Using the **Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition** to Promote and Defend the People's Right to Adequate Food



A Manual for Social Movements and Civil Society Organizations

The document was prepared by Svetlana Boincean, Andrea Ferrante, Gisele Henriques, Natalia Landívar, Sue Longley, and Martin Wolpold-Bosien, with contributions from Rehema Bavuma, Sarojeni Rengam, Angel Strapazzón, Claudio Schuftan, and the support of Flavio Valente, Abby Carrigan, Kate Durbin and Cornelia Helmcke.

Proofreading: Elisabeth Black

Layout: jore werbeagentur · Heidelberg, Germany

Publishing: Wilma Strothenke

Published in October 2013 by:

CIDSE - International alliance of Catholic development agencies
Rue Stévin 16, B-1000 Brussels, Belgium
www.cidse.org

IUF - International Union of Food, Agricultural, Hotel, Restaurant, Catering, Tobacco and Allied Workers' Associations (IUF)
Rampe du Pont-Rouge, 8, CH-1213, Petit-Lancy, Switzerland
http://cms.iuf.org/

La Vía Campesina
Jl. Mampang Prapatan XIV No. 5 Jakarta Selatan DKI Jakarta 12790, Indonesia
http://viacampesina.org

FIAN International
Willy-Brandt-Platz 5, 69115 Heidelberg, Germany
www.fian.org

Cover image: Farmer watering his field of sugar cane, Salima, Malawi - Alida Vanni/iStock

This document was set up as a manual on how to use the Global Strategic Framework. It is meant as such and not as a common political document of the publishing organizations. The examples presented in this manual do not necessarily reflect the opinion of the publishing organizations.

Thanks to CIDSE (via Trocaire) and the Swiss Development Cooperation (SDC) for their financial contribution to this document.

List of acronyms and abbreviations

CAADP	The Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme
CESCR	Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights
CFS	Committee on World Food Security
CSM	Civil Society Mechanism
CSO	Civil Society Organization
EC	European Commission
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
GMO	Genetically Modified Organism
GSF	Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition
HLTF	High Level Task Force on the Global Food Security Crisis
HRCAC	Human Rights Council Advisory Committee
IAASTD	International Assessment of Agricultural Knowledge, Science and Technology for Development
ICARRD	International Conference on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development
ICESCR	International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights
IFAD	International Fund for Agriculture Development
IFPRI	International Food Policy Research Institute
ILO	International Labour Organization
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IPC	International Planning Committee for Food Sovereignty
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
NCDs	Non-Communicable Diseases
NEPAD	New Partnership for Africa's Development
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
OECD	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
OHCHR	Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights
RAI	Responsible Agricultural Investment
RtAF	Right to Adequate Food
RUTF	Ready to Use Therapeutic Food
UN	United Nations
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Emergency Fund
VGRtF	Voluntary Guidelines to Support the Progressive Realization of the Right to Adequate Food in the Context of National Food Security
VGGT	Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security
WFP	World Food Programme
WHO	World Health Organization of the United Nations
WTO	World Trade Organization

Table of contents

1. Introduction 5

1.1 Global decisions in Rome and their implications at home – The purpose of the manual 5
1.2 The 'food crisis' and the reform of the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) 5
1.3 A flagship document for policy coherence in global food governance: The importance of the Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition 7

2. The GSF made easy: breaking it down 9

2.1 An Overview of the content: The GSF at a glance 9
2.2 Not flawless but a promising start: Important achievements in the First Version of the GSF 10
2.3 Rolling with the times: The GSF as a living document 12
2.4 Turning lip service into action: Monitoring and accountability 12

3. Using the GSF and making it relevant for the struggles of social movements and civil society organizations 15

3.1 How to use the GSF? 15
3.2 The GSF – A human rights-based global framework for food security and nutrition 15
3.3 The central role of small-scale food producers 18
3.4 Agricultural and food workers 20
3.5 Gender 22
3.6 Nutrition 24
3.7 Tenure of natural resources 26
3.8 Agroecology and the ecosystem approach 28
3.9 Monitoring and accountability 30

4. Summary – how to use the GSF 32

4.1 Main achievements 32
4.2 The five levels of action 32
4.3 The Coherence Check 33

5. Perspectives 36

5.1 The vision ahead 36
5.2 Outlook: The process ahead 36

Annex: List of resources and References 37

1 Introduction

1.1 Global decisions in Rome and their implications at home – the purpose of the manual

There is a general agreement among social movements, civil society groups and also governments from around the globe that a lack of clarity persists at national and local levels regarding ongoing negotiations and debates pertaining to food security and nutrition in Rome, where the UN Committee on World Food Security and the UN organizations which work with food and agriculture are based. There is a clear information gap, and this publication aims to contribute to bridge this gap.

Why should social movements and civil society organizations (CSOs) be interested in what is being discussed, debated and approved in Rome? The answer is simple: because it is impossible to ignore that global decision making on food, nutrition and agriculture has become highly relevant for the day-to-day life of people in their national context. But, among the myriad of ongoing international processes related to food security and nutrition, are movements and civil society organizations able to recognize which ones are of relevance for them? As a stepping stone towards tackling this apparent minefield of information, the authors suggest that social movements and CSOs can start by analyzing if demands and topics of their own local and national struggles are reflected in these global decisions and documents emerging from Rome.

The authors of this manual are members of international social movements and CSOs which are involved in local and national struggles in different parts of the world, and have been engaged in the elaboration and negotiation process of the Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition (GSF). The authors firmly believe that there is a two-way learning process: civil society demands brought to the Rome-related GSF process were formulated on the basis of the long-standing struggles and advocacy efforts of many movements and groups in numerous countries. Now, the main achievements at the CFS level should again serve to feed and support these groups' struggles and advocacy efforts at the national level – bringing Rome home.

However, one important point in particular should be stressed from the outset: in terms of content, nothing in the GSF is new. What is new, however, is the process: the GSF represents a document of global intergovernmental consensus on matters related to food security and nutrition, including extremely important demands and perspectives of social movements and civil society groups.

The manual has been written with a primary purpose in mind: to connect both ends of the spectrum in terms of actors engaged in the food security and nutrition negotiation, and to clearly outline the relevance of achieving a global consensus in Rome, which adequately reflects and responds to the struggles and efforts of social movements and CSOs ongoing at home, around the world. The hope of the authors is that, upon engaging with this manual, it will promptly become evident to the reader exactly why and how the GSF can be used in the work of social movements and CSOs at national and local level, and also why the CFS is an important space for advancing social movements' and civil society groups' perspectives on the global level.

1.2 The 'food crisis' and the reform of the Committee on World Food Security (CFS)

When the CFS[1] first embarked upon its reform process in 2008, it found itself confronted with the so-called 'food crisis', which was mainly a result of increases in food prices, which characterized the crises of 2007 and 2008. The increases in international food prices affected many developing countries, particularly the low-income food-deficit countries, which having oriented their national agriculture towards

1 Committee on World Food Security (CFS). See: http://www.fao.org/cfs/en/

exports in the preceding years, subsequently found themselves largely dependent on the world market to feed their populations.[2] Consequently, leaders of many developing countries, such as Haiti, Egypt, Burkina Faso, Mauritania and Mexico, soon found themselves facing civil unrest, namely in the form of 'food riots', primarily because they did not have the means – and/or the political will – to subsidize the purchase of food in external markets.[3]

As a result, the problem of food production and hunger strongly re-emerged on the international political agenda and ignited a momentum for a new global food governance system. In 2008, the UN system, led by UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon, established the High Level Task Force on the Global Food Security Crisis (HLTF)[4] with support from the UN agencies with food security mandates[5], as well as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank. The even more comprehensive initiative, championed by a set of southern and northern countries, with support from social movements and civil society organizations, was the call for revitalization of the mandate and the work of the CFS. This initiative led to the reform of the CFS, adopted in October 2009 and ratified by the World Food Summit in November 2009, which opened the way to an unprecedented increase in participation of social movements, particularly small-scale food producer organizations, within the global governance related to food security and nutrition.[6]

In its 35th session of October 2009, the CFS redefined its role with the aspiration of becoming "the foremost inclusive international and intergovernmental platform for a broad range of committed stakeholders to work together in a coordinated manner and in support of country-led processes towards the elimination of hunger and ensuring food security and nutrition for all human beings."[7]

The reform document also entails a new vision statement which establishes the explicit human rights perspective on food security of the CFS: the vision of the reformed CFS is to "strive for a world free from hunger where countries implement the Voluntary Guidelines to support the progressive realization of the right to adequate food in the context of national food security."[8]

The reform of the CFS was a noteworthy achievement for civil society and social movements, and particularly for the organizations of small-scale food producers and supporters of food sovereignty, human rights and democratization, who actively engaged in the year-long process of negotiations regarding the CFS reform, influencing its character and rules significantly. The reform document recognized key principles outlined by the International Planning Committee for Food Sovereignty (IPC), such as the authority of the renewed CFS within the global food security architecture (political centrality), its inclu-

2 Golay, Christophe/ Büschi, Michaela, (2012) *The right to food and global strategic frameworks: The Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition (GSF) and the UN Comprehensive Framework for Action (CFA),* FAO Study..

3 La Vía Campesina (2012), *Committee on World Food Security (CFS): A new space for the food policies of the world: opportunities and limitations*. La Via Campesina Notebook, number 4, September 2012, http://viacampesina.org/en/index.php/publications-mainmenu-30

4 For more information on the UN High-Level Task Force on the Global Food Security Crisis (HLTF) see: http://www.un-foodsecurity.org/structure

5 Particularly the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO, the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) and the World Food Programme (WFP)

6 See Flavio Luiz Schieck Valente (2010), *It is time for a Rights-based Global Strategic Framework on Food Security and Nutrition*, in: Right to Food and Nutrition Watch 2010, see www.rtfn-watch.org

7 CFS Reform Document (2009), See: http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/cfs/Docs0910/ReformDoc/CFS_2009_2_Rev_2_S_K7197.pdf

8 FAO (2004), Voluntary guidelines to support the progressive realization of the right to adequate food in the context of national food security.

sive character, while also providing unprecedented participation opportunities for a broad range of stakeholders, particularly those most affected by food insecurity (inclusivity).[9]

The long-standing practice of the IPC to strongly emphasize the autonomous representation of the constituencies of smallholders, agricultural and food workers, artisanal fisherfolk, pastoralists, indigenous people, the landless, and women and youth, was used as one of the key organizing principles of the new Civil Society Mechanism (CSM) to the CFS. Today, civil society organizations, and particularly the representatives from small-scale food producer groups, participate in the Advisory Group to the CFS Bureau and in all relevant negotiation rounds of standard-setting documents and policy decisions on topics, such as tenure of land, forests and fisheries, global policy frameworks on food security and nutrition, gender and food security, food security and protracted crisis, food security and climate change, responsible investment in agriculture, monitoring of food security and nutrition policies, etc.[10]

1.3 A flagship document for policy coherence in global food governance: The importance of the Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition

For civil society organizations who have been actively engaged in the CFS since its reform, the first version of the Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition lies at the very heart of the reformed CFS. The GSF is mainly built on decisions taken during CFS Plenary sessions on various issues, including investment in agriculture, food price volatility, and responsible governance of tenure on land, amongst others. In addition, the GSF is complemented by recommendations for food security and nutrition strategies, policies and actions taken in multilateral spaces, and which are also relevant for non-state actors.

After a challenging two-year negotiation process, CFS member states finally adopted the first version of the GSF during its 39th session in October 2012. According to the decision made by the CFS: "The main added value of the GSF is to provide an overarching framework and a single reference document with practical guidance on core recommendations for food security and nutrition strategies, policies and actions validated by the wide ownership, participation and consultation afforded by the CFS."[11]

9 IPC (2010), The Reformed Committee on World Food Security. A briefing paper for civil society, see: http://www.foodsovereignty.org/Portals/0/documenti%20sito/Home/News/reformed%20 CFS_english.pdf

10 The purpose of the CSM is to facilitate civil society participation within the context of the Committee on World Food Security *(CFS)*. See: http://www.csm4cfs.org/

11 CFS (2012), *First Version of the Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition (GSF)*. Thirty-ninth Session, 15-20 October 2012, paragraph 7 (will be abbreviated in the following footnotes as CFS, GSF, paragraph 7).

Box 1: CSO Statement on the adoption of the GSF by the CFS

"We welcome the adoption, on October 17th, 2012, of the first version of the Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition (GSF). The GSF, as the overarching framework, will be the primary global reference for coordination and coherence in decision-making on food and agricultural issues. It is an important achievement of the Committee on World Food Security (CFS). We, as social movements and civil society organizations, participated intensively in its elaboration.

The GSF constitutes a step forward in promoting a new model of governance on food, agriculture, and nutrition. This document is built upon the human rights approach, women's rights and the recognition of the central role of smallholder farmers, agricultural and food workers, artisanal fisherfolks, pastoralists, indigenous peoples, landless people, women and youth, to food and nutrition security. The GSF also recognizes that formal employment of rural workers and assurance of minimum living wages are key for food security and nutrition. The document mentions the potential of agroecology and provides important guidance on nutrition based on the Right to Food Guidelines. It also reaffirms the strong commitment of states to the implementation of the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Lands, Fisheries and Forests, including through agrarian reform.

The GSF negotiations reached an important consensus on human rights-based monitoring and accountability, which implies that states, intergovernmental institutions and the private sector are held accountable for their actions and omissions regarding their obligations under international human rights law. Several issues that are important to civil society are not addressed in the current version of the GSF in particular Food Sovereignty. We affirm our commitment to ensure that the new paradigm for food security policy will be based on food sovereignty. We expect countries and all actors to fully support the implementation on the GFS on all levels. We will contribute to make use of this important tool for our initiatives and struggles at local, national and international levels."[12]

12 See: http://www.csm4cfs.org/policy_issues-6/global_strategic_framework-8/cfs_39_ outcomes_ evaluation-69/

2 The GSF made easy: breaking it down

2.1 An Overview of the content: The GSF at a glance

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND
- A. The reform of the Committee on World Food Security, its vision and roles
- B. Nature, purpose, and process of elaboration of the GSF
- C. Definitions

II. THE ROOT CAUSES OF HUNGER, LESSONS LEARNED, AND EMERGING CHALLENGES
- A. Structural causes of hunger and malnutrition
- B. Past experiences and lessons learned
- C. Emerging challenges and looking ahead

III. THE FOUNDATIONS AND OVERARCHING FRAMEWORKS
- A. The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)
- B. The Voluntary Guidelines to support the progressive realisation of the right to adequate food in the context of national food security (VGRtF)
- C. The Five Rome Principles for Sustainable Global Food Security
- D. The Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security (VGGT)
- E. High-Level Forums on Aid Effectiveness
- F. United Nations Updated Comprehensive Framework for Action (UCFA)
- G. Other frameworks and documents

IV. POLICY, PROGRAMME, AND OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS
- A. The twin-track approach
- B. Increasing smallholder-sensitive investment in agriculture
- C. Addressing excessive food price volatility
- D. Addressing gender issues in food security and nutrition
- E. Increasing agricultural productivity and production in a socially, economically and environmentally sustainable manner
- F. Nutrition
- G. Tenure of land, fisheries and forests
- H. Addressing Food Security and Nutrition in Protracted Crises

V. UNITING AND ORGANISING TO FIGHT HUNGER
- A. Core actions at country level
- B. Improving regional support to national and local actions
- C. Improving global support to regional and national actions, and response to global challenges
- D. Making it happen: linking policies and programmes with resources
- E. Monitoring and follow-up

VI. ISSUES THAT MAY REQUIRE FURTHER ATTENTION

2.2 Not flawless but a promising start: Important achievements in the First Version of the GSF

Whilst the final GSF document, as endorsed at the CFS 39 in October of 2012, did not reflect all the demands made by civil society throughout the preceding negotiations, it should be recognized that the process *per se* of developing a GSF represented – and shall continue to represent in subsequent GSF negotiation rounds – an important experience for civil society organizations and social movements engaged in the reformed CFS, and that several significant achievements were made by civil society in terms of their key demands being met.

The commitment of CSOs and social movements to the process, including their intense involvement during all stages of its development to date, resulted in the inclusion of essential demands from small-scale food producers and human rights activists in the first version of the GSF. Civil society firmly defended the participatory, inclusive and transparent character of the GSF process within the new governance scheme of the CFS. The process also served to balance inter-governmental dynamics, demonstrating the importance of the multilateral system.

From a civil society perspective, the most important overall achievements of the GSF are:

a) The Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition is the first global framework adopted by a consensus of governments that systematically mainstreams the right to adequate food and human rights into policies relevant to food security and nutrition at the global, regional and national levels;

b) The GSF builds on a holistic understanding of rights holders and the articulation of their claims. The GSF explicitly recognizes and stresses, throughout the document, the central role of small-scale food producers, such as smallholders, agricultural and food workers, artisanal fisherfolk, pastoralists, indigenous people, the landless, and women and youth, as key actors for achieving food security and nutrition for all, and

c) The GSF requires all stakeholders to implement and ensure the coherence of these policies with regard to the right to adequate food: "The GSF emphasizes policy coherence and is addressed to decision- and policy-makers responsible for policy areas with a direct or indirect impact on food security and nutrition, such as trade, agriculture, health, environment, natural resources and economic or investment policies."[13]

13 CFS, GSF, para 9.

Box 2: The need for Coherence in Food Policy: The Case of the G8's *New Alliance*

Food and nutritional security is a complex issue which is impacted by many different policy areas, such as agriculture, health, trade and development policies as well as financial and business regulation, to name a few. The interests, approaches and objectives of related stakeholders differ significantly and are not always aligned, which can cause significant confusion, and in some cases, even counter progress. The fragmentation of food and nutritional security policies poses a series of threats to the realization of the right to food.

Ensuring policy coherence is not an easy task, yet it is indispensible for focused and coordinated action, the alignment of objectives, and the harmonization of different initiatives to ensure positive impact is reached. Coherent policies can also be a useful tool for monitoring and accountability. The GSF, as the overarching global framework on food security and nutrition policy, plays an important role in that respect. It was developed within the CFS and was the fruit of an inclusive and participatory process, negotiated among states, which cannot be said for other food security and nutrition initiatives. Furthermore, the GSF is a living document, which will be updated frequently to reflect ongoing CFS negotiation processes and discussion, ensuring it is constantly up to date and reflects the latest thinking on food security and nutrition.

The G8's *New Alliance*: Crystallizing the Risks of Incoherence

The New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition is a partnership between the G8, the African Union, the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD), its Comprehensive African Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP), participating African governments[14] and private sector companies. The aim of the initiative is to drive "sustained and inclusive growth" for Africa's agricultural sector, with emphasis on "accelerating the flow of private capital" to African agriculture. Participating governments have had to make certain concessions to attract foreign investment and demonstrate a favorable "business climate" such as tax breaks for companies, long-term leases on land, use of natural resources and access to cheap local labor. Practically, this has meant governments have actually adopted legislation and favorable investment codes, or even signed economic agreements to "improve" their economic and legal environment for investors. Such changes in national law are often made without consultation with the population or impact assessments to inform or prevent deleterious consequences of some forms of investments on human rights.

New Alliance partnership agreements differ from country to country, but have similar approaches, such as the privatization and commercialization of the seed sector, revising land laws, procedures and legislation to secure investment, and the promotion of investment in the agricultural sector.

Risks

The motivations that push different stakeholders (such as transnational corporations, among others) to invest have common roots. Examples of such roots include the economic gains they can potentially capitalize upon, or the profit they can generate via capturing shares in the market, expanding distribution channels, and securing new business partners and brand

14 Burkina Faso, Tanzania, Ghana, Ethiopia, Mozambique, Cote d'Ivoire, (joined 2012) and Nigeria, Benin and Malawi (joined in 2013).

recognition. In the case of the *New Alliance*, food security and nutrition has been disconnected from human rights and has become a business issue.

The principal risk is that the financial and commercial interests of the private sector may come to trump over human rights. No effective human rights accountability mechanism has been included into the framework of the alliance. The initiative can also reinforce concentration and corporate capture within the food system, and lead to the promotion of non-sustainable models of agricultural production (such as industrialized, high external input use and monocropping systems) which have socio-economic, environmental and labor repercussions. Also of concern is the rift that such a system can cause between different classes of farmers, deepening inequalities and marginalizing smallholders who cannot afford to compete with industrialized agriculture.[15] On the ground, such initiatives can result in the concentration of land holdings and resource grabbing and plundering, inequality, human rights violations, dispossession, environmental degradation, food insecurity, corporate control of basic inputs (such as seeds), loss of biodiversity, conflict and the criminalization of human rights defenders.[16]

The GSF's central objective is to offer policy guidance for states in developing their food security and nutrition policies. The document, which has been negotiated by states, reflects an existing consensus across governments on food security and nutrition. It clearly stipulates a series of policy guidelines, grounded in the right to adequate food, which pertain to agricultural workers, women, tenure rights and monitoring and accountability. Any international initiative should be taken through the CFS and not through separate initiatives such as the G8's New Alliance. In case governments do become active they should respect and use the GSF as the common framework.

2.3 Rolling with the times: The GSF as a living document

The GSF is a dynamic, living document that reflects the current international consensus among governments, which will be regularly updated to include outcomes and decisions of the CFS.[17] As such, it is foreseen that the GSF is annually updated by integrating the latest decisions of the CFS, and revised in a broader sense each three to four years. Civil society groups have the opportunity and the mandate to accompany the updating and revision process within the working groups set up by the CSM.

2.4 Turning lip service into action: Monitoring and accountability

Monitoring and accountability is one of the pillars of the CFS reform. According to its reform document, the CFS was meant to "promote accountability and share best practices at all levels" and to estab-

15 De Schutter, Olivier (2011), *Towards more equitable value chains: alternative business models in support of the right to food,* Report presented at the 66th Session of the United Nations General Assembly [A/66/262] See: http://www.srfood.org/images/stories/pdf/officialreports/srrtf_contractfarming_a-66-262.pdf

16 See also CIDSE/Ecumenical Advocacy Alliance (2013): *Whose Alliance? The G-8 and the Emergence of a Global Corporate Regime for Agriculture*; see: http://www.cidse.org/content/publications/just-food/food-governance/whose-alliance-_the_g8_new_alliance_for_food_security_and_nutrition_in_africa.html

17 CFS (2012), *First Version of the Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition (GSF)*. Preamble and Decision Box, Thirty-ninth Session, 15-20 October 2012, Agenda Item V.b, paragraph 5.

lish "an innovative mechanism [...] to monitor progress towards these agreed upon objectives and actions."[18] For that purpose, an OpenEnded Working Group was created with a mandate to work towards an innovative mechanism that helps countries and regions, as appropriate, to address the question of whether food security and nutrition objectives are being achieved.[19]

The GSF recognizes the importance of accountability for advancing the progressive realization of the right to adequate food, and the need for monitoring right to food indicators. The GSF also underlines that the principles that shall guide monitoring and accountability systems on food security and nutrition should be human rights-based, with a particular reference to the right to adequate food.[20]

The application of the GSF at national and regional levels is essentially the responsibility of member states, if they are indeed serious about the GSF being a significant tool for shaping policies and achieving democratic ownership. It is also the duty of member states to establish effective monitoring mechanisms to ensure accountability of all actors involved.

However, it is also fundamental that social movements and civil society organizations in countries, with the support of their respective platforms and networks at regional level, contribute to both the practical application of the GSF, and in particular the monitoring of its implementation. Civil society monitoring on the ground is crucial for holding governments accountable for their decisions taken at the UN level.

Box 3: The CFS as an alternative global political forum

Interview with Andrea Ferrante, AIAB-La Vía Campesina

Why is the new CFS a useful forum in which we can push for policies alternative to those that already exist?

The CFS is a unique place in the context of international institutions, where social movements and civil society organizations have a real role in the decision-making process. The reformed CFS allows CSOs to be an essential part of the negotiation process of international policies – at present this inclusiveness is unique to the CFS and absent in other international fora hosted by the United Nations or others, such as the WTO or the World Bank. This is why the reformed CFS can be considered a starting point for the democratization of those international institutions which shape the main public policies that affect our people worldwide. There is a clear need to fight to defend and even to and broaden this space of participation. We also understand that some governments already intend on taking a step backwards and reducing the space for civil society again, as they see that the CFS experience as posing a risk or danger to the way in which they have carried out world politics to date – that is, without consulting or involving the people and their movements affected by such policy making.

18 CFS Reform Document (2009), see above, paragraph 6.

19 CFS, GSF, paragraph 90.

20 See more details in Section 3.9

On the other hand, we can see that the reformed CFS is seen by many other actors as a key reference and a model for civil society participation in other institutions of the UN System. Indeed, comparison between, for example, the space for civil society participation in the Rio+20 process in 2012, and the space given to civil society actors engaging in the CFS reveals a huge difference. It is, for this reason, that it is important that the social movements linked to food and agriculture contribute to these fundamental reforms of the UN system. After many years of struggle, a significant achievement has been made through the reform of the CFS. In response to this achievement, it is of the utmost importance that the space for airing and exchanging voices of social movements and CSOs, and for proposing alternative policy proposals, is both defended and broadened. Defending and strengthening this space can be achieved through the increased capacity of CSOs and grassroots organizations as international movements working within UN institutions, particularly in the field of agriculture, food and nutrition, where civil society actors have already made significant progress.

Why is the GSF particularly important for La Vía Campesina, for small-scale food producers and the struggle for food security?

There are three points worth highlighting: firstly, the human rights-based approach to food security policy is widely recognized as being essential to the GSF. Such recognition marks an important contrast to recent decades of claims that trade policies and free trade agreements should not only guide food and agriculture policies on all levels, but would also automatically solve hunger and food insecurity. Today, with the GSF – a document which has been approved by all governments participating in the CFS, and which clearly states that food-related policies should be, in the first place, based around the human right to food – an important shift can be seen. There is a need for CSOs and social movements to spread the word about this important shift when talking about the CFS and the GSF specifically.

Secondly, the GSF is the first document generated by global consensus in which the smallholders are recognized as the most important investors in agriculture and as central actors in all food and agriculture policies addressing hunger and malnutrition. This reference is made not only to smallholders affected by malnutrition or hunger, but indeed to all smallholders around the world – a point that cannot be over-emphasized. This is also a key issue for CSOs and social movements when discussing investment in agriculture. It is important to first recognize and focus on the role of smallholders and on what governments should do to support them, and then to discuss under which conditions investments of the private sector might be helpful. The GSF must be used for CSOs and social movements in this sense during political discussions and negotiations.

Thirdly, the GSF underlines that the smallholders' way of production is generally recognized as being more environmentally friendly, as well as leading to an increase in equal social benefits than those brought about by the industrial model of production. In addition, the GSF recognizes that smallholders have a huge potential to boost their means of production, and to play a key role in achieving food security for all.

3. Using the GSF and making it relevant for the struggles of social movements and civil society organizations

3.1 How to use the GSF?

The GSF will have no significance or impact if it remains a paper of global consensus only. Hence the process of implementing the GSF at the national level is crucial to its success. The goal is to ensure that key elements of the GSF can be used at the national level to advance important demands for policy changes towards the full realization of the human right to food and nutrition. To this end, it is important that 'national ownership' be widely recognized and understood as 'democratic ownership.' States have a fundamental role to play in the application of the GSF at national and sub-national levels, but it is also important that social movements and civil society organizations contribute by making use of this important tool in their initiatives and struggles at local, national and international levels.

For this purpose, the following pages document some of the most important references and quotes in the GSF that both represent important achievements for social movements and civil society organizations, and also provide concrete and practical examples of how the document can be used by the self-same groups in their political struggles and advocacy efforts at local, national and international levels.

3.2 The GSF – A human rights-based global framework for food security and nutrition

The GSF is based upon the vision of the reformed CFS, which is to "strive for a world free from hunger where countries implement the voluntary guidelines for the progressive realization of the right to adequate food in the context of national food security."[21] Therefore, the essential role of the right to adequate food within the GSF is a logical application of the CFS vision statement into the overarching framework that is to guide the CFS and all its stakeholders.

The GSF refers to the right to adequate food as recognized within international human rights law,[22] as well as its definition put forth by the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights in its General Comment 12 of 1999, which states that: "The right to adequate food is realized when every man, woman and child, alone or in community with others, have physical and economic access at all times to adequate food or means for its procurement."[23]

It is noteworthy that the GSF reaffirms the obligations of state parties to the ICESCR, to respect, protect and fulfill the human right to adequate food through national, regional and global policies.[24] Interna-

21 FAO (2004), Voluntary guidelines to support the progressive realization of the right to adequate food in the context of national food security.

22 "States party to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) of 1966, recognized: "... the right of everyone to an adequate standard of living for himself and his family, including adequate food (...) and to the continuous improvement of living conditions" (Article 11, par. 1) as well as "the fundamental right of everyone to be free from hunger" (Article 11, par. 2)." CFS, GSF, paragraph 13.

23 CFS, GSF, paragraph 14.

24 "States Parties to the ICESCR have the obligation to respect, promote and protect and to take appropriate steps to achieve progressively the full realization of the right to adequate food. This includes respecting existing access to adequate food by not taking any measures that result in preventing such access, and protecting the right of everyone to adequate food by taking steps to prevent enterprises and individuals from depriving individuals of their access to adequate food. The covenant says that countries should promote policies to contribute to the progressive realization of people's rights to adequate food by proactively engaging in activities intended to

tional human rights instruments are broadly referenced to in chapter III on foundations and overarching frameworks of the GSF.[25]

The GSF includes important paragraphs that highlight the collective consensus and commitment to implement, *inter alia:* the human right to food through national, regional and global policies; policies that prioritize small-scale food producers; living wages and labor rights; the new Voluntary Guidelines on Responsible Governance on Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests, including through redistributive reforms; women's rights by fighting all forms of discrimination; the human rights dimension of social protection, and, finally, nutrition policies within a human rights perspective, with emphasis given to the social determinants of nutrition and nutrition-sensitive development.

Regarding monitoring and accountability of national and global policies on food security and nutrition, the GSF defines an important consensus: monitoring and accountability systems should be human rights based, with particular reference to the progressive realization of the right to adequate food.

The GSF fully includes the FAO principles on how to implement the Right to Food Guidelines. FAO had proposed using the *"PANTHER"* principles (participation, accountability, non-discrimination, transparency, human dignity, empowerment and rule of law) when applying a human rights-based approach to policies and programs related to food security and nutrition at all levels and stages of the process.[26]

Moreover, the GSF supports the mainstreaming of these human rights principles in all policy, strategy and program recommendations on food security and nutrition at the country level. In particular, the seven practical steps to implement the Right to Food Guidelines at the national level, as suggested by FAO, were included in the GSF (see box below).

strengthen people's access to and utilization of resources and means to ensure their livelihood, including food security. Countries should also, to extent that resources permit, establish and maintain safety nets or other assistance to protect those who are unable to provide for themselves. E/C.12/1999/5 – General Comment 12, pp 6, 8 and 1", CFS, GSF, footnote xvii.

25 "A number of overarching frameworks provide key principles and strategies for the achievement of food security and nutrition. These include the World Food Summit Plan of Action and the Rome Declaration on World Food Security the Final Declaration of the 2009 World Summit on Food Security, the [Right to Food Guidelines] and the VGGT, as well as the ICESCR, which established the human right to adequate food, and all applicable international law relevant to food security, nutrition, and human rights". CFS, GSF, paragraph 18.

26 Ibidem, paragraph 20 (see for a short explanation of the PANTHER principles: Landivar, Natalia/Wolpold-Bosien, Martin (2012): *Human Rights – A Strategy for the Fight against Hunger*, FAO Factsheet .

Box 4: The GSF on the Seven Steps for States to implement the Right to Adequate Food

"**Step One**: Identify who the food insecure are, where they live, and why they are hungry. Using disaggregated data, analyze the underlying causes of their food insecurity to enable governments to better target their efforts.

Step Two: Undertake a careful assessment, in consultation with key stakeholders, of existing policies, institutions, legislation, programs and budget allocations to better identify both constraints and opportunities to meet the needs and rights of the food insecure.

Step Three: Based on the assessment, adopt a national human-rights-based strategy for food security and nutrition as a roadmap for coordinated government action to progressively realize the right to adequate food. This strategy should include targets, timeframes, responsibilities and evaluation indicators that are known to all, and should be the basis for the allocation of budgetary resources.

Step Four: Identify the roles and responsibilities of the relevant public institutions at all levels in order to ensure transparency, accountability and effective coordination and, if necessary, establish, reform or improve the organization and structure of these public institutions.

Step Five: Consider the integration of the right to food into national legislation, such as the constitution, a framework law, or a sectoral law, thus setting a long-term binding standard for government and stakeholders.

Step Six: Monitor the impact and outcomes of policies, legislation, programs and projects, with a view to measuring the achievement of stated objectives, filling possible gaps and constantly improving government action. This could include right to food impact assessments of policies and programs. Particular attention needs to be given to monitoring the food security situation of vulnerable groups, especially women, children and the elderly, and their nutritional status, including the prevalence of micronutrient deficiencies.

Step Seven: Establish accountability and claims mechanisms, which may be judicial, extrajudicial or administrative, to enable rights-holders to hold governments accountable and to ensure that corrective action can be taken without delay when policies or programs are not implemented or delivering the expected services."[27]

27 CFS, GSF, para 75

3.3 The central role of small-scale food producers

3.3.1 Small-scale food producers: facts & figures

Defined by the FAO as "small-scale farmers, pastoralists, forest keepers, and fisherfolks who manage areas varying from less than one hectare to up to 10 hectares," smallholders are, according to the FAO, characterized by family-focused motives such as favoring the stability of the farm household system, using mainly family labor for production and using part of the produce for family consumption.[28] Many small-scale food producers are part of the more than 370 million self-identified indigenous people in some 70 countries around the world.[29]

- The FAO estimates that 80% of the farmland in sub-Saharan Africa and Asia is managed by smallholders (working on up to 10 hectares).
- Out of the 2.5 billion people in poor countries living directly from the food and agriculture sector, 1.5 billion people live in smallholder households.
- Smallholders provide up to 80% of the food supply in Asia and sub-Saharan Africa.
- Small-scale fisheries contribute to 46% of global marine and inland fish catches (with the figure rising to 54% in developing countries).
- Small-scale fisheries employ over 90% of the world's 35 million capture fishers and support another estimated 85 million people employed in associated processing, distribution and marketing.[30]
- Altieri et al (2012), note that the "myriad of ecologically-based agricultural styles developed by at least 75% of the 1.5 billion smallholders, family farmers and indigenous people on 350 million small farms account for no less than 50% of the global agricultural output for domestic consumption."[31]
- In addition, the International Fund for Agriculture Development (IFAD) highlights, in its 2012 report, that there are more than 370 million self-identified indigenous people in some 70 countries around the world. Traditional indigenous lands and territories contain some 80% of the planet's biodiversity.
- Worldwide, indigenous peoples account for 5% of the population, but represent 15% of those living in poverty. One of the root causes of the poverty and marginalization of indigenous peoples is loss of control over their traditional lands, territories and natural resources.[32]
- The CFS High Level Panel of Experts Report 2013 found that in China, 200 million smallholdings which cover 10% of the total amount of agricultural land that is globally available, produce 20% of all food in the world.
- The same study highlights that in Brazil, smallholders only take up 24.3% of the total agricultural area, but generate 74% of all agricultural employment and produce 38% of the total value of production.[33]

28 FAO (2012), Smallholders and Family Farmers, http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/nr/sustainability_pathways/docs/Factsheet_SMALLHOLDERS.pdf

29 IFAD (2012), Indigenous peoples: valuing, respecting and supporting diversity, http://www.ifad.org/pub/factsheet/ip/e.pdf

30 FAO (2012), Smallholders and Family Farmers, see above.

31 Altieri MA, Nichols C, Funes F (2012), *The scaling up of agroecology: spreading the hope for food sovereignty and resiliency,* http://www.agroeco.org/socla/archivospdf/Rio20.pdf

32 IFAD (2012), Indigenous peoples: valuing, respecting and supporting diversity, see above.

3.3.2 Small-scale food producers' concerns as they stand in GSF

The GSF represents a significant step forward in building a holistic understanding of the 'rights holder' and a clear concept of how small-scale food producers fulfill this role. It defines the concept of smallholders as broadly as established in the CFS reform document:

> "For the purposes of this document, references to small-scale food producers or to smallholder farmers are meant to include smallholder farmers, agriculture and food workers, artisanal fisherfolk, pastoralists, indigenous peoples and the landless."[34]

Smallholders and small-scale food producers are at the center of the GSF throughout the document. A few quotes may be helpful to illustrate this focus on small-scale food producers as both: (a) the most important contributors for food security and nutrition and investors in agriculture, especially in the global South; and (b) as part of the social groups of rights holders most affected by violations of the right to food and other human rights.

> "Small-scale food producers, many of whom are women, play a central role in producing most of the food consumed locally in many developing regions and are the primary investors in agriculture in many developing countries.
> States, international and regional organizations, and all other appropriate stakeholders are therefore recommended to, among others:
> a) Ensure that public investment, services, and policies for agriculture give due priority to enabling, supporting and complementing smallholders' own investment, with particular attention to women food producers who face specific difficulties and need specific policies and support;
> b) Ensure that agricultural policies and public investment give priority to food production and improving levels of nutrition, especially of the most vulnerable populations, and increase the resilience of local and traditional food systems and biodiversity. There needs to be a focus on strengthening sustainable smallholder food production, reducing postharvest losses and increasing post-harvest value addition, and on fostering smallholder inclusive local, national and regional food markets, including transportation, storage and processing."[35]

The GSF also makes reference and underlines the importance of existing international legal instruments, political documents and outstanding scientific reports that are important for small-scale food producers, indigenous people, rural workers and women.[36] In this spirit, the GSF stipulates: "All appropriate stakeholders, in particular small-scale food producers and local communities, must be closely involved in the design, planning and implementation of programs and projects, including research programs."[37]

---

33 CFS HLPE (2013), Investing in smallholder agriculture for food security.

34 CFS Reform Document, CFS:2009/2 Rev.2, p. 11, ii), GSF, Footnote 1, C Definitions.

35 CFS, GSF, Paragraphs 37-38

36 "A number of other documents, instruments, guidelines and programs provide principles and strategies that may be relevant to the achievement of food security. These include: The 1989 Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC), The 1981 International Code of Marketing of Breast-milk Substitutes, The 1979 Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), The 1993 Declaration on the Elimination of Violence Against Women (DEVAW), The 1995 Beijing Platform for Action ensure women's rights, ILO Conventions 87, 98 and 169, The International Assessment of Agricultural Knowledge, Science and Technology for, Development (IAASTD), The final Declaration of the International Conference on Agrarian Reform and Rural, Development (ICARRD), The UN Declaration on Rights of Indigenous People (UNDRIP); GSF, Paragraph 27.

37 CFS, GSF, paragraph 16(i

3.3.3 How can small-scale food producers make use of the GSF?

Interview with Rehema Bavuma, World Forum of Fish Workers and Fish Harvesters (WFF)

Why is the fact that the GSF puts small-scale food producers, small-scale fisherfolks among them, at the center of national and global policies, good news for you?

Small-scale food producers, fisherfolk among them, are one of the most marginalized groups in the world, not only in terms of the social services provided to them, but also with regard to participation in formulation of policies that affect them. They face unique challenges that require unique solutions yet they are often left out of mainstream policies. There is a lack of food security policies that address the nature of the needs of fisherfolk communities and their concerns. Even where policies exist, their implementation becomes extremely difficult, and one of the reasons for this is that people for whom the policies are made have not been involved in the formulation or implementation of these policies.

It is not easy for the governments to voluntarily implement these policies themselves; they often need to be pressured to move forward to make significant changes. When people are not involved in the process of policy making, they are often not aware of the existence of the policies to protect them and chances are that the policies will never be implemented at all. The GSF is a very good example of a policy document that was developed inclusively through a full consultation in which small-scale producers were involved.

How can small-scale food producers and their organizations such as WFF use the GSF in their struggles for their rights?

The next step is to make people aware of the GSF and teach them how to use it to identify policy gaps at the national level, and also to make changes to it. The task at hand is to ensure that policy makers in countries with high numbers of small-scale producers be made aware of the GSF. They must become actively engaged with the document and its contents. They must facilitate pathways to ensure that the GSF contributes towards coherent national level policies. In using the GSF, CSOs and social movements can identify ways to improve national level policies. The document can be used to reflect on the food policies that exist at a national level, as well as on the coherence of these policies and the gaps that may exist in them.

One important way to do this is to increasingly involve small-scale food producers with the GSF. It is already known that the document will be updated regularly. The inclusion and active participation of many more social movements and small-scale food producers should be ensured in future. The involvement and knowledge of these groups will help to push national food policies forward, in line with the GSF recommendations.

3.4 Agricultural and food workers

3.4.1 Agricultural and food workers: facts & figures

According to the ILO and the FAO, 1.3 billion people work in agriculture of which 300-400 million are employed workers. The percentage of women employed in agriculture is increasing as women take up work in cut flowers, horticulture, pack-houses in addition to sectors like tea which traditionally has employed women to pluck tea.

"Agricultural workers" do not own or rent the land on which they work, nor the tools and equipment they use and so are a group distinct from farmers. They work:

- on everything from highly capitalized and mechanized plantations and large scale farms to smallholder, family farms;
- for a 'wage', whether cash payment, in kind payment (or combination) - often for very low "wages";

- within an 'employment relationship' - employer-employee (though often without a formal or written contract) - with either a farmer, or farming or plantation company (often national or transnational corporations), or labor contractor or sub-contractor (*gangmasters*).[38]

Employment in agriculture is characterized by:

- Lack of rights at work – agricultural workers are often excluded from national labor legislation and denied even the fundamental right of association.
- Low wages and long hours – their right to food and nutrition is often undermined by these poverty wages
- Poor health and safety – agriculture rank alongside mining and construction as one of the most dangerous industries to work in;
- Precarious work, in particular for migrant workers.[39]

Despite their significant contribution to local, national and world food security, agricultural workers are often ignored by policy makers who fail to meet their obligations to promote and protect workers' rights.

3.4.2 Agricultural and food workers' concerns as they stand in GSF

In paragraph 34, the GSF states: "Many agricultural and food workers and their families suffer from hunger and malnutrition because basic labor laws, minimum wage policies and social security systems do not cover rural workers. Formal employment and the assurance of a minimum living wage is key for workers' food security and nutrition."

In paragraph 30, the GSF indicates the payment of **living wages to agricultural** workers as a direct action to immediately tackle hunger for the most vulnerable:

> "Attention must be paid to the immediate needs of those who are unable to meet their food and nutrition requirements, in line with the fundamental right to be free of hunger. Immediate actions may include a range of interventions including emergency food assistance, payment of living wages to agricultural workers, nutrition interventions, cash transfers and other social protection instruments, access to inputs and food price policy interventions."[40]

In addition, the GSF also highlights, in paragraph 32 of Version 1, the need to promote decent employment as a requirement for medium- and long-term actions towards building resilience and addressing the root causes of hunger:

> "As described in the Anti-Hunger Programme, the key requirements are to … improve agricultural productivity and enhance livelihoods and food security and nutrition in poor rural communities; promote productive activities and decent employment."[41]

The GSF underlines that "formal employment and the assurance of a minimum living wage are keys for workers food security and nutrition."[42]

---

38 Hurst, P et al. *Agricultural Workers and Their Contribution to Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development*. Food and Agriculture Organization, International Labour Organization, International Union of Food, Agricultural, Hotel, Restaurant, Catering, Tobacco and Allied Workers' Associations. ILO Geneva, 2007.

39 ILO, *Promotion of rural employment for poverty reduction*, Report to the International Labour Conference 2008, http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_norm/---relconf/documents/meetingdocument/wcms_091721.pdf

40 CFS, GSF, Paragraph 30

41 CFS, GSF, Paragraph 32

42 CFS, GSF, Paragraph 34

The GSF also explicitly refers to maternity protection and employment security and indicates that women should enjoy their maternity protection while having their employment secure. States should

> "adopt and implement maternity and paternity protection legislation and related measures that allow women and men to perform their care-giving role and therefore provide for the nutritional needs of their children and protect their own health, whilst protecting their employment security."[43]

3.4.3 How can agricultural and food workers make use of the GSF?

- The GSF recognizes (in a limited manner) the role and contribution of agricultural workers and thus provides an opening to raise provision of decent work in agriculture as a tool for ensuring the right to food and global food security;
- The GSF can help put decent work in agriculture and addressing the rights' deficits of agricultural workers on the global and national agendas;
- Trade unions can use GSF to demand the payment of minimum living wages to agricultural workers as a direct action to tackle hunger.
- Paragraph 38 of the GSF for agricultural workers to be involved "in the formulation, implementation and evaluation of policies for investment in agriculture and in the design of investment programs in agriculture and food value chains." Social movements, trade unions and civil society organizations should ensure this happens.

3.5 Gender

3.5.1 Gender: facts & figures

Women constitute a vital part of the rural workforce, according to the 2011 FAO Report on Women in Agriculture:

- Women comprise, on average, 43% of the agricultural labor force in developing countries, ranging from 20% in Latin America to 50% in Eastern Asia and sub-Saharan Africa. About half of the people employed in small-scale fisheries are women.
- If women had the same access to productive resources as men, they could increase yields on their farms by 20–30%, lifting 100–150 million people out of hunger. This could consequently raise total agricultural output in developing countries by 2.5–4%, which could in turn reduce the number of hungry people in the world by 12–17%.
- In addition, the FAO notes that for those developing countries for which data are available, between 10% and 20% of all land holders are women, although these figures mask significant differences among countries even within the same region. The developing countries holding both the lowest and highest shares of female land holders are in Africa.[44]

3.5.2 Gender as it stands in GSF

The GSF states that the "participation of women as key actors in agriculture must be assured, considering their potential contribution to the production of the food consumed in developing countries, while ending the discrimination they experience in being denied access to productive assets, knowledge through extension services, and financial services, which results in reduced productivity and greater

43 CFS, GSF, Paragraph 48

44 FAO (2011), The State of Food and Agriculture 2010–2011: Women In Agriculture – Closing the gender gap for development, p. 37-38, http://www.fao.org/docrep/013/i2050e/i2050e00.htm

poverty."[45] The document also acknowledges the need to "prevent the intergenerational transmission of hunger and malnutrition, including through education and promotion of literacy among women and girls."[46]

Moreover, particular attention is given to addressing the nutritional needs of women and girls (paragraph 31), and also to the relevant international legal frameworks for the achievement of women's food security (paragraph 27). The document also refers to the CFS 37 final report for specific policy recommendations, including recognition of women as key food producers, calling for the promotion of their leadership and involvement in decision-making processes, as well as for equal access to productive resources and inheritance, protection from violence and discrimination, maternity/paternity legislation, gender analysis of food security policies and the promotion of girls' rights (see paragraphs 47-49).

3.5.3 How can women's movements make use of the GSF?

Interview with Sarojeni Rengam, PANAP

Why is having a reference to women's rights in the GSF significant?

Women are vital to food production and deeply involved in agriculture over the world - their participation is therefore critical. In most countries and cultures, women as farmers and workers are marginalized; whilst this is changing in rhetoric, implementation is the place where reality will come into play, in terms of women's participation in decision making.

The GSF is significant because it recognizes women's central role and the importance of involving them in decision making. In many countries they are the main group involved in providing and growing food – more so indeed than their male counterparts – and yet they are often invisible.

How can this support women's struggle?

It is very important to ensure that the GSF is implemented on the ground. There should be a way to move this forward in terms of mechanisms for monitoring and feedback to ensure that it is being implemented at national and local levels, and that there's progress and a process towards implementation.

The GSF is also important in that it provides awareness about the fact that part of the struggle is not only to ensure that women's roles and contributions in agriculture are acknowledged, but to also ensure that they are involved in decision-making processes. Also of significance in the GSF is that there is support for women's participation, and for building awareness and leadership of women and by women in these areas.

It is not only the responsibility of national governments: local institutions and alternative social movements also have a key role to play. Oftentimes, even many of these alternative movements are still very male dominated. Moreover, most communities, CSOs and movements feel that radical changes in terms of women's empowerment should not be pushed for, arguing instead that it makes more sense to wait, and once the right to food and rights to land have been secured, the struggle for women's rights and their participation can be addressed, as a second priority. However, in reality, women's rights should go hand in hand with the right to food and the right to land, since women's rights are, of course, human rights.

If 50% (and the figure rises to 80% in some places) of the group responsible for producing food is not involved in policy decisions pertaining to food, agriculture and nutrition, the discrimination of women and their human rights becomes evident. It is highly important that the struggle for the right to food, the right to land and the right to productive resources go hand in hand with gender equity and equality, and with mainstreaming gender overall, by providing women the space and the opportunity to facilitate their decision making and leadership capacity within different sectors of society.

45 CFS, GSF, paragraph 16

46 Ibidem.

How do you think the GSF can be used in your context?

The GSF is part of a package being used by PANAP and colleagues, together with the Right to Food Guidelines[47], the Guidelines on Tenure[48], and now with a new discussion on responsible agricultural investments which can all be seen as being inter-related. The GSF will be useful because it brings together the numerous elements featured in the different existing international agreements and guidelines, establishing a standard for guiding the lobby work, policy advocacy and campaigning.

The GSF also plays a role in awareness building. It can be used as a reference point to highlight what is happening at the global level, and to draw attention to the need to raise these same discussions at the local level. In this way the GSF serves as a tool and a kind of standard to be pushed. It is not radical per se, but represents an amalgamation of what has already been agreed, which is useful in itself.

3.6 Nutrition

3.6.1 Nutrition: facts & figures

- As outlined in the 2012 State of Food Insecurity Report, almost 870 million people, mostly in developing countries – 15% of their total populations – were estimated to be chronically undernourished in 2010–2012.[49]
- The United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF) estimates, in its 2013 report, that globally, nearly one in four children under five (165 million or 26% in 2011) are stunted (low height for age), and 16% are underweight.[50]
- According to The Lancet Series on Maternal and Child Nutrition, undernutrition causes 45% of child deaths, resulting in 3.1 million deaths of children below the age of 5 annually.[51]

Paradoxically, the FAO notes that "whilst malnutrition is associated with poverty, this does not mean that some forms of malnutrition do not exist among population groups that have enough food to eat," with overconsumption and unbalanced diets raising levels of malnutrition, obesity and degenerative diseases. According to the World Health Organization, more than 1.4 billion adults, of age 20 and older, were overweight in 2008.[52]

In addition, Altieri et al (2012) note that "roughly one-third of food produced for human consumption is wasted globally, which amounts to about 1.3 billion tons per year, enough to feed the entire African continent. Most of this food is wasted by consumers in Europe and North America is 95-115 kg/year/per capita, while this figure in Sub-Saharan Africa and South/Southeast Asia is only 6-11 kg/year."[53]

47 Abbreviation for: Voluntary Guidelines to Support the Progressive Realization of the Right to Adequate Food in the context of national food security, FAO 2004

48 Abbreviation for Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security, CFS/FAO 2012

49 FAO, IFAD, WFP (2012), The State of Food Insecurity in the World 2012, Rome

50 UNICEF (2013), Improving Child Nutrition, http://www.who.int/pmnch/media/news/2013/20130416_unicef_nutrition.pdf

51 The Lancet (2013), Maternal and Child Nutrition, http://download.thelancet.com/flatcontentassets/pdfs/nutrition-eng.pdf

52 World Health Organization, see: www.who.int.

53 Altieri MA, Nichols C, Funes F (2012), The scaling up of agroecology: spreading the hope for food sovereignty and resiliency, http://www.agroeco.org/socla/archivospdf/Rio20.pdf

3.6.2 Nutrition as it stands in GSF

On nutrition, the GSF draws primarily on the Voluntary Guidelines for the Progressive Realization of the Right to Adequate Food in the Context of National Food Security.[54] The GSF recommends, *inter alia,* to maintain, adapt, and/or strengthen dietary diversity and healthy eating habits and food preparation, as well as feeding patterns, including breastfeeding. It also recommends that steps be taken – in particular through education, information and labeling regulations – to prevent overconsumption and unbalanced diets that may lead to malnutrition, obesity and degenerative diseases.

Furthermore, it calls on all relevant stakeholders – in particular communities and local governments – to strive for the following goals when designing, implementing, managing, monitoring and evaluating food security-related programs and policies: (i) to increase the production and consumption of healthy and nutritious foods, especially those that are rich in micronutrients; (ii) to address the specific food and nutritional needs of people living with HIV/AIDS, or suffering from other epidemics, and (iii) to take appropriate measures to promote and encourage breastfeeding, in line with the respective cultural norms and the International Code of Marketing of Breast-milk Substitutes[55] and subsequent resolutions of the World Health Assembly.

Moreover, in paragraph 56, the GSF calls for the dissemination of information on the feeding of infants and young children that is consistent and in line with current scientific knowledge and internationally accepted practices, and to take steps to counteract misinformation on infant feeding. In addition, in the section of the document which examines the root causes of hunger, paragraph 16g notes that the "quality, safety and diversity of food consumed is important, as well as the calorie content."

3.6.3 How can nutrition movements use the GSF?

Interview with Claudio Schuftan, People's Health Movement

Why is having a reference to nutrition in the GSF significant?

Food and nutrition have complementary, but different connotations. The food issue is dominant in documentation that has come out in interactions with FAO in the last couple years. A primary focus on food security alone results in bypassing important nutrition considerations all along the life cycle. Such omissions include, to name but a few, micronutrient issues, non-communicable diseases (NCDs) and their nutritional bases, the importance of breastfeeding, and the dangerous precedent of using Ready-to-Use Therapeutic Foods (RUTF) for preventive measures. It is also worth underlining that among the social determinants of malnutrition, food security is only one element, together with care, health and sanitation.

How can this support your struggle?

Food issues cannot be understood without linking them to nutrition issues. The fact that these two areas are complementary does not automatically mean that the food lobby will be addressing them both. Public health nutritionists simply must work with allies to integrate the nutrition perspective into the ongoing dialogue. Mothers and children need to know both about food and nutrition.

How do you think the GSF can be used in your context?

The People's Health Movement is optimistic that the GSF will be used by numerous public and international institutions and by civil society. With this in mind, it is vital that the GSF text refers explicitly to nutrition issues which demand as much attention as food security issues. It must not be forgotten, for instance, that nutrition issues affect, among others, food producers and their families.

54 CFS, GSF, (see paragraphs 56 and 57); FAO (2004), Voluntary Guidelines to Support the Progressive Realization of the Right To Adequate Food In The Context Of National Food Security

55 World Health Organisation (1981), International Code of Marketing of Breast-milk Substitutes, pp. 24, http://www.who.int/nutrition/publications/code_english.pdf

3.7 Tenure of natural resources

3.7.1 Natural resources and food insecurity: facts & figures

The lack of adequate and secure access to land and natural resources for the rural and urban poor is one of the key causes of hunger and poverty in the world. Land grabbing further exacerbates the highly unequal distribution of land ownership, thereby impacting the enjoyment of the human rights of the local population, particularly their right to adequate food. As concluded in the 2010 report submitted by the former UN Special Rapporteur on the right to adequate food, Jean Ziegler, to the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee on Discrimination in the Context of the Right to Food, peasants, including small-scale food producers, are among the first victims of discrimination in the realization of the right to food:

"Hunger, like poverty, is still predominantly a rural problem, and among the rural population it is the peasant farmers, small landholders, landless workers, fisherfolks, hunters and gatherers who suffer disproportionately. The United Nations Millennium Development Project Task Force on Hunger has shown that 80% of the world's hungry live in rural areas. Some 50% of the world's hungry are smallholder farmers who depend mainly or partly on agriculture for their livelihoods, but lack sufficient access to productive resources such as land, water and seeds. Another 20% of those suffering from hunger are landless families who survive as tenant farmers or poorly paid agricultural laborers, and often have to migrate from one insecure, informal job to another. Another 10% of the world's hungry live in rural communities from traditional fishing, hunting and herding activities."[56]

The lack of access to adequate and secure access to land has been exacerbated during the last years by the phenomenon of 'land grabbing.' The 2011 Dakar Appeal against land grabbing states: "recent massive land grabs targeting tens of millions of acres for the benefit of private interests or third states - whether for reasons of food, energy, mining, environment, tourism, speculation or geopolitics - violate human rights by depriving local, indigenous, peasants, pastoralists and fisher communities of their livelihoods, by restricting their access to natural resources or by removing their freedom to produce as they wish, and exacerbate the inequalities of women in access and control of land."[57]

Precise details on the land deals are hard to come by because the agreements are often kept secret. Numbers on the exact magnitude of this new land rush therefore have to be treated with caution. The CFS High Level Panel of Experts for Food Security and Nutrition estimated in 2011 that between 50 and 80 million hectares of good farmland have been transferred to corporations and investors in the last few years.[58]

Several factors contribute to the new scramble for land: the increased demand for agrofuels; high food prices that lead states which are dependent on food imports to acquire cheap farmland in poorer countries; the search for stable investment opportunities in the aftermath of the financial crisis; measures said to serve environmental ends, such as in the establishment of natural reserves or carbon trade schemes; mining activities to satisfy the increased demand of mineral raw materials. Investors are corporations, financial investors and the governments of rich countries. While precise details are hard to come by, it is estimated that at least 70 million hectares of agricultural land have been transferred in the last few years.[59]

---

56 HRCAC (2011), Study of the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee on discrimination in the context of the right to food, paragraph 23, http://www.righttofood.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/A-HRC-16-401.pdf

57 http://www.fian.org/en/news/article/detail/dakar-appeal-against-the-land-grab/

58 HLPE (2011), Land Tenure and International Investments in Agriculture: Rome.

59 See for an overview of different estimates and sources and an in-depth analysis of the phenomenon: Saturnino M, Borras JR and Franco Jennifer C (2012), Global Land Grabbing and Trajectories of Agrarian Change: A Preliminary Analysis. In: *Journal of Agrarian Change*, Vol. 12 No. 1, January 2012, pp. 34–59,

The CFS approved in May of 2012, after two years of negotiations, the Voluntary Guidelines on Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests (VGGT). Social movements and civil society organizations participated actively in the elaboration process to this new standard setting document which can be extremely useful to secure and promote adequate and secure access to land and other natural resources for the small-scale food producers, peasants, fisherfolks, indigenous peoples and the landless.

3.7.2 Tenure of land, fisheries and forests as it stands in GSF

The GSF fully endorses the key principles negotiated within the Voluntary Guidelines on Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests (VGGT) process:

a) "Recognize and respect all legitimate tenure rights holders and their rights [...];
b) Safeguard legitimate tenure rights against threats and infringements [...];
c) Promote and facilitate the enjoyment of legitimate tenure rights [...];
d) Provide access to justice to deal with infringements of legitimate tenure rights [...];
e) Prevent tenure disputes, violent conflicts and corruption [...]."[60]

The GSF recommendation: More specifically, the GSF also points to states' obligations and private actors' responsibilities with regard to human rights and tenure rights of natural resources:

> "States should respect and protect the rights of individuals with respect to resources such as land, water, forests, fisheries and livestock without any discrimination. Where necessary and appropriate, states should carry out land reforms and other policy reforms consistent with their human rights obligations and in accordance with the rule of law in order to secure efficient and equitable access to land and to strengthen pro-poor growth. Special attention may be given to groups such as pastoralists and indigenous people and their relation to natural resources."[61]

> "Non-state actors, including business enterprises, have a responsibility to respect human rights and legitimate tenure rights. Business enterprises should act with due diligence to avoid infringing on the human rights and legitimate tenure rights of others. They should include appropriate risk management systems to prevent and address adverse impacts on human rights and legitimate tenure rights."[62]

3.7.3 How can land rights movements make use of the GSF?

Interview with Angel Strapazzón, CLOC-La Vía Campesina

What is La Vía Campesina's assessment of the Tenure Guidelines and their inclusion in the GSF?
La Via Campesina (LVC) supported the process on the Land Tenure Guidelines from the beginning. The Latin America region was committed to work in the International Facilitating Team which had been established from the beginning by the International Planning Committee for Food Sovereignty (IPC), and that later evolved into the CSM. The achievements of the process did not meet only the goals but actually even surpassed the expectations of Vía Campesina. The mere fact that the document is based on human rights makes it the first international recognition of the right to land of the peasants, as well as of the other food producing sectors, such as fisherfolk and pastoralists. Peasants and small-scale food producers have been recognized as economic, social, and cultural agents, and that is a true achievement.

---

http://r1.ufrrj.br/geac/portal/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/BORRAS-e-FRANCO-Global-land-grabbing-and-trajectories-of-agrarian-change.pdf

60 CFS, GSF, 63.

61 Ibidem, paragraph 61.

62 Ibidem, paragraph 65.

Why are the Guidelines and their inclusion into the GSF useful for peasants' struggles?
They have reversed governments' view that social movements and CSOs working on land rights are the beneficiaries of charity or assistance. The fact that the document includes a chapter about agrarian reform and redistribution of resources underlines that it is not possible to develop as economic agents without land redistribution and control over natural resources. By the same token, the acknowledgement that legitimate and ancestral ownership of land, forests, and fisheries vouches for itself and not mandatorily through the recognition of formal institutions, gives land movements a platform for access to land through means of a different mechanism, which is essential. One should have access to land not by buying and selling, but rather by ancestral custom or common law, and by producing food to live on, or for local markets. It is not at all the same to produce food looking for profit than to produce to feed oneself and the community.

3.8 Agroecology and the ecosystem approach

3.8.1 Agroecology: facts & figures

There have been several attempts to date to define agroecology. In this publication, a holistic understanding of agroecology, which also highlights the practice's link to food sovereignty, is being suggested:

> "Regenerating localized food systems means shifting away from uniformity, concentration, coercion and centralization towards diversity, decentralization, dynamic adaptation and democracy. This is what the struggle for food sovereignty and agroecology is all about."[63]

Expanding on this, Altieri and Toledo (2011) state that:

> "Agroecological initiatives aim at transforming industrial agriculture partly by transitioning the existing food systems away from fossil fuel-based production largely for agroexport crops and biofuels towards an alternative agricultural paradigm that encourages local/national food production by small and family farmers based on local innovation, resources and solar energy. This implies access of peasants to land, seeds, water, credit and local markets, partly through the creation of supportive economic policies, financial incentives, market opportunities and agroecological technologies."[64]

As highlighted in the report on 'Agro-ecology and the Right to Food', submitted by the Special Rapporteur on the right to food, Olivier De Schutter, to the Human Rights Council in 2012:

- "To date, agroecological projects have shown an average crop yield increase of 80% in 57 developing countries, with an average increase of 116% for all African projects,"
- "Recent projects conducted in 20 African countries demonstrated a doubling of crop yields over a period of 3-10 years."[65]
- As highlighted by Altieri et al (2012), most of the food consumed today in the world is derived from 5,000 domesticated crop species and 1.9 million peasant-bred plant varieties mostly grown without agrochemicals.

---

63 IIED, IUCN, CEESP and Yale F&ES report (2006), *Agroecology and the Struggle for Food Sovereignty in the Americas* http://bitsandbytes.ca/sites/default/files/Agroecology_and_the_Strugle_for_FS_in_the_Americas.pdf

64 Altieri and Toledo (2011), The agroecological revolution in Latin America: rescuing nature, ensuring food sovereignty and empowering peasants. Journal of Peasant Studies, 38:3, 587-612. Extract available at http://rio20.net/en/propuestas/the-agroecological-revolution-in-latin-america-rescuing-nature-ensuring-food-sovereignty-and-empowering-peasants/

65 De Schutter, Olivier (2012), Agro-ecology and the right to food, http://www.srfood.org/index.php/en/component/content/article/1174-report-agroecology-and-the-right-to-food

- Both of the aforementioned reports from IAASTD (2008) and Olivier de Schutter (2012) note that small-scale farmers can double food production within 10 years in critical regions by using agroecological methods already available.
- A global assessment of the impacts of agroecology by Pretty et al (2003)66 demonstrated clear increases in food production over some 29 million hectares, with nearly 9 million households benefiting from increased food diversity and security. Altieri et al also make reference to the 2010 re-examination of the Pretty et al data, which demonstrated how 286 interventions in 57 "poor countries" covering 37 million ha (3% of the cultivated area in developing countries) have increased productivity on 12.6 million farms while improving ecosystem services. The average crop yield increase was 79%.[67]

3.8.2 Agroecology as it stands in GSF

Although social movements and civil society organizations stressed the growing international recognition of the agroecological approach and its importance for food security and nutrition, a few influential governments within the CFS expressed their strong opposition to the concept. However, a handful of important references to the agroecological and ecosystems approach were accepted as CFS 39 negotiations came to a close in October 2012.

In this sense, it is noteworthy that the GSF acknowledges the potential of agroecology for improving agricultural sustainability and income generation, as well as its resilience in the face of climate change, as highlighted in Section II) addressing, among other factors, the root causes of hunger:

> "l) Sound management of ecosystems and natural resources as well as agro-ecological practices have proved to be important in improving agricultural sustainability as well as the incomes of food producers and their resilience in the face of climate change; m) The importance of local knowledge in promoting food security, particularly as the latter is influenced by the capacity to manage natural assets and biodiversity and to adapt to the localized impact of climate change."[68]

The GSF calls on CFS member states, international and regional organizations, together with other relevant stakeholders, to elaborate programs, policies and laws in line with an ecosystem approach at local and national level, in order to increase agricultural productivity and production in a socially, economically and environmentally sustainable manner, as outlined in paragraphs 53 l, m and p of version 1 of the GSF:

> "promote more sustainable agriculture that improves food security, eradicates hunger and is economically viable, while conserving land, water, plant and animal genetic resources, biodiversity and ecosystems and enhancing resilience to climate change and natural disasters;
> Consider, as appropriate, an ecosystem approach in agricultural management in order to achieve sustainable agriculture, including for example, but not limited to, integrated pest management, organic agriculture, and other traditional and indigenous coping strategies that promote agro-ecosystem diversification and soil carbon sequestration;
> work to conserve and improve forests as valuable ecosystems that contribute to the improvement of agricultural production;"[69]

---

66 Pretty JN, Morison JIL, Hine RE (2003), Reducing food poverty by increasing agricultural sustainability in developing countries. In: *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, Volume 95, Issue 1, April 2003, pp. 217–234, http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167880902000877

67 Altieri MA, Nichols C, Funes F (2012), The scaling up of agroecology: spreading the hope for food sovereignty and resiliency, http://www.agroeco.org/socla/archivospdf/Rio20.pdf

68 CFS, GSF, Paragraph 16.

69 CFS, GSF, Paragraph 53.

3.8.3 How to further promote agroecology in practice and politics?

The civil society groups involved in the GSF process decided to already use these references, but to also continue to bring this issue – together with other controversial demands, such as food sovereignty and the governance of genetic resources – to the attention of the CFS.

The most important fact, however, is that at the global level, an increasing number of food and agricultural producers, consumers, their movements, civil society groups and growing parts of the general public, already support the paradigmatic shift towards agroecology. It is impossible, even for politicians, to ignore these developments. However, the agroecological movement will not limit the struggle to the local, national and regional levels only, but will insist on opening space and promoting debate at the global level as well, and particularly at the CFS.

3.9 Monitoring and accountability

3.9.1 Monitoring and accountability: Why it matters

As stressed by the CSO Working Document on the GSF, national and global political decisions that fail to take the human rights obligations of states and intergovernmental organizations into account are among the main reasons why hunger in the world persists. Monitoring of public policies can be a powerful means of holding governments and intergovernmental bodies accountable for their policies and programs, and to assess the degree to which states are meeting their obligations to respect, protect and fulfill the human right to adequate food of every person.

As highlighted earlier in this document, the CFS reform document also indicates that monitoring and ensuring accountability is one of the main pillars of the CFS leading up to the establishment of an innovative monitoring mechanism. In this line, social movements and civil society groups insisted in introducing human rights-based accountability and monitoring as a priority issue into the GFS, which was approved by intergovernmental consensus.

3.9.2 Monitoring and accountability as it stands in the GSF

The GSF states: "Accountability for commitments and for results is crucial, especially for advancing the progressive realization of the right to adequate food, and it is noted that those countries making the greatest progress on food security and nutrition are those that have demonstrated the greatest political will, with a strong political and financial commitment that is open and transparent to all stakeholders. Objectives to be monitored should include nutritional outcomes, right to food indicators, agricultural sector performance, progress towards achievement of the MDGs, particularly MDG1, and regionally agreed targets."[70]

In this way, the GSF establishes **five principles that should apply to monitoring and accountability systems,** which are:

"a) They should be human-rights based, with particular reference to the progressive realization of the right to adequate food;
b) They should make it possible for decision-makers to be accountable;
c) They should be participatory and include assessments that involve all stakeholders and beneficiaries, including the most vulnerable;
d) They should be simple, yet comprehensive, accurate, timely and understandable to all, with indicators disaggregated by sex, age, region, etc., that capture impact, process and expected outcomes;
e) They should not duplicate existing systems, but rather build upon and strengthen national statistical and analytical capacities" (par. 92-93).[71]

70 CFS, GSF, Paragraph 92.

71 CFS, GSF, paragraph 93

Monitoring and accountability should be implemented by broad national platforms or councils that ensure participation of all relevant stakeholders, which also oversees the implementation of the GSF at national level and ensures policy coherence.[72]

3.9.3 How to use these references in the GSF for monitoring and accountability?

Over the last twenty years, an increasing number of social movements and civil society organizations have intensively worked on human rights-based monitoring of public policies at the national, regional and global levels. Many of these reports have been presented to national parliaments, governments, the general public, and to regional and global UN human rights bodies, or in CFS or FAO conference side events. Many of them were produced using the Voluntary Guidelines on the Right to Food as a monitoring tool. Now, several elements of the GSF can be used as references for monitoring and accountability as well.

The most prominent example for the increased cooperation among civil society organizations working on the process of human rights-based monitoring of policies relevant for food security and nutrition is certainly the annual *Right to Food and Nutrition Watch.* The *Watch* is a civil society initiative from a diversity of social movements and civil society organizations and networks,[73] which, since 2008, has monitored the implementation of the right to food worldwide. Since then, a yearly report has been published presenting an analysis of major issues such as the food price crisis of 2007–2008, the reform of the world food governance system, land grabbing, nutrition, accountability, alternatives to policies that generate hunger, in addition to case and country studies on the implementation of the right to food in more than 50 countries. The *Watch* uses different types of monitoring methodologies to screen national, regional and global compliance with the right to food, such as the case's documentation of right to food violations provided by the threatened or affected communities, fact finding missions' reports, parallel reports to the CESCR, and policy monitoring tools based on the FAO Right to Food Guidelines to assess structure, processes and results of state actions from the right to food perspective. In addition, it has also sought collaboration with UN Special Procedures, particularly with the UN Special Rapporteur on the right to adequate food.[74]

72 CFS, GSF, paragraph 72

73 The Right to Food and Nutrition Watch, see: http://www.rtfn-watch.org

74 See: www.srfood.org

4 Summary – how to use the GSF

4.1 Main achievements

The Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition, as adopted in its first version in October 2012 by the Committee on World Food Security, is intended to become the primary global reference for coordination and coherence in decision making on food, nutrition and agricultural issues. It is an important achievement of the CFS. Many social movements and civil society organizations participated in the elaboration of this global intergovernmental consensus document and consider it a step forward in promoting a new model of governance on food, agriculture, and nutrition.

From a civil society perspective, the most important overall achievements of the GSF are:

a) The Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition is the first global framework adopted by a consensus of governments that systematically mainstreams the right to adequate food and human rights into policies relevant to food security and nutrition at the global, regional and national levels.

b) The GSF explicitly recognizes and stresses, throughout the document, the central role of small-scale food producers, such as smallholders, agricultural and food workers, artisanal fisherfolk, pastoralists, indigenous people, the landless, and women and youth, as key actors for achieving food security and nutrition for all.

c) The GSF requires all stakeholders to implement and ensure the coherence of these policies with regard to the right to adequate food. The GSF emphasizes policy coherence and is addressed to decision- and policy-makers responsible for policy areas with a direct or indirect impact on food security and nutrition, such as trade, agriculture, health, environment, natural resources, and economic or investment policies.

4.2 The five levels of action

The GSF will have no significance if it remains a paper of global consensus only. Hence the process of implementing of the GSF at national level is crucial to its success. The ultimate goal is to ensure that key elements of the GSF can be used to advance important demands for policy changes promoted by social movements and civil society organizations on the local, national, regional and global levels.

Social movements and civil society organizations can use the GSF for action on different levels:

- Awareness raising, dissemination and training: people on the community, national, regional and global levels should know about key elements of food security and nutrition policies where international consensus was reached, in order to relate their own demands on all these levels to what has been agreed upon globally.

- Advocacy strategies, social struggles and mobilization: social movements and civil society groups can quote specific parts the GSF in their national, regional and international position papers, political statements or public activities, holding governments accountable for what they agreed upon in the CFS:

> "In Rome, you agreed on the following policy or principle (for example on land tenure, living wages, participation of small-scale food producers in decision making, equal heritance rights for women, human rights based monitoring, etc.)…"
> "Now, we propose to adopt national policies according to this international consensus you approved as well, in compliance with your international obligations and commitments."

▪ Promoting and strengthening multi-actor and multi-sector platforms on policies for food security and nutrition, with strong civil society and social movements' participation, as it is recommended by the GSF and practiced by the CFS on the global level.

▪ Monitoring policy coherence: as a reference document, the GSF is a useful tool for CSO to expose policy incoherence and demand action from governments which should be in line with their previous commitments. In that sense, the GSF can serve for a comprehensive Coherence Check of national, regional and global policies with direct or indirect impact on food security and nutrition (see the following sub-chapter).

▪ Building the GSF into national capacity building programs and curricula for members of social movements and civil society groups, but also government officials and academia, with the support of regional and national FAO or other UN offices, governments and universities.

4.3 The Coherence Check

Use the GSF to check, monitor and assess specific or more general public policies with impact on food security and nutrition, and particularly with the human right to adequate food.

The methodological approach follows the question: Are public policies and the current legislation in the following areas coherent with the global consensus reached in the GSF? In case such coherence is not (yet) ensured, which corrective measures should be adopted?

Significant examples for such exercises are:

a) Are national legislation and public policies on food security and nutrition in line with the human rights-based approach? This includes:

- The compliance with state obligations to respect, protect and fulfil the right to adequate food: are there cases and policies where the compliance or non-compliance is evident and documented?
- Are human rights principles, including participation, accountability, non discrimination, transparency, human dignity, empowerment and rule of law, implemented within policy process?
- Does the country implement the Right to Food Guidelines in line with the Seven Steps approach?

In case such coherence is not (yet) ensured, which corrective measures must be adopted?

b) Are national legislation and public policies on food and agriculture in line with the central role of small-scale food producers for food security and nutrition? This includes,

- The recognition, priority attention and inclusion of small-scale food producers in the design, implementation and evaluation of national policies that affects them?
- Are they included in shaping policies on investment in agriculture, fisheries, forests and the exploitation of primary resources?
- Are the rights of indigenous peoples, pastoralists, fisherfolks and other small-scale food producers, as defined in the international instruments included in the GSF, complied with?
- Are these groups included in policy formulation, evaluation and revision on trade, land tenure regulation, natural resources management or expansion of agrofuel production?
- Are the organizations of small-scale food producers included in national governance structures that ensure coherence of public policies with international commitments and particularly with obligations of the state under international human rights law?

In case such coherence is not (yet) ensured, which corrective measures must be adopted?

c) Are national legislation and public policies concerning agricultural and food workers consistent with the global consensus adopted in the GSF, particularly:

- Are the rights to decent work, formal employment and social protection guaranteed for all food and agricultural workers?
- Is the minimum wage assured on the living wage level, and is its payment duly controlled?
- Are the ILO conventions on food and agricultural workers rights ratified by the country and complied with?
- Is the protection and independence of trade unions and their inclusion in policy design, evaluation and revision ensured for those areas where their rights and interests are affected?

In case such coherence is not (yet) ensured, which corrective measures must be adopted?

d) Are national legislation and public policies concerning gender consistent with the global consensus adopted in the GSF, particularly:

- Are women equally treated as men in their *recognition* as food producers and their inclusion in policy-making?
- Do women and men have equal access to productive resources and inheritance?
- Are women effectively protected against discrimination and violence?
- Is a comprehensive maternity/paternity legislation in place?
- Are public policies continuously evaluated and revised based on a gender analysis?

In case such coherence is not (yet) ensured, which corrective measures must be adopted?

e) Are national legislation and public policies concerning nutrition consistent with the global consensus adopted in the GSF, particularly:

- Do they contribute to maintain and strengthen dietary diversity and healthy eating habits and food preparation?
- Do they promote the production and consumption of healthy and nutritious foods, especially those that are rich of micronutrients?
- Do they address specific food and nutritional needs of people living with HIV/AIDS?
- Do they promote and encourage breastfeeding, in line with the International Code of Marketing of Breast-milk Substitutes?
- Do they properly regulate and control food companies regarding quality, safety and diversity of food consumed to prevent overconsumption and unbalanced diets that may lead to malnutrition, obesity or degenerative diseases?

In case such coherence is not (yet) ensured, which corrective measures must be adopted?

f) Are national legislation and public policies concerning tenure of land, fisheries and forests consistent with the global consensus adopted in the GSF, particularly:

- Do they implement the Voluntary Guidelines on Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests (VGGT)?
- Do they fully recognize and respect legitimate tenure rights holders and their rights, particularly women, indigenous people, peasants, fisherfolks, pastoralists and other small-scale food producers?.

- Do they protect their legitimate tenure rights against threats and infringements, and are the protection and conflict settlement mechanisms in line with standards set in the VGGT?
- Do they facilitate and promote the access to natural resources by carrying out land reforms or other policy reforms consistent with their human rights obligations?
- Do they properly regulate and control non-state actors, including business actors, to avoid infringing on human rights or tenure rights of smallholders and other small-scale food producers?

In case such coherence is not (yet) ensured, which corrective measures must be adopted?

g) Are national legislation and public policies concerning monitoring and accountability consistent with the global consensus adopted in the GSF, particularly:

- Is an effective multi-actor and multi-sectoral platform or council established to monitor public policies and ensure accountability and coherence?
- Are the mechanisms to monitor public policies relevant for food security and nutrition based on human rights and particularly the right to adequate food?
- Do the existing monitoring mechanisms include all important actors in the field of food security and nutrition, and particularly the small-scale food producers, such as peasants, indigenous people, pastoralists, fisherfolks, agricultural and food workers, consumers, women and youth?
- Do the monitoring mechanisms effectively lead to hold decision-makers accountable and to improve legislation and public policies towards full human rights coherence?

In case such coherence is not (yet) ensured, which corrective measures must be adopted?

5. Perspectives

5.1 The vision ahead

The GSF first version as adopted in October of 2012 is a step forward, but the vision of social movements and civil society organizations, as formulated in the CSO Working Document on the GSF, goes far beyond:

"We envision a world where those who produce, distribute and need food are at the heart of food, agricultural, livestock, forestry and fisheries systems and policies: a world where food production is rooted in environmentally sustainable production, under local control and honoring traditional knowledge, whilst guaranteeing the possibility of a diversified and healthy diet and nutritional well-being; a world where trade policies and practices will serve the rights of peoples to safe, healthy and ecologically sustainable production and consumption; a world where the interests of the next generation will be included, and a world where new social relations are free from oppression and from the inequalities of class, ethnicity, caste, gender, religion.

We envision a world where the role of the State is reaffirmed and where States uphold their responsibility to protect and promote democracy, as well as respect and strengthen food and peoples' sovereignty.

Land, oceans, rivers, forests and all of nature are much more than a means of production; they are the very basis of life, culture and identity, and fulfill crucial social, cultural, spiritual and environmental functions. We envision genuine agrarian, fisheries, pastoralist and forest reforms that guarantee access to, and the sharing of, productive territories and other resources free from the threat of large scale land and other natural resources privatization, loss and eviction. The right of self-determination of indigenous peoples must also be upheld.

Our vision is deeply rooted in the human rights framework and seeks to seamlessly integrate the concepts of food sovereignty, the right to food and food and nutrition security. The indivisibility of rights is a core principle that is fundamental to the human rights approach. Accountability is another core principle that must be respected and protected by all actors (state and non-state); impunity of violations against these rights must be overcome.

We recognize the need to re-emphasize the centrality of nutrition in the GSF, including its upstream social determinants such as universal access to potable drinking water, sanitation, maternal and child care and quality primary health care and education." [75]

5.2 Outlook: The process ahead

The updating and reviewing process of the GSF is ongoing. In 2013/2014, the new CFS decisions will be integrated. Subsequent to these additions, a comprehensive reviewing and re-negotiation process is planned, to be concluded in 2016. Social movements and civil society groups will have the possibility to participate again in the process, and are thus encouraged to prepare for it accordingly.

Controversial themes which are commonly of particular interest to civil society groups – such as food sovereignty, agroecology and the governance of genetic resources, as well as the regulation of transnational corporations, the reorientation of trade policies, and the democratization of the global food and nutrition systems – will need particularly strong cooperation and mobilization amongst those groups and networks which are following and actively engaging in these changes at the local, national and regional levels, and which are conscious that such fundamental shifts cannot be realized without changes being implemented at the global governance level.

75 CSO Working Document on the GSF, December 2011.

What is clear is that it will not be easy to achieve substantial progress. With this in mind, it is vital that people around the world are informed about the political space provided by the CFS and are equipped to engage in it, as well as being aware of the importance of the GSF and its relevance for the national level. This will significantly contribute to strengthen the coordination and cooperation of social movements and civil society groups from the local to the global level, based on shared concerns and a common vision.

Annex: List of resources and References

Altieri. Miguel/Toledo, Victor (2011), The *agroecological revolution in Latin America: rescuing nature, ensuring food sovereignty and empowering peasants.* Journal of Peasant Studies, 38:3, 587-612. Extract available at http://rio20.net/en/propuestas/the-agroecological-revolution-in-latin-america-rescuing-nature-ensuring-food-sovereignty-and-empowering-peasants/

Altieri Miguel/Nichols, Clara/Funes, Fernando(2012), *The scaling up of agroecology: spreading the hope for food sovereignty and resiliency,* http://www.agroeco.org/socla/archivospdf/Rio20.pdf

Borras, Saturnino M, JR/ Franco Jennifer C (2012), *Global Land Grabbing and Trajectories of Agrarian Change: A Preliminary Analysis.* In: Journal of Agrarian Change, Vol. 12 No. 1, January 2012, pp. 34–59, http://r1.ufrrj.br/geac/portal/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/BORRAS-e-FRANCO-Global-land-grabbing-and-trajectories-of-agrarian-change.pdf

CFS, 2009. *Reform of the Committee on World Food Security*, Final Version, Thirty-fifth session of the CFS, 14,15 and 17 October 2009, Agenda Item III, CFS: 2009/2 Rev 2, Rome.

CFS, 2012. *Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition*, Thirty-ninth session, 15-20 October 2012, CFS 2012/39/5 Add.1, Rome.
http://www.fao.org/docrep/meeting/026/ME498E.pdf

CFS, 2012. *First Version of the Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition (GSF)*. Preamble and Decision Box, Thirty-ninth Session, 15-20 October 2012, Agenda Item V.b, Rome.

CFS HLPE (2011), *Land Tenure and International Investments in Agriculture.*

CFS HLPE (2013), *Investing in smallholder agriculture for food security.*

CIDSE/Ecumenical Advocacy Alliance (2013): *Whose Alliance? The G-8 and the Emergence of a Global Corporate Regime for Agriculture*; see
http://www.cidse.org/content/publications/just-food/food-governance/whose-alliance-_the_g8_new_alliance_for_food_security_and_nutrition_in_africa.html

CSO (2011), *Civil Society Working Document on the Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition,* see:
http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/41/cso_working_document_on_the_gsf_december_2011_en.pdf

CSO (2012) Statement on the Adoption of the GFS, October 17, 2012, see:
http://www.csm4cfs.org/policy_issues-6/global_strategic_framework-8/cfs_39_outcomes_evaluation-69/

De Schutter, Olivier (2011), *Towards more equitable value chains: alternative business models in support of the right to food,* Report presented at the 66th Session of the United Nations General Assembly [A/66/262], see:
http://www.srfood.org/images/stories/pdf/officialreports/srrtf_contractfarming_a-66-262.pdf

De Schutter, Olivier (2011), *Agroecology and the Right to Food,* Report presented at the 16th Session of the United Nations Human Rights Council [A/HRC/16/49],

FAO (2004), *Voluntary Guidelines to Support the Progressive Realization of the Right to Adequate Food in the Context of National Food Security,* Adopted by the 127th Session of the FAO Council November 2004, http://www.fao.org/docrep/meeting/009/y9825e/y9825e00.HTM

FAO (2012), *Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security,* In: Report of the 38th (Special) Session of the Committee on World Food Security (11 May 2012), Appendix D. Rome

FAO (2011), *The State of Food And Agriculture: Women in Agriculture – Closing the gender gap for development,* http://www.fao.org/docrep/013/i2050e/i2050e.pdf

FAO, IFAD, WFP (2012), *The State of Food Insecurity in the World 2012*, Rome, http://www.fao.org/publications/sofi/en/

FAO (2012), *Smallholders and Family Farmers*, http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/nr/sustainability_pathways/docs/Factsheet_SMALLHOLDERS.pdf

FIAN International (2007), *How to Use the Voluntary Guidelines on the Right to Food: A Manual for Social Movements, Community-Based Organisations and Non-Governmental Organisations,* http://www.rtfn-watch.org/uploads/media/voluntary_guidelines.pdf

FIAN International and Hakijamii (Economic and Social Rights Centre), 2009, *Voluntary Guidelines For Good Governance In Land And Natural Resource Tenure: Civil Society Perspectives,* http://www.foodsovereignty.org/Portals/0/documenti%20sito/Resources/Archive/Working%20Groups/ART/General/VolGuideSocPersp.pdf

Golay, Christophe/Büschi, Michaela Büschi (2012), *The right to food and global strategic frameworks: The Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition (GSF) and the UN Comprehensive Framework for Action (CFA).* FAO Study.

Hurst, P et al. (2007), *Agricultural Workers and Their Contribution to Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development.* Food and Agriculture Organization, International Labour Organization, International Union of Food, Agricultural, Hotel, Restaurant, Catering, Tobacco and Allied Workers' Associations.

IFAD (2012), *Indigenous peoples: valuing, respecting and supporting diversity,* http://www.ifad.org/pub/factsheet/ip/e.pdf

IIED, IUCN, CEESP and Yale F&ES report (2006), *Agroecology and the Struggle for Food Sovereignty in the Americas* http://bitsandbytes.ca/sites/default/files/Agroecology_and_the_Struggle_for_FS_in_the_Americas.pdf

ILO (2008), *Promotion of rural employment for poverty reduction,* Report to the International Labour Conference 2008, http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_norm/---relconf/documents/meetingdocument/wcms_091721.pdf

International Assessment of Agricultural Knowledge, Science and Technology for Development (IAASTD), *Agriculture at a Crossroads,* 2008, www.agassessment.org.

International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) of 1966, http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/CESCR.aspx

IPC (2010), *The reformed committee on world food security, a briefing paper for civil society,* elaborated by Christoph G, Brem-Wilson J, International Planning Committee for Food Sovereignty, Crocevia and Mundubat.

La Vía Campesina (2012), *Committee on World Food Security (CFS): A new space for the food policies of the world: opportunities and limitations.* La Via Campesina Notebook, number 4, September 2012, http://viacampesina.org/en/index.php/publications-mainmenu-30

Landívar, Natalia/Wolpold-Bosien, Martin (2012): *Human Rights – A Strategy for the Fight against Hunger,* FAO Factsheet

Landívar, Natalia/Wolpold-Bosien, Martin (2012): *The Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition: A right to food perspective,* FAO Factsheet

Nyéléni (2007), *Declaration of the Forum for Food Sovereignty,* available at http://www.nyeleni.org/spip.php?article290

Pretty JN, Morison JIL, Hine RE (2003), *Reducing food poverty by increasing agricultural sustainability in developing countries*. In: Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment, Volume 95, Issue 1, April 2003, pp. 217–234, http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167880902000877

Right to Food and Nutrition Watch 2010, *Land grabbing and nutrition – Challenges for Global Governance,* www.rtfn-watch.org

Right to Food and Nutrition Watch 2011, *Claiming Human Rights - The Accountability Challenge,* www.rtfn-watch.org

Right to Food and Nutrition Watch 2012, *Who Decides about Global Food and Nutrition? Strategies to regain control,* www.rtfn-watch.org

Right to Food and Nutrition Watch 2013, *Alternatives and Resistance to Policies that Generate Hunger,* www.rtfn-watch.org

Schieck Valente, Flavio Luiz (2010), *It is time for a Rights-based Global Strategic Framework on Food Security and Nutrition,* in: Right to Food and Nutrition Watch 2010

The Lancet (2013), *Maternal and Child Nutrition*, http://download.thelancet.com/flatcontentassets/pdfs/nutrition-eng.pdf

UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (2007), http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/DRIPS_en.pdf

UN HRCAC (2011), *Study of the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee on discrimination in the context of the right to food,* paragraph 23, http://www.righttofood.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/A-HRC-16-401.pdf

UNICEF (2013), *Improving Child Nutrition*, http://www.who.int/pmnch/media/news/2013/20130416_unicef_nutrition.pdf

Wolpold-Bosien, Martin, 2012. *Working Together Towards a Human Rights Framework for Food Security and Nutrition – How Far Have We Come?* In: Right to Food and Nutrition Watch 2012.

World Health Organisation (1981), *International Code of Marketing of Breast-milk Substitutes,* http://www.who.int/nutrition/publications/code_english.pdf

Further references:

CFS (Committee on World Food Security), see: http://www.fao.org/cfs/cfs-home/en/

CSM (Civil Society Mechanism to the CFS), see: www.csm4cfs.org

CIDSE, see: www.cidse.org

FIAN International, see: www.fian.org

IPC, see: www.foodsovereignty.org

IUF, see: http://cms.iuf.org

La Vía Campesina, see: www.viacampesina.org

Right to Food and Nutrition Watch, see: www.rtfn-watch.org

UN High-Level Task Force on the Global Food Security Crisis (HLTF) see: www.un-foodsecurity.org

UN Special Rapporteur on the right to adequate food, see: www.srfood.org

The Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition, as adopted in its first version in October 2012 by the Committee on World Food Security (CFS), is intended to become the primary global reference for coordination and coherence in decision making on food, nutrition and agricultural issues.

It is an important achievement of the CFS. Many social movements and civil society organizations participated in the elaboration of this global intergovernmental consensus document and consider it a step forward in promoting a new model of governance on food, agriculture, and nutrition.