Thank you to the HLPE for the opportunity to comment on this report.Water and food security is a broad topic and the report does a good job in highlighting many important aspects, however we have suggestions in filling some critical gaps. The below comments also cover the other questions.

**Crises/conflict**

There is a lack of real analysis/engagement with water as it relates to food insecurity and nutrition in situations of conflict, occupation and war, where water issues are critical and in some cases can prolong or exacerbate conflict, as well as affect all sectors from agriculture, WaSH, food security and nutrition. The issue of protracted crises has been on the CFS agenda for the past 2 years, and it is important that this report reflect that process. We suggest that the HLPE add a section on these issues, including the international legal obligations associated with water insecurity or denial of water resources in conflict, and there are several examples to be used as case studies.

In Palestine, and especially the Gaza Strip, the Israeli government systematically denies water access to Palestinians. One such example that HIC-HLRN documented is the situation Bedouin communities living in the “unrecognized villages” face in the Negev desert; this information can be found in the HIC-HLRN publication “The Goldberg Opportunity”, found here: <http://www.hic-net.org/document.php?pid=3832>, as well as the over-extraction affecting water levels in the dead sea: <http://landtimes.landpedia.org/newsdes.php?id=q3A=&catid=ow==&edition=pg>== . It is also critical to examine the case of Gaza, which faces extreme denial of access to water, having devastating effects of food security and nutrition, sanitation and health. A simple search reveals a plethora of information, including the destruction of water infrastructure during the war on Gaza that took place over the summer. Palestine is an area we work closely with, but it is not the only territory affected- there are many other situations that could and should also be studied and highlighted.

**Urban/slums/etc**

The report touches on issues of urban access to water outside of urban agriculture, but does not provide enough analysis on the real global challenge of water access for vulnerable urban populations, particularly in slums. This challenge goes beyond general public health issues, into real consequences for food and nutrition security, as briefly mentioned in the present report, however it is imperative that we also analyze all challenges and best practices dealing with urban challenges. For this issue it is important to look at local government and authorities role in managing public resources and service delivery. In the Greater Cairo Area many informal areas and communities are unrecognized by governments and thus are denied access to public water services- Batn al-Baqara in Cairo is one such community (of many), and some information can be found here: <http://landtimes.landpedia.org/newsdes.php?id=pGxs&catid=ow==&edition=qw>==

Urban areas continue to grow, and will continue to do, with related growth and expansion of informal settlements and slums, and as the “urban poor” increases as do the consequent health, food and nutritional challenges. It is important the barriers to access are fully addressed in the report for urban populations. These challenges continue to persist as water infrastructure is increasingly privatized and prices increase for access.

**Privatization/commons/management**

We are happy to see the inclusion of the negative effects resulting from the privatization of water, and water infrastructure, especially the resulting power imbalance, including the section on “water grabbing”. This is a real threat to real sustainable development and the realization of human rights for many persons, from urban poor to small scale food producers and indigenous communities. Water, including watersheds, are a part of the commons. This report should reflect this viewpoint more strongly, and present more in-depth the policy/governance best practices and the challenges for managing water as part of the commons. In terms of governance, we urge the HLPE to examine also the benefits of public-popular partnerships for water management, which integrate national and local government with communities directly in planning processes, as an alternative to the public-private partnerships touted by the world bank, which often have damaging outcomes for vulnerable populations. The “Reclaiming Public Water” publication has many good examples of alternative water management systems to be included in this report.

**Human Rights and the right to Water, and land**

We fully support the inclusion of section 3.6 on the right to water; as a UN mechanism, the CFS is bound by a human rights mandate, and should promote a normative framework in all policy recommendations. The right to water and the right to food are integrally linked, and it is necessary to expand this to cover water for agriculture, fisheries, etc.- without rights to water, the right to food cannot be fully realized. The right to water should also include productive uses to water and the right to water for ecosystems.

The core components of realizing the right to water for the purpose of drinking/hygiene and productive uses should be addressed in the same framework looking at availability, accessibility, and quality. Water is required to produce food, and the rights to water must reflect this connection. The UN CESCR General Comment 15 on the right to water states that “Attention should be given to ensuring that disadvantaged and marginalized farmers, including women farmers, have equitable access to water and water management systems, including sustainable rain harvesting and irrigation technology… States parties should ensure that there is adequate access to water for subsistence farming and for securing the livelihoods of indigenous peoples.”  This report takes a good step in pushing for a more comprehensive understanding of the right to water.

By expanding the right to water, including the mandate of the Special Rapporteur on the right to water and sanitation, food and water, along with land can be treated more coherently at the global and local policy levels. As mentioned previously, water should be treated as part of the commons. The sustainable use of water for agriculture, and other productive uses must be regulated in this lens, especially the overuse/misuse by large corporations. Access to the productive (and safe) water resources should be prioritized for small scale food producers, including livestock and pastoralists. Expanding this mandate, also including extra-territorial obligations, will better underpin the transboundary implications of water resources (and water grabbing), and increase the obligations and safeguards for investment projects, specifically on TNCs.

We are happy to see that report contains good analysis of the problems associated with “de-coupling” water from land, and generally the lack of coherent governance between land and water. Land and water cannot be treated as separate sectors, and must have a balanced and complimentary rights-based approach in governance and policy at all levels.

Better policy coherence also aligns with agroecology, which the report strongly support, as it offers an alternative, more resource conscious method of food production, and also acknowledges indigenous methods of production.  We could welcome more specific information on the benefits of the agroecological approach in managing water resources, especially in areas that are not water rich.