing countries mitigate and adapt to the consequences of climate change.
- International law should be respected in order to address the root causes of protracted crises. International law should be consistently applied.

4. International organisations should work in close collaboration with civil society organisations and local communities to **improve the appropriateness and effectiveness of international assistance.**

- The recommendations to place more emphasis on protecting and promoting livelihoods during emergencies, as well as meeting immediate food needs through food aid and other forms of food assistance...
- ... as are the recommendations to strengthen local institutions and organisations. It is important to emphasise the need to avoid creating dependency upon external aid.
- There is a need to improve coordination between international organisations and reform funding mechanisms to ensure that long term aid is available in order to support livelihoods.

5. **Civil society should be involved in the high level expert group**, which develops the Agenda for Action and ensures that the principles and modalities outlined above are taken into account.

- The CFS Advisory Group should be requested to establish the high level expert group, ensuring that civil society actors are included.
- The expert group should prepare the agenda as the basis for high level, inter-government discussions in the CFS. The Agenda for Action should be part of, and coherent with, the Global Strategic Framework to be developed by the CFS.

---

## **5. Managing Vulnerability**

**Conclusions from the Working group of the CSO Consultation to prepare CSO Position for the discussions for the Round Table Managing vulnerability and risks to promote better food security and nutrition.**

### **1. Regarding the recommendation on price volatility**

Given the recognition of the importance of the price volatility, it is even more important to look at the causes of it. The HLPE should be asked to have a thorough analysis of the causes of volatility, including issues as inter-linkages between financial and physical markets; increased demand for non-food agricultural products (eg. agrofuels); the liberalisation of agricultural markets; the changes in international food reserves,...

The HLPE should also not only address the risks related to price volatility, but also addressing the volatility itself. It should therefore come with proposals to limit the price volatility, that should include : the regulation of financial markets and of speculation on food markets; food reserves management from local, national, regional and international levels; trade related instruments including variable levies and supply management instruments; sound investment policies that reinforce the resilience of small holder producers to price shocks.

## **2. Regarding the recommendation on climate change**

While the discussion of the effects of climate change to vulnerable sectors is extensive, there is a lack of discussion on the drivers and causes of climate change. One of the main drivers and causes of climate change is the unsustainable industrial and agricultural policies and lifestyles, mainly in richer countries of the world, for example, the peoples' diets in many developed countries have too much protein from animal origin, leading to direct and indirect GHG emissions.

There should be more recognition of the roles that women play in food security and the initiatives or solutions they offer

Therefore we invite the Committee to:

Commission the HLPE to make proposals on the best design of a range of interlinked policies and programs ( in agriculture, nutrition, research and development, trade, finance, institutional arrangements, agro-fuels) for the adaptation to , mitigation of , and reduction of risks and vulnerabilities caused by climate change. The proposed policies and programs should be based on a thorough review of climate change's drivers, causes, and impacts particularly to women and children in rural communities with clear reference to the work of the IAASTD, as well as of the solutions and initiatives being done, particularly by women, at local, national and international levels. This should include identifying pathways to ensure that food security and nutrition are considered in national and international adaptation and mitigation policies.

## **3. Regarding the recommendation to set up a CFS working Group.**

Two tasks are being proposed to the Working Group. The general task of this Working Group should be to propose policies to prevent and reduce price volatility and to reduce impacts of price volatility, for adoption and implementation by CFS.

We remind members that the CFS is the main global policy space on Food Security and should seize its responsibility to coordinate and adopt policies.

We insist also on the greatest importance that the proposed CFS Working Group includes all the concerned intergovernmental institutions concerned by the struggle against Food Insecurity, as well as the CSOs (participants at the CFS). This is required to make it possible to the CFS to coordinate properly the concerned institutions, to ensure its leadership on this issue and for the CFS members to have a policy dialogue with these institutions.

We believe indeed that it has sense that the CFS Working Group look first to the analysis and the proposals of the HLPE and make his own proposals before to identify the needed changes on institutional level.

#### **4. Regarding the recommendation on vulnerability**

Since civil society cannot accept the fact that the vulnerability is considered inevitable and conform to ask governments for a social protection strategy that includes safety nets that protect the rights of the poor.

We have a responsibility to reduce structural vulnerability, not just cyclical. The free-market recipes have been a frontal attack on public policies for food, health, education. Today we know that the food crisis of 2008, driven primarily by speculation, caused more hunger than any other factor. It is a political responsibility to end it, just as the deregulation of the market, which affects the global crisis.

Therefore we ask governments to implement policies that ensure the common goods and to combat the vulnerability in all areas: health, education, standard of living, food, environment ... The CFS and governments need to ensure these with the participation of civil society.

We insist that the CFS provides the foremost importance to address vulnerability by enabling small holders producers to access the resources necessary for production, by ensuring fair and stable prices both for small holder producers and for consumers. To ensure stable prices at the international level is necessary to establish measures to regulate markets and production.