**Evaluation of the Protracted Crises WG (PC WG)**

**& its Impact on the CFS Protracted Crises Process**

**Background**

The Civil Society Working Group on Protracted Crises was originally formed under the platform of the IPC Annual Meeting held in Rome in November 2003. It was proposed by APN and supported by NAFSO and a group of CSO affected by protracted crises .This group had spent a minimum of 7 years advocating , mobilizing and intervening in the different FAO and later CFS sessions on the issue of Food Insecurity in conflict situations. CSO helped transform this issue from "a taboo" into a priority matter of the CFS. The IPC WG came to coordinate the CSM work in relation to the CFS Protracted Crises Process. With over 90 members, the CSM PC WG has been deeply involved in the genuine participatory approach led by the Chairs, CFS Secretariat and CFS TST.

**The Process**

A multi-stakeholder Steering Committee (SC) was established for the CFS Protracted Crises Process consisting of representatives of the stakeholders on the CFS Advisory Group. Razan Zuayter, Coordination Committee member of the CSM, was the representative of the civil society. The main tasks of the Committee were to guide the organization of the High level expert forum (HLEF) on Protracted Crises as well as its follow up activities such as the preparation of the Agenda for Action. The CSM managed to introduce 2 speakers as well as 2 papers to the HLEF held in September 2012.

A CFS Technical Support Team (TST) was also formed, including two representatives from the CSM, Mr. Herman Kumara and Mariam Al jaajaa.

The CSM has developed a self-nominated CSM Technical Support Team to provide rapid and ongoing support to the CSO participants in both the Multi-stakeholder Steering Committee and the CFS Technical Support Team. With 14 members, the CSM Technical Support Team helped ensure sound communication and exchange of input between the CSM working group and the CFS Secretariat. The team had a balanced participation of people with experience from different protracted crisis contexts.

**CSM Impact on the Process**

CSM WG believes that it has impacted the Protracted Crises process to a great extent, bringing on board the opinions, convictions and felt needs of communities vulnerable to Protracted Crises from across the globe though their far reaching networks. Apart from helping to ground the Protracted Crisis in the broad context of real situations, members of the CSM WG have been extremely active in the PC CFS Process (through the SC, TST, and the OEWG) and has volunteered many hours to be able to incorporate CSO input in to the Agenda for Action. The During the process of developing the Draft Agenda of Action, most of the CSO demands were endorsed by the Chairs and the CFS Technical Committee, examples of which are in the table below:-

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| CSM demands | Current Situation |
| CSOs believe that a primary purpose of the Agenda for Action is to enable the implementation of existing CFS policy guidance in protracted crises and to honour existing humanitarian and human rights obligations. CSOs alerted the CFS Secretariat about the hesitation to speak about these obligations.  CSM proposed the mainstreaming of obligations throughout the document and the addition of a key introductory principle on compliance to obligations. | CSM proposals were accepted amongst of which:   1. Principle 1 on Compliance to existing obligations. 2. Mention of obligations in the Alignment section (para 19) |
| CSO called on the OEWG not to adopt "resilience" as the overarching framework as it does not include prevention, avoiding and absorbing underlying causes of crises and their re-occurrence. | Resilience is an important but no longer the over arching framework of the A4A.  Addressing underlying causes is mentioned many times including:   1. The purpose (Bullet 1 of Para 18) : "Address the underlying causes of food insecurity and malnutrition, build resilient livelihoods and food systems and meet immediate needs in protracted crisis situations;" 2. The Background and Rationale :    1. (Para 9) "The reasons for these limitations (ie. existing policies and actions) include: narrow scope of analysis (e.g. a failure to analyse historical trends, existing capacities and underlying causes)"    2. (Para 11)A transformation in policies and actions is needed to ensure a comprehensive approach to addressing food insecurity and malnutrition in protracted crises, which not only meets short-term, immediate food needs but also builds resilient livelihoods and food systems and addresses underlying causes. 3. The Introduction of the principles for action (Para 26) " The principles seek to transform current ways of doing things in order to address the underlying causes and effects of acute food insecurity;" |
| CSM insisted that the Initiatives and frameworks such as the New Deal and the Fragile States principles, which do not include all governments and the full range of stakeholders should be seen as having a different status in the Agenda for Action, And they should not be legitimised on block within the core A4A content. | These frameworks are no longer mentioned in the A4A main sections but rather in the appendices as examples / reference frameworks. |
| CSOs stressed the need of directing the A4A at all states and not only states suffering from crises, for the following reasons   * to prevent crises in countries at risk * to request all states to respect and abide by extra-territorial * obligations to protect displaced populations. | After a series of calls , "All governments at all levels" are now included in the audience. (Para 22) |
| CSM insisted that the A4A should also be directed at affected communities as a priority | "Food insecure protracted crisis-affected communities and affected populations" are at the top of the list of audience (Para 22) |
| CSM WG stressed that focus should be given to "small-scale food producers" and their access to all productive resources, not only land tenure. | Principle 5 amended to : "Safeguard the access and control of small-scale food producers and family farmers over productive assets and natural resources, promoting the stable and equitable governance of tenure of land and other natural resources before, during and when emerging from protracted crises. " |
| CSM has called on incorporating "transitional justice" processes to peace building as "peace building" is not comprehensive to ensure that crises do not reoccur. | Principle 6: " promote and integrate solutions for food security and nutrition into peace-building, transitional justice and governance related efforts. "  Principle 6 (ii) : "Peace-building, improved governance, reduced fragility and transitional justice related interventions and strategies at country, regional and global levels are crucial to emergence from protracted crisis" |

The CSM WG will remain steadfast in its commitment to ensure that the affected and marginalized sectors of society are represented in the A4A content and preparation processes. There are many issues that the CSM will continue fighting for including:-

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| CSM demands | Current Situation |
| Mainstreaming of Nutrition | There has been progress made on Nutrition as it is now mentioned every time Food Security is mentioned. CSM though will insist on incorporating Nutrition in the title as well as the examples of action and way forward section. |
| Some missing concepts –such as refugees and displaced persons | Refugees and IDPS are currently absent in the document- CSM will try and provide suggestions on how these gaps can be filled |
| Highlighting the urgency of compliance to extra-territorial obligations that have enormous impacts on food security on a national level | The Maastricht Principles, mentioned by the CSM WG was included in the Appendices. Further acknowledgement of extra-territorial obligations is needed within the core text. |
| CSOs believe that the Background and Rationale is lacking and does not sufficiently address the spectrum of protracted crises, but rather specific humanitarian crisis. Conflict, occupation and war have specific circumstances and impacts in terms of food security that must also be addressed in this document. | The CSM WG managed to include some examples in Appendix C on occupation and conflict but will ensure that the Agenda for Action is consistent with other CFS frameworks, such as the VGTLFF that have mentioned occupation as a type of a protracted crises situation . |
| The strengthening of the way forward section and the action orientation of the A4A | The A4A has come a long way but needs further work in taking in lessons learnt from the useful case studies shared and transforming them into actions proposed .  CSM has given three suggestions that it will insist on and will provide further suggestions in the coming meetings:  1-the development of an Inventory of Norms around Food and nutrition security in Protracted / as well as a policy reform tool kit that helps actors implement existing obligations and CFS frameworks.  3-Develop a civil society implementation kit |