



Food and Agriculture Organization
of the United Nations

Global Forum on Food Security and Nutrition • FSN Forum

TEMPLATE FOR SUBMISSIONS

31.01.2023 – 03.05.2023

<https://www.fao.org/fsnforum/call-submissions/use-application-cfs-policy-recommendations>

Call for submissions: Use and application of CFS policy recommendations on price volatility and food security, and social protection for food security and nutrition

Template for submissions (for individual experiences)

Experiences and good practices in the use and application of two selected CFS policy recommendations

Please use the template below to reflect your experience and good practices in applying (any) the following sets of policy recommendations:

Set 1: [Price Volatility and Food Security](#) (endorsed in 2011, CFS 37)

Set 2: [Social Protection for Food Security & Nutrition](#) (endorsed in 2012, CFS 39)

Please note that if you wish to share more than one experience, a separate form should be used for each contribution. Submissions should be strictly limited to 1,000 Words.

The Call for Submissions is open until 3rd of May 2023.



**Template for submissions
(for individual experiences)**

Title of the experience	
Geographical coverage	Global
Country(ies) / Region(s) covered by the experience	Africa, Europe and Western and Central Asia, Latin America and Caribbean, Asia, North America
Contact person	Name: Alberta Guerra (on behalf of the CSIPM) Email address: alberta.guerra@actionaid.org
Affiliation	<input type="checkbox"/> Government <input type="checkbox"/> UN organization <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Civil Society / NGO <input type="checkbox"/> Private Sector <input type="checkbox"/> Academia <input type="checkbox"/> Donor <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify)
(i) Which sets of policy recommendations has been relevant to the experience? <i>(Choose all that apply)</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Set 1: Price Volatility and Food Security <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Set 2: Social Protection for Food Security & Nutrition <i>[if none of these two sets of policy recommendations has been used, please go directly to question xii]</i>
(ii) Which specific policy recommendation(s) of the Price Volatility and Social Protection has been used and found particularly relevant to the experience?	Price Volatility and Food Security <i>(Chose among the recommendations listed in the document, from a) to q) and explain why)</i> <i>[e.g. Price volatility: recommendations: k) n) and q).]</i> Social Protection for Food Security & Nutrition <i>(Chose among the recommendations listed under A), B), C) and D) in the document and explain why)</i> <i>[e.g. Social Protection: recommendations: A 4); B 1)2)3): D 2)]</i>
(iii) How have these policy recommendations been used in your context? <i>Brief description of the experience</i>	<p>The CFS policy recommendations have informed the work of many CSOs (as part of the CSIPM) to influence the decision-making in the following processes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Raise awareness on the impact of biofuel production on international market and FPV and call for appropriate policies to reduce such volatility - Raise awareness on the impact of financial speculation on food prices and call for appropriate regulation of commodity markets - Continue advocacy on the need to build and support physical food reserves at national and regional level

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Continue advocacy to promote social protection measures to support those most vulnerable <p>In this current time, we are facing the third food crisis in 15 years. The CFS policy recommendations on food price volatility, and social protection, have been developed as a response to the food price crisis in 2011. Since then, food prices have somehow stabilized for a short period of time, but the root causes of hunger have not been resolved, and the persistence of conflicts with the outbreak of the Covid19 pandemic, the worsening of climate change impacts and lastly the outbreak of the Ukraine war have shown again the fragility of the food system leading to an unprecedented global food crisis with 258 million people facing acute food insecurity at crisis or worse levels.</p> <p>The CSIPM has highlighted the shortcoming of national and international policies in taking the urgent measures to address the multiple crisis at play, and recommended urgent actions to cope with the impacts of the COVID19 pandemic before, and the impacts of the Ukraine war on food, fuel and fertilizers prices.</p> <p>In particular, the CFS policy recommendations on FPV and SP have informed the following CSIPM positioning and recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CSM global synthesis report on Covid 19 - Gender, COVID-19 and Food Systems: impacts, community responses and feminist policy demands - Voices from the ground 2: transformative solutions to the global systemic food crises - CSIPM statement on food crisis response during the CFS 50th Plenary session in October 2022 - Launch of the campaign “You do politics, we go hungry” - Policy brief on “A CFS coordinated policy response to the global food crisis”
<p>Who has been involved in the experience? (Choose all that apply)</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Government</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> UN organization</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Civil Society / NGO</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Private Sector</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Academia</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Donor</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify)</p>
<p>How were the various stakeholders’ groups affected by food insecurity and malnutrition involved in the context of your experience?</p>	<p>Small scale food producers, who are also the mostly affected by food insecurity, are at the core of the CSIPM mission and organization. The CSIPM is structured in a way to give prominence to those constituencies of food producers mostly affected by food insecurity. The two global reports prepared by the CSIPM (Voices from the ground 1 and 2) are the result of global and regional consultations involving all these grassroots groups, local organizations and social movements who are part of the CSIPM to bring their voices to the CFS.</p>
<p>Main activities</p>	<p>Raising awareness, consultations, gathering of experiences directly</p>

	<p>from the ground, advocacy at all levels</p>
Timeframe	<p>First consultation happened in May 2020</p>
<p>(iv) Results obtained / expected (for each, specify whether these outcomes are actual (as of when), or expected (and by when))</p>	<p><u>Results in the short term (qualitative and quantitative)</u> (In addition to providing a qualitative assessment, please indicate where feasible the number of people that have been directly involved in activities, e.g. six trainings involving a total of 250 people)</p> <p>We got 539 contributions from 72 countries in the last year consultation. Thanks to these consultations, those most affected had the opportunity to share the impacts of the price spikes on their lives, discuss the measures taken by the respective Governments and provide examples of community-led solutions to inform policy responses. Their perspectives collated into the CSIPM global report has been presented directly at the CFS with the aim of informing the CFS political response to the crisis.</p>
	<p><u>Results in the medium to long term (qualitative and quantitative)</u> (In addition to providing a qualitative assessment, including in addressing the underlying causes of food insecurity and malnutrition, please indicate where feasible the number of people that have been or are expected to be indirectly affected by activities, e.g. training leading to development of a local action plan expected to affect 1,000 people)</p> <p>CSIPM members advocate for a policy change at local, national, regional and global level to get adequate responses to the current crisis which may impacts million of people on the ground. The CFS is still discussing how to address the global crisis and is indispensable that in doing this, the voices of the most affected, including their proposed solutions, are heard and considered.</p>
	<p><u>Most significant changes</u> (Please indicate the most significant changes that resulted from the activities as a result of the use and application of any of these two sets of policy recommendations)</p>
<p>(v) What were key catalysts that influenced the use of these CFS policy recommendations?</p>	<p>The continue fragility of the food system and the persistence of recurrent crisis have impacted food prices more often than before. The continue increase of people suffering from hunger has led the CSIPM to invoke more than before the application of these CFS policy recommendations for the urgent need to stabilize food prices, ensure fair prices for small scale food producers, and ensure adequate social protection in time of crisis</p>
<p>(vi) What were the major constraints and challenges in the use of these CFS policy recommendations, and how were they addressed?</p>	<p>From the consultation carried out by the CSIPM, it emerged that many Governments failed to provide the adequate social protection mechanisms to support the most vulnerable. In the last year and after the outbreak of the Ukraine war, the situation is even worse due to the limited fiscal capacity of countries after the Covid19 and the current debt crisis that's putting many countries at the risk of debt distress. The same happened with the CFS policy recommendations on FPV. Despite the call for more regulation of the commodity markets to</p>

	<p>reduce speculation on food commodities, to reduce pressure on food prices driven by land use change for biofuel production, and to regulate the corporate power of agribusiness making huge profits out of the crisis, very little has been done. We conclude that the lack of awareness of the CFS policy recommendations as well as the lack of political will to address the root cause of food insecurity have affected the real implementation of these CFS recs.</p> <p>Finally, the protracted crisis triggered by conflicts and climate change, exacerbated by the COVID19 pandemic and the effects of the Ukraine war on the fuel, food and fertilizers price has led to a global food crisis without precedents. This urges a CFS coordinated political response which is not happening while multiple fragmented initiatives are taking place at the expenses of the CFS coordination role.</p>
<p>(vii) What mechanisms have been developed to monitor the use of these policy recommendations? (if any)</p>	<p>(Please indicate whether these mechanisms were developed by government or in the context of a project)</p> <p>The CSIPM has the monitoring WG which has the mandate to monitor the application of the CFS policy outcomes accordingly with the CFS work plan. Beyond that, the CSIPM members, is used to recall those CFS policy recommendations that resonate with the context to remind Governments of what has been internationally agreed to address the particular challenges we are facing.</p>
<p>(viii) Based on the experience presented, what good practices would you recommend for successful use or implementation of these CFS policy recommendations?</p>	<p>We recommend to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Raise awareness on the CFS policy recommendations in policy meetings with Governments and recommend their implementation - Include reference of the CFS policy recommendations in reports, briefings, consultations that are carried out to inform policy decisions_
<p>(ix) Are there any concrete plans to further use these CFS policy recommendations?</p>	<p>The CSIPM is pushing for a CFS Global Coordinated Response to the Food Crisis aimed at “<i>Strengthening the CFS as a platform for coordination in addressing food crises</i>”. One of the activities proposed was to ask the HLPE to collate existing relevant CFS policy outcomes within a reasoned, human rights-based framework presenting the causes of and the challenges engendered by food crises - such as price volatility, conflicts, debt, dependence on imports of food and inputs, need for enhanced support for small-scale food production and territorial markets, etc. – and policy guidance to address these challenges as provided by CFS outcomes. The platform could also act as a virtual space for sharing experiences and data among MSs and CFS participants as well as information regarding international initiatives taken to address food crisis, thus serving as a comprehensive toolbox. MSs and other actors, such as local authorities, could be supported to draw on the toolbox. Quarterly meetings could be held to take stock of the evolving food and nutrition security situation and discuss key issues towards enhanced policy coordination, giving particular attention to the voices of most affected countries and constituencies and the uniquely</p>

	<i>diversified forms of evidence on which the CFS can call, including through the evidence provided by the HLPE. Using the CFS platform function in this way would facilitate detecting signs of an impending emergency and promoting timely action.”</i>
(x) How could these policy recommendations be (further) used in the future for improving the food security and nutrition, advancing the progressive realization of the right to food, achieving SDGs?	If the CFS is enabled to fully play its role on policy coordination, the CFS policy recommendations on FPV and SP become a crucial and indispensable tool to address the current global crisis. We are facing a global emergency that requires a systemic change of our food system to avoid recurrent food price spikes, and adequate social protection measures to support the most vulnerable during crisis.
(xi) Link(s) to additional information	
Question xii) below to be filled only if none of these two sets of policy recommendation has been used or applied.	
xii) What are the reasons for not using these policy recommendations in your context so far?	<i>e.g. absence of sufficient resources; lack of awareness etc;_</i>