

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Brussels 9 February 2010

Summaries of contributions to the Public Consultation on:

"Towards an EU policy framework to assist developing countries addressing agriculture and food security challenges"

This document does not present the official position of the European Commission. It is designed to sound out the views of interested parties. The suggestions contained in this document in no way prejudge either the form or the content of any future proposal by the European Commission.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the issues paper was to gather orientations and views from relevant stakeholders regarding the proposed rationale, scope, strategic objectives, approach and implementation of a food security policy framework for the EU. The public consultation ran from 16 November 2009 to 9 January 2010 and was open to all interested stakeholders. However, contributions received after this period have also been taken into account. 49 responses were received from Member States and their development cooperation counterparts, UN organisations, NGOs, trade unions, research centres, private companies and individuals. The list of respondents has been annexed to the paper.

This paper summarises and reflects most of the contributions sent by international organisations, institutions and individual persons who answered the questions and sometimes also sent general comments about the issues paper "Towards a EU policy framework to assist developing countries addressing agriculture and food security challenges".

Almost all respondents welcomed the European Commission consultation on the issues paper and the initiative for a new Communication on an EU Food Security Policy, considering it a relevant subject for EU interest.

The following twenty main conclusions from the consultation exercise express the general line as put forward by the (majority of) respondents:

- A clear vision and strong ambition by the EU on different dimensions of food security were expected.
- The Global Partnership on Food Security and Nutrition and the reformed Committee on Food Security (CFS) were seen as key to achieving improved global governance.
- The new Communication should build on good practices and lessons learned on policies and projects from the EC/EU and could possibly include a review of financial instruments.
- In terms of Policy Coherence for Development (PCD), the EC should ensure that its policies are coherent with food security objectives. It was seen as crucial that the EU ensures better coherence between its agricultural (CAP), trade (EPAs), fisheries (CFP) and development policies. Greater coordination and coherence is also needed between short-term humanitarian assistance and longer-term development policy.
- Most Member States agreed that better coordination and cooperation is needed within the EU and EC. It is believed that accelerating progress on the EU Code of Conduct on the Division of Labour would contribute to improved governance globally and in-country.
- Respondents had different views on the "whole of the EU approach". In any case better clarification is needed on the meaning of this approach and what role the EC and member states have in this regard.
- Respondents believed funding for food security should be delivered in line with country-led plans and in line with the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action on aid effectiveness. Policies, programmes and projects should always be context-specific taking into account the regional, national and local situations.
- Sustainable development and sustainable agricultural productions systems should be at the heart of the new food security policy, incorporating adaptation to and mitigation of climate change.
- Focus on inclusive rural development, recognising the broad scope of rural livelihoods including livestock, fisheries and forestry, the multi-functionality of agriculture, and the importance of diversification of income sources.

- The importance of bottom-up and community-based approaches with permanent and real participation of local communities, including the most vulnerable, was stressed. Vulnerable groups include HIV infected people, sick and disabled people, indigenous people, pastoralists, but also children and women.
- The important role of women in attaining food security should be acknowledged in the Communication.
- Many respondents favoured the adoption of a Right-to-Food approach to food security, ensuring that underlying causes of food insecurity are analysed and addressed, emphasising a participatory approach, focusing on the most vulnerable, and increasing responsibility and accountability of governments.
- Contributing to improved national policies on food security, including both availability and access to food, should be an important objective of the new EU policy framework. In some countries the EU can assist in developing land policies and implementing further legal land reforms to ensure equal land ownership and inheritance rights for women
- National and regional agriculture and food security policies should allow protection of vulnerable local food producers from destructive market forces.
- Food security policy and interventions should pay specific attention to the nutrition dimension which is the ultimate outcome of food security. There should be specific support for mother and child nutrition programmes. Moreover, nutritional objectives and indicators could be developed for agricultural and food security projects and programmes.
- Addressing and supporting social protection and safety net schemes in agriculture, nutrition and food security programmes was seen as critical to increase access to food. In addition, supporting employment generation programmes, particularly for the most vulnerable, and diversifying income sources, should form a key part of EU development policy on food security.
- The Communication should pay due attention to supporting knowledge and innovation systems, including agricultural research and extension services.
- A significant number of respondents argued for a discouragement of export restrictions as a way to restrict price volatility.
- Most respondents indicated that international and regional food reserves will be difficult if not impossible to manage. Regionally coordinated national food reserves were suggested as an option, but most emphasis was placed on national and local level reserves as instruments to mitigate the effects of crises.
- Building resilience of rural communities was seen as the best way to mitigate the impact of food crises, to be complemented by early warning systems, reserves, safety nets and insurance.

The following sections give detailed information on the answers provided to the thirty-four specific questions of the consultation exercise. The questions and answers follow the same order as in the Issues Paper.

WHAT RATIONALE FOR AN EU POLICY ON AGRICULTURE AND FOOD SECURITY IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES?

1. Do you see other drivers that could justify the development of an EU policy on agriculture and food security and which could need to be addressed in the policy?

Many different drivers have been mentioned - these include:

- EU (EC and member states) policies and the need for policy coherence. Especially the CAP and EPAs were mentioned by numerous respondents as having negative impacts on food security in many developing countries.
- Several respondents pointed towards the imbalances in the global food systems and the need to target smallholder farmers.
- Various respondents acknowledged food security and its relations with economic growth, poverty reduction and (human) development as an important driver. Also food security and its links with political stability, fragile states and recurrent emergencies were mentioned by some respondents.
- A considerable number of respondents pointed out various factors that have an important impact on food security and should be considered in the new communication such as: energy, land issues, climate change and related disasters, migration, urbanisation, demographic trends, the financial and the food crises.
- Different respondents mentioned the need for sustainable development and/or sustainable agriculture to address food insecurity.
- It has also been mentioned by several respondents that more attention could be paid to nutritional factors. Nutrition should receive a prominent place in the new communication.
- Other drives that were introduced by the respondents include: respecting the right to food, economic growth in developing countries (Brazil, China etc), the MDG review, and potential changes in consumption patterns towards more sustainable consumption.

2. In your view, which are the main strengths and weaknesses of the current European Community/EU Member States' action in the areas of agriculture and food security?

Strengths:

- It has been brought up by many contributors that the EU is recognised as lead donor in agriculture, rural development and food security in terms of resources and in terms of experience. The Food Facility is also seen as very positive in this regard.
- Some contributors refer to the EC using several instruments in the field of food security as strength. There is the Food Facility, Food Security Thematic Programme and there is budget support in these fields, for example.
- Another main strength which was mentioned by some contributors is that the EU/EC is an active actor in promoting policy coherence.

Weaknesses:

- Many contributors referred to current actions, instruments and policies of the EU and EC in the field of agriculture and food security lacking coherence, coordination and links. Mostly the EPAs and CAP have been mentioned but also fisheries policy, biofuel and food assistance vs. development, but also reporting systems for example.
- Many civil society organisations have mentioned that the duration of EU projects, project objectives and regulations are not consistent. It has also been mentioned that instruments lack flexibility and complementarity to address complex situations.

- Some contributors stated bureaucracy as a weakness which might hinder success in objectives.
- Declining ODA for agriculture and rural development in past decades and lack of funding for food security and agricultural development has been referred to by many civil society organisations as a weakness.
- Civil society organisations have also mentioned that the EC has not been engaged and visible enough in questions relating to the global governance of food security.
- It has also been pointed out by few contributors that in recent times actions have mainly been in the domain of short-term humanitarian activities, relief and emergency support to the detriment of actions in the medium to longer term.
- Another weakness which was brought up by a contributor is the bias towards agriculture in current thinking, not all dimensions of food security would get equal emphasis. Another contributor mentioned for example that there is a lack of attention for the situation of rural households (and the urban poor) whose income and diet is not primarily linked to own production. The EU would also seem to have a narrow view of what constitutes an emergency, excluding for example high rates of malnutrition.
- Some NGOs have identified a lack of adequate consultation or mechanisms enabling true participation in particular of civil society as a weakness.

3. What advantages/disadvantages do you see in a "whole of the Union" policy on agriculture and food security compared to the current European Community/EU Member States policy frameworks and compared to existing global/regional policy frameworks?

25. Do you agree that a "whole of the EU" approach could enhance the effectiveness of the EU actions to address current developing countries' challenges in agriculture production and food security?

Answers to these questions will be summarised together as in both the questions and answers there is some overlap and the same issues have been repeatedly mentioned.

Potential advantages that have been introduced by many respondents:

- Increased effectiveness and impact
- Increased coherence and harmonisation
- Reduced fragmentation of aid
- Platform for dialogue and cooperation
- Facilitation of division of labour
- Working with the EU can become more efficient (mentioned by some civil society organisations)

Potential disadvantages that have been mentioned:

- Reduces opportunities for diversity of approaches
- Weakened agenda for ODA and development policy was mentioned by civil society
- Justification to hide a decline of ODA was also mentioned by civil society organisations

At this moment there seems to be no agreement on having a "whole of the Union" policy and approach. Several member states and their technical cooperation counterparts have mentioned that there should be flexibility in the framework especially with regard to the activities of individual states which should not be limited. It has been mentioned that the concept is insufficiently designed yet and more clarification is still needed on what this would mean

practically. Some mentioned that it is too early to have such an approach or policy already and others mentioned that it can be first designed at a rather general level. It could be determined by a set of overarching principles for example. After learning from experiences it can be further developed to contain more detailed guidelines.

In contradiction to the member states and their technical cooperation counterparts there seems to be some civil society platforms and organisations that see the "whole of the Union" policy and/or as a serious threat to ODA and development. In general, all respondents seem to agree that more coordination and cooperation should take place within the EU and EC also for policy coherence. Some respondents mentioned cooperation and coordination should also take place with other actors and countries such as the US and BRIC. It has been mentioned by many of the respondents that the approach should be aligned with the ongoing debate on global governance and build on existing global, regional and national processes. It has been mentioned by some respondents that the EU should support the reformed CFS for example and the Global Partnership for Agriculture, Food Security and Nutrition. It has moreover been mentioned that the EC could have an important role in coordinating EU donors. The framework should also be more specific as to what extent it would like to do this.

4. Which European policy/set of policies could the EU build upon in order to support regional integration responses to food production challenges in developing countries?

- Policy Coherence for Development has been mentioned by many respondents. In this regard the CAP and EPAs also need to be reformed.
- Advancing African Agriculture (AAA) has been stated as a good policy to build upon.
- It has been cited by many respondents that the EU should actively support existing and emerging global, regional and national initiatives. CAADP, ECOWAS and COMESA have been mentioned as examples. Agriculture could also receive a prominent place in Regional Indicative Programmes in which it has not been a major feature to date.
- Supporting small-scale farmers has been mentioned by many respondents, it is important to increase their market access through different measures.
- Supporting sustainable/biodiverse agricultural systems was also mentioned by several respondents.
- Some civil society organisations recalled supporting land reform policies.
- Investing more in agriculture and rural development has been mentioned by some civil society organisations.

Many civil society organisations based their answer for this question on the IAASTD study. This study has not been referred to in the issues paper but according to some respondents it highlights many of the current issues and solutions in the food security debate.

Question 5: Do you think that rights-based approaches to food security could be an added value in the redefinition of the EU approach to agriculture and food security? If so, please explain why and how these approaches could be operationalised.

None of the respondents have an objection against the adoption of the rights-based approach to food and most of the respondents saw the added value of such an approach.

- Underlying causes of hunger, malnutrition, and food insecurity can be better analysed and addressed.
- Emphasises a participatory approach, builds capacity and empowers.
- Ensures focus on most vulnerable, marginalised and poorest.
- Increases responsibility and accountability of governments.

It has been mentioned by many respondents that the Right to Food Guidelines provides a useful framework for action that can guide governments in policy and programmes. Some respondents underlined that the right to food should be at the centre of the framework and that the EU should advocate implementation at national level.

According to the Special Rapporteur on the right to food, states should adopt framework legislation as part of a national strategy ensuring that the right to food is justiciable before national courts. It ensures that governmental bodies are held accountable, that the right to food is at the centre of national development strategies, and that the position of countries in negotiations related to trade or investment are strengthened. In addition, it is important that targets and benchmarks are set for accountability. Decisions, rules, regulations and criteria utilised in the implementation of policies and programmes should be transparent.

INCREASING AVAILABILITY OF FOOD

6. Based on your experience which actions could be promoted in short, medium and long term to foster food supply, and which actions could be promoted at global, regional and national levels? In particular at regional level what do you think the role of agricultural policies/strategies should be and how best could the European Commission and EU Member States support them?

Short term actions:

- Facilitating rapid access to basic inputs adapted to local conditions (seeds, fertilizers, tools, equipment, etc.) of smallholder farmers. These initiatives should be based on “productive safety nets” and on direct cash and input transfers to the most vulnerable smallholder farmers.
- Facilitating access to rural financial/credit systems by smallholder farmers.
- Implementing home, school and community gardens.
- Investing in local food purchase programmes involving smallholder farmers.
- Investing in simple, low-cost and small-scale storage facilities and schemes and in techniques and equipment for food processing and conservation.
- In times of crises, the EU should provide food assistance based on a transparent needs assessment of the most vulnerable groups, linked to livelihood programs, and in a form that is culturally appropriate.

Medium term actions:

- Investing in training, capacity building and farmer-to-farmer exchange programmes.
- Investing in urban agriculture.
- Mapping of food deficit areas and making the information available.
- Implementing early warning systems at local and national levels.
- Facilitating access to crop insurance services.
- Providing market and price information, both for inputs and agricultural products.
- Investing in rural and agricultural infrastructures rehabilitation.
- Promoting access to land and land tenure programmes at local/national level.
- Replicating/application of research findings which showed positive results.
- Sustainable investment in agriculture and livestock systems and enhance productivity.

Long term actions:

- Supporting low income countries to develop food security policies and strategies.
- Improving agricultural services.
- Investing in soil conservation and rehabilitation schemes to restore soil fertility.

- Investing in sustainable natural resource management.
- Investing in agricultural research.

Actions at global level:

- Moving forward with the Global Partnership for Agriculture, Food Security and Nutrition (GPAFSN) with the leadership of the regions in the South.
- The GPAFSN should establish objectives and recommendations covering all policies impacting on food security (i.e. trade, agriculture, energy, climate change) and contribute to enhancing stakeholder coordination.
- Eliminate developed country agricultural subsidies and tariffs in Doha Round negotiations.
- Address and follow consensus and principles of the Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda for Action (AAA) towards enhancing aid effectiveness to agriculture and food security.
- Regulate the market and stakeholders. This means to firmly fight against price volatility and speculation in agricultural commodities. Stocks at local, national, and international levels should be used to regulate market prices in order to enhance access to food.
- Activities of the large companies that control large parts of the agro-food world should be better regulated in their countries and abroad. A fairer system of production, consumption and distribution of power should be promoted for the benefit of small local producers.
- Develop strict regulations regarding land grabbing in the South by financial institutions and agribusiness.

Actions at regional level:

- Removing regional barriers to agricultural trade and strengthening South-South cooperation in agriculture. EU should also support the CAADP process.
- Support regional integration beyond trade.

Actions at national level:

- The EU should support demand-driven policies. Political support should be developed in poor countries in order to invest in local smallholder agriculture.
- Guaranteeing budgetary priority to the agricultural and rural sectors to stimulate agricultural growth and job creation in order to promote sustainable development.
- Ensure coherence of the food security project activities with broader priorities of regional policy and regulatory frameworks, e.g. UEMOA, ECOWAS, EAC, SADC.
- Emphasis should be given to building local/national capacity.
- Support reform and strengthening of agricultural services along the value chain.
- Promotion of agriculture in a more systemic way, focusing less on individual components (crops, livestock, etc.) and more on variety of eco-systems.
- Support development of sustainable indigenous institutions in agriculture and rural development.
- Promote farmer organisations to play their role in policy formulation, decision making and evaluation and in providing services to their members, particularly related to access to advisory services and input and output markets.
- Support to networking and partnerships for exchange, learning, synergies and reciprocal support at local, national, regional and international levels regarding research, extension, agricultural training and farmer organisations and input and output market stakeholders.
- Provide support for the development of public-private partnerships, contract farming, and agro-based clusters.
- Strengthen monitoring relevant for policy making and investment decisions.

- In the longer run, investment in rural infrastructure must be increased in developing countries and this is where the European Commission could play a large role.
- Policies need to ensure water rights for the poorest people.

7. What role do you see, if any, for the EU development policy to contribute to increased food production in developing countries and the availability of food (directly and/or indirectly)? And how could animal and plant health best be integrated in all pillars of food security policies and strategies?

Suggestions for plant health integration:

- Plant health requires research efforts and transformation of results into extension messages.
- Support capacity building to ensure adequacy of legislation, enforcement and appropriate surveillance as well as health control systems.
- There is a growing range of technical options, many supported by research in EU labs and research centres, for biological intensification of productivity in the short and medium term. EU-funded regional programmes have already demonstrated the effectiveness and impact of Farmer Field Schools in empowering rural communities to adapt their production systems through ecosystem management. This approach should be expanded.

Suggestions for animal welfare integration:

- Prevention of animal diseases is important for safeguarding human health.
- Animal health also has an important bearing on many of the poor people's livelihoods and food security, particularly in pastoralist systems.
- The EU could support initiatives towards regulation of disease control aspects. It should support on-going initiatives at the animal health front such as "One World One Health".
- Availability of, access to and quality of veterinary drugs is a major issue and needs to be addressed. New ways of organising veterinary services need to be developed since government's capacity to provide adequate services has deteriorated in many countries.

8. Which, in your views, are the main policy constraints and opportunities in developing domestic/regional trade markets in developing countries, in particular for south-south integration? Do you consider that the EU should play a role in such development and if so, which one?

- Despite existing regional trade agreements in Africa and the commitment of the African Union to create an African Common Market, there are significant agricultural trade barriers between countries. The EU could have a significant role in encouraging countries to implement regional trade agreements and to provide technical assistance funding for trade facilitation and standards development targeted at smallholders. The level of public sector confidence in regional food markets should be increased. And domestic demand for locally produced or processed food should be strengthened. Private sector investment should be encouraged and made favourable. It should also be recognised by the EU that EPAs are in conflict with prioritising and sequencing of local and regional market building.

9. How to address pastoralism in this context?

- Recognize pastoralism in policy documents and address pastoralists in a direct and consistent way.
- The EU should view pastoralists as significant economic actors with potential to build local adaptive capacity to climate change.

- Recognise importance of the livestock sector and its potential for export development and economic growth.
- Secure pastoralist control of and access to pastures and water in order to maximise the productivity of livestock. New tenure legislation is recommended which recognises land rights of pastoralists.
- Reversing land degradation in grasslands through improved soil management would contribute to enhancing food and feed productivity, reduce risks to drought and flood and improve livestock-based livelihoods. The EU has a large experience in grasslands that could be expanded to other areas.
- Improve rural infrastructure and market access for pastoralists.
- Provide complementary and alternative livelihoods for pastoralist groups.
- Particular attention should be given concerning the situation of women who suffer from multiple forms of discrimination.

IMPROVING ACCESS TO FOOD

10. How could the dimensions of access to food be better integrated in European Commission/EU Member States' assistance programmes?

- Many respondents stressed the need for better dialogue and coordination between the authorities responsible for humanitarian aid and development aid. There should also be greater coherence between policies and cooperation programmes of EU delegations and of Member States, in the areas of food security, development, trade, climate change, etc.
- The EU, in its policy dialogue, should encourage partner countries to take the different dimensions of food access into account. Importance was stressed concerning bottom-up and community based approaches.
- Development of inter-sectoral social protection policies would enable the EC to pay more attention to social protection and safety net systems development, both through policy dialogue at country level around budget support and through bilateral programming.
- It is necessary to assist small-scale farmers and rural communities to uphold at least a basic level of subsistence production for own consumption and consider support to diversification of the household economy into non-farm income. Participation of farmer communities, organisations and networks of rural communities in monitoring and supervision of public policies is crucial to guarantee access.
- Support was highlighted for the regional dimension of access to food. Regional and sub-national actors can identify vulnerable groups and are better placed to implement national or regional programmes. Twinning EU Member states with countries in the region in the field of agricultural development was suggested as it could improve productivity by adopting advanced technologies.
- There appears to be consensus on generating food reserves, mainly at local level, in particular in order to supply schools and vulnerable populations at high risk. Access to food should be complemented with access to and control over resources like seeds, water, technology or credit which are essential for food production.
- Regarding the improvement of market governance at the macroeconomic level, the EU was criticised of maintaining preferential treatment for its own production over the production of developing countries. There were also some arguments in favour of food sovereignty as the basis for growing food for subsistence, for the local market and for trade.

11. Which could be the priority areas for action at national/regional and international level to improve physical access to food?

- It was underlined that the EU should support the integration of national and cross-border markets in developing countries by supporting the development of national – rural and urban – infrastructure (transport and communication, supply chains, storage facilities, etc.). A priority area could be to favour improved food storage and ensure an efficient distribution system to alleviate any crisis in the future. International focus should be on investment in rural infrastructure and access to inputs such as seeds and fertilizer.
- It was also argued that in order to improve food access and food security it is necessary to modernise smallholder agriculture through commercialisation, introduction of value adding technologies, and strengthened linkages with other actors in strategically important food value chains. Farmer organisations and cooperatives need greater strengthening in order to build social capital, reduce transaction costs, develop agro-enterprise skills and mitigate risks
- There was consensus that many developing countries need to implement land reform policies to divide ownership more equitably so that tenants and landless workers can have access to land. Some countries need to implement further legal reforms to ensure equal land ownership and inheritance rights for women.
- Most respondents agreed on the need for preparation of regional strategies, including food reserves, establishing inter-regional strategic frameworks for commodity exchange and avoiding trade restrictions. Furthermore, EU policy should support national governments to develop a conducive policy environment for private sector development in rural areas. At the international level, it was suggested to improve trade policies and create market opportunities, by enhancing coordination and partnerships. There was again a strong call for reasserting the primacy of agricultural and food policies over EU trade policies.
- Early warning systems/Disaster Risk Reduction should also be developed at local, national and regional levels with participation of the communities.

12. How can donors, and in particular the European Commission/EU Member States, address most effectively the social dimension of access to food?

- It was agreed by all that addressing and supporting social protection and safety net actions and schemes in agriculture, nutrition and food security programmes is critical to increase access to food from a social aspect. In addition, supporting employment generation programmes should form a key part of EU development policy.
- Many respondents found that the most effective way for donors to deal with the social dimension of access to food is by prioritising education and school feeding programmes - it combats malnutrition and has proven to be one of the best ways to ensure education.
- The point which was most raised was to ensure effective mainstreaming and recognition of rights for women and children (and HIV/AIDS patients) as the most vulnerable. The EU should invest in empowering women and increase women's access to land ownership, water, and to other natural resources, sanitation and other services, financing and technology, and recognise women's work within the family and the different economic initiatives that they are engaged in. The EU should also invest in the improvement of gender specific statistical information.
- Social protection, nutrition and health monitoring must form a critical part of any strategy for sustainable access to food. There should be support for mother and child nutrition programmes, focusing on specific nutritious food products distributed to women. Food assistance could be provided in the form of grants or food stamps and subsidies for small

farmers to purchase inputs and equipment. This short-term assistance should be integrated into a longer-term development framework.

- It was stressed that support should be given to programmes that support household capacities to cope with shocks. Social protection assists through reducing both the risk and vulnerability to shocks and stresses.
- In addition, there was strong agreement that land rights issues should be analysed. In order to address this, policy coherence from the EU is necessary: trade agreements between the EU, or EU-based companies and developing country governments or local communities must not lead to the alienation of local communities from agricultural land.
- Other comments included support for genetically modified crops because they are more resistant to pests, weeds, insects and parasites, which allow better crops and reduce the need for pesticides. Yields could also be increased by ensuring that farmers have access to seeds, fertilizers, machinery, technology, credit and markets. This could be done through increased public sector investment in agriculture and general infrastructure, and developed countries to increase their development assistance to developing countries. On the other hand, the need to develop long-term socially and environmentally sustainable food supply chains that could improve access to food was underlined.
- It was also argued that the food industry has a role to play and this can be done by promoting partnerships. Powerful examples are the Global Alliance to Improved Nutrition (GAIN) and the World Food Programme (WFP).

13. How could the EU contribute to improving the governance of food markets in developing countries?

- EU trade and agricultural policies were heavily criticised. Increasing importance was given to the potential of intra-African trade and regional market building. The EU should support actions to reduce trade barriers on the import and export of food regionally, particularly in Africa. This will require a certain protection level for small farmers, stimulating farmer organisations and extension services under the auspices of the Ministry of Agriculture.
- It is also crucial that the EU ensures better coherence between its agricultural policy (CAP), its trade policy (EPAs) and its development policy. More flexibility towards food markets and access to inputs in the developing world could be promoted by the EU to improve governance. The EU should also look at the regulation of global food chains as social and environmental standards are often lowered to gain competitive advantages.
- On the other hand, the EU can contribute by supporting developing countries to set up the appropriate democratic policies, laws, regulations, norms or even codes of conduct for the private sector. It is also possible to strengthen the national agricultural sector by strengthening systems for the enforcement of standards, for example on measurements and quality, and supporting policy harmonisation and rationalisation across borders.
- It was emphasised that the EU should contribute in strengthening farmers' and local organisations to build constituencies and raise the "voice" of the most vulnerable in the governance of the food systems. Improved governance of food markets in developing countries must lead smallholders to having fair and open access to markets. It was also suggested that, with specific reference to the declaration of the 2009 World Summit on Food Security held in Rome, WTO-consistent measures aimed at creating incentives for smallholder farmers in developing countries to invest in increased productivity and enabling them to compete on a more equal footing in agricultural markets should be put in place.

- The EU must firmly support mechanisms for stabilising prices of basic food materials and oversight bodies that allow avoiding speculative excesses. Governments must be enabled to govern their local markets, using the appropriate combination of subsidies and other measures. There should also be mechanisms to create incentives for local production and reduce the dependency on imports, particularly on imports of goods that previously were produced locally, or that are now sold at a significant price increase.

IMPROVING QUALITY AND ENSURING APPROPRIATE UTILISATION OF FOOD

14. In your view, what policies and approaches could be developed by donors in particular the European Commission/EU Member States to improve the prevention and management of malnutrition?

- Nutrition security is the ultimate aim of food security. Agricultural programmes, as well as health interventions, safety net interventions, water, sanitation and hygiene programmes should be nutrition sensitive and their impact on the nutritional status of the most vulnerable adequately monitored. It is important to set up effective nutrition surveillance mechanisms to detect nutritional problems and to identify the most vulnerable.
- Support should be given to countries to formulate adequate national health and nutrition policies and help set up coordination mechanisms between the sectors of agriculture, health, education, social protection.
- The agricultural sector has to focus on the cultivation of the right crops, the utilisation of the right seed varieties, on the basis of consumption patterns, and the composition of the local diets. Family agriculture and farmers' livelihoods need to be strengthened and diversified. Research can help in developing adequate locally adapted crops and plants which serve nutritional needs of vulnerable populations. The number of agricultural extension workers has to be increased. These should promote biodiversity, cultivation of nutritious crops, pulses, fruits and plants and include nutrition education. The promotion of home and school gardens can provide the necessary micronutrients.
- Natural resources, like for instance forests, constitute the base of subsistence for people in developing countries. Through adequate governance and preservation of these natural resources, "safety nets" are available to these populations.
- Health services need to contribute to adequate nutrition by distributing supplementary productions, such as vitamin A and therapeutic zinc. Preventive measures are more cost-effective than treatment of malnutrition. Nutrition programmes have to target, in particular, pregnant women and children under two as the most severe damages occur during this period of time and are no longer reversible. Community based education programmes need to sensitise mothers about adequate caring practices, hygiene and promote exclusive breastfeeding. This can prevent infants from serious infectious diseases.
- Food assistance programmes have to include the right compositions of micronutrients, fats and proteins. Local production of supplementary foods needs to be encouraged.

15. How could nutritional components best be integrated in other pillars of food security policies and strategies?

- Nutrition objectives have to be included in Poverty reduction strategies and UN Development Assistance frameworks and mainstreamed in other policies. The High Level Task Force (HLTF) could provide methodological support to different stakeholders at

national levels and help policy makers to carry out mainstreaming. Programmes may not be detrimental to the achievement of nutrition objectives. The EU should demonstrate leadership for a stronger global governance of Food Security and Nutrition and encourage relevant actors to come together. Strategic funding for interventions targeting children under 5 should be available and access to free basic health care for children under 5 and pregnant women promoted. Special attention needs to be given to farmers affected by HIV as they have specific nutritional requirements.

16. How could the EU better target chronic malnutrition? How could the European Commission better address the vicious cycle linking malnutrition to ill health and impaired individual growth and loss in productivity?

- The multi-causality of nutrition problems have to be tackled in a comprehensive manner. The ones to be targeted are the most marginalised and disadvantaged groups, mainly women and children. Community based interventions need to be scaled up in the countries with the highest burden of malnutrition. The Lancet series has identified a number of (cost-) effective interventions. These include distribution of nutrition products that prevent or treat malnutrition, including the promotion of exclusive breastfeeding and maternal education on adequate caring practices. This needs to be complemented by women's empowerment that allows an optimal intra-household distribution and use of resources.
- Support needs to be provided for the development of coordinated, integrated public health and food security programmes, based on adequate data made available through nutrition surveillance programmes and clinical records. The political will both within countries and globally has to be strengthened. Experience has shown that this is best achieved when dedicated nutrition champions are in place. The UN inter-agency approach REACH was seen as an example of coordinated efforts.

17. How could a smoother shift from nutrition in emergency situations to post-crisis and development situations be ensured?

- Institutions need to be built up and strengthened that design, plan and implement emergency projects. A lot more work needs to be done on disaster preparedness and disaster risk management, strengthening people's resilience. This could be supported by a better in-depth understanding of people's livelihood systems. A further necessary mechanism is integrated early warning systems, complemented by timely and effective needs assessments.
- Emergency food assistance responses should integrate a long term food security perspective from the beginning. The UN twin-track approach integrates immediate and short term food assistance and long term food security approaches. Local and regional purchases have to be part of this approach. To facilitate purchases from small farmers, the EC tendering and purchasing regulations and procedures have to be adapted.
- National and international coordination bodies and strong political leadership on nutrition are indispensable. A Task Force on Nutrition can be appointed to work out plans for nutrition.
- The agricultural sector needs to be integrated in the approach, by providing adequate agricultural inputs, putting in place appropriate extension services, reaching equitable land distribution, ensuring access to water. Safety nets, such as school feeding should be in place that can be temporarily scaled up when needed.
- It has been mentioned that at the moment little funding is available for transition situations and multi-sectoral responses. Funding mechanisms are not flexible enough to respond

adequately to fast changing circumstances.

18. How could a multisectoral response to nutrition be operationalised at national and international level? Which could be in your view the main challenges to such operationalisation?

- The global nutrition architecture is ineffective at the moment. A number of regional and international mechanisms have been put in place which could be used as a basis. To ensure an effective multi-sectoral response three layers should be in place: 1) a Plan of Action, 2) an institution to oversee programmes and take responsibility for them and 3) a monitoring and evaluation system. This needs to be backed by strong political leadership. EC delegations in third countries could take on this role.
- Multi-sectoral responses should include targeted direct interventions, such as supplementary feeding products, government controlled food distribution systems which are based on a government-community partnership mechanism, including local procurement from farmers, local production of malnutrition treatment products, hygiene and parasite control, referral systems, conditional cash transfers. International agencies should carry out joint assessments to identify gaps, to improve targeting of vulnerable populations, as well as geographical targeting. Equally, joint monitoring systems have to be in place, utilising common indicators. Access to quality water may not be forgotten. And in the agricultural sector small livestock, poultry, aquaculture and horticulture can effectively contribute to improving the nutrition status of people.

CRISIS PREVENTION, PEPAEDNESS, AND MANAGEMENT

19. How could the impacts of crises be mitigated at national and household levels?

- Most respondents stressed the crucial importance of supporting the resilience of rural producers and communities as a basic condition to mitigate the effects of food crises. This implies supporting livelihood strategies aimed at increasing community coping capacities and involves an emphasis on diversified sources of income, also covering non-food productive assets and activities. The need to focus on the local level and on local adaptive capacities was a common remark, building on existing local approaches/community based strategies such as adaptive approaches to water resources management, food security and disaster risk reduction and wider natural resource management strategies. Moreover, on the whole, a shift is needed from the predominantly reactive emergency response to building capacities of local populations to anticipate and plan for risks beforehand.
- Also common among the replies was the view that rural resilience needs to be based on enhanced food production by smallholder farmers through sustainable agriculture, supported through appropriate government and donor policies.
- Moreover, many respondents stressed the need for the EC to support the development of national strategies that incorporate adaptation, disaster risk reduction, humanitarian assistance and development, in coordination with other stakeholders. The need to advance implementation of the EU strategy on Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) was mentioned occasionally.
- Again, the importance of the local and national levels was stressed: mitigation activities need to be embedded at the ground level, backed by a well planned comprehensive strategy, based on sound analysis of local conditions and the root causes of food insecurity in the area. Also in implementation better coordination was called for between the agendas, actors and existing policies on food security, food assistance, DRR, climate

change adaptation, social protection, natural resource management, and poverty reduction, within the EU, and also with other donors, the UN, Government Ministries, civil society, and the private sector. Suggestions were made to strengthen capacities of cross-cutting institutional set-ups, such as inter-ministerial committees, national platforms on Disaster Risk Reduction or Food Security Task Forces.

- Many respondents also mentioned that appropriate early warning systems would mitigate the effects of crises. However, it was also recognised that linking information and operation, i.e. converting an early warning into concrete action, has been a constant challenge. The information generated by an early warning does not automatically help those in need of assistance, because the information systems have been designed for the central administration or donors. Many respondents therefore stressed the importance of community-based early warning mechanisms (e.g. with information on child nutrition) or at least a strong community-link.
- Social transfers and safety nets were generally seen as essential complementary ways to mitigate the impact of crises at household level. Such safety nets protect and preserve human assets and can take the form of cash or food transfers, productive investment (through food- or cash-for-work, nutrition and education). It is important to build on existing instruments and to strengthen them, and develop strong targeting methodologies, as well as clearly defined exit strategies. The approaches need to be context-specific, e.g. it was mentioned that cash transfers can be a cost-effective means of mitigating food shortages where financial access is a constraint rather than the market availability, and where conditions of good general security exist. Food subsidies and insurance instruments (to insure against the risk of crop failure) are other choices.
- Finally, it was also mentioned by some that, along with a crisis response, the longer-term goals for increased sustainable production and improved early warning and rapid response systems should be integrated. This would for instance apply to crises caused by transboundary pests and diseases.

20. Do you think that specific instruments could be developed to prevent the volatility of food prices? If so, which could be in your view the most effective for that purpose?

21. What policies and instruments could be put in place, by who (donors, beneficiaries?) and at which level (international, regional, national?) to prevent and mitigate food crisis?

- In general, reactions favoured enhanced investments in the prevention of crises, in risk management and in early warning, and stressed the need to take more decisive action based on the information provided by such alerts. In this connection, enhanced investments in agriculture, directed to small scale farmers and sector support services, would be needed including strengthening the capacities of farmer organisations and agricultural trade unions. More investment should also be made towards developing social security systems of developing countries on a long-term basis.
- With respect to food price volatility, a number of direct and indirect factors were highlighted as important in containing the level of volatility: reducing supply volatility; agricultural research and development; improvements to the functioning of agricultural land, labour and capital markets; strengthening post-harvest storage and improving management and coordination of public stocks in cooperation with local communities, national governments and regional organisations; improving transparency, reliability and timeliness of data on public and private reserve levels; discouragement of speculative investments in food commodities; facilitation of market-based price risk management; agricultural trade reforms and initiatives to reduce the prevalence of export

bans/restrictions. Caution with respect to bio-energy programmes was also called for, limiting the demand of food crops for biofuel production.

- While it was generally recognised that a certain level of volatility can not be avoided and that market interference at global levels to prevent or substantially lower market price volatility would not be cost-effective, the various measures suggested would make it less likely that the conditions for a spike might arise, would reduce the size and duration of a price spike; and reduce its impact. Moreover, there are several instruments and strategies to manage country exposure to shocks and relevant risks, to insure against the impact of shocks, and to manage relevant market risks.
- Most respondents argued that price volatility should best be managed at national levels, using a combination of instruments, including food reserves, market-based warehouse receipt systems, price controls, market-based price and weather risk instruments (insurance, options, futures), and border instruments. Many also referred to the need for effective (national/regional) early warning systems, institutionalised as part of (national/regional) disaster risk management institutions. Early warning systems (linking weather data with nutritional information and market prices) should be better informed by community-level monitoring, as the real indicators of food insecurity are felt by communities long before peak crises.
- With respect to trade instruments, measures that protect small-scale producers and strategic agricultural (sub)sectors were mentioned several times as beneficial for food security, while avoiding those trade measures (like export bans) that could exacerbate the price peaks. Others mentioned that facilitating and stimulating trade in food staple crops, particularly at regional level, would be the most important measure to counter price volatility.
- At international levels, a number of respondents mentioned the need to limit speculation in food products through tighter regulatory measures on financial investments in commodity index funds that could drive up food prices. Others disagreed with the disruptive effect of speculation, citing that little evidence was found on the influence of speculation on the 2007/08 food price crisis. In general, most respondents saw merit in improved world information systems, including on monitoring of prices, harvest predictions and reserves for basic food products.

22. Do you think regionally or globally managed food stocks – physical or virtual – would be a useful alternative for national level stocks? How could such supra-national stocks be managed?

- On the appropriateness of using regional and international food stocks as an alternative for national level stocks, the views differed, but were generally negative. On the other hand, all respondents were positive about the usefulness of national and local level stocks to play a role in the mitigation of the effects of food crises.
- Arguments against regional and international reserves are related to the costs of buying and storing food, the difficulty of timely rotation of stocks and avoidance of waste, the problems of agreeing to an effective governance structure and location of reserves, the vulnerability to corruption, and to problems of transport to crisis areas.
- Views differed on regional stocks. Some cited problems of management and governance as arguments against regional stocks. Others argued that in circumstances where national grain reserves are inappropriate, regional reserves could be established, particularly in regions with strong economic integration, but that the development of regional reserves needs to be related to the development of regional agricultural and food policies since decisions related to food reserve levels should be directly linked to price and production levels. Moreover, in regions that include several countries that are prone to regular,

protracted or repeated food insecurity (e.g. Eastern Africa, Southern Africa), regional food stocks might make sense in terms of cost-efficiency and speed of response to a crisis or disaster.

- Reactions were unanimously supportive of national and local food reserves. To be effective and rapidly distributed in case of crisis, stocks need to be as near as possible to the location of need. A number of respondents argued that well managed national reserves, possibly combined with other policies (trade, fiscal - e.g. lowering VAT on basic foodstuffs), can play an important role in reducing price volatility and can also be used for food distribution to vulnerable populations. Moreover, domestic procurement of food for these reserves can greatly benefit local farmers. Building stocks at the harvest time can support local markets and farmers' incomes and limit the common collapse of prices after the harvest in most developing countries. Released at times of higher prices, during the lean season, stocks will then buffer price increase in the long term. Additionally, more investment in post-harvest storage technologies is needed to support household and community level reserves.
- A number of respondents indicated that physical reserves could be combined with financial reserves for the procurement of food and that attention should be given to innovative instruments – such as purchase options guaranteeing capped or fixed prices for food imports.
- With respect to virtual stocks, few responses were received. Most respondents to the question considered the virtual stock idea as not viable and/or addressing a problem that does not appear to exist - the proposal rests on the hypothesis that speculation in future markets affect spot prices, but a review of the various potential mechanisms whereby speculation might have distorted markets suggests scepticism that speculators played a significant causal role in the price spikes of 2007/08. Others indicated that implementing a virtual global strategic reserve could be beneficial for States facing an emergency that can acquire food at a reasonable and, predictable price.
- Finally, it was suggested to establish (regional) information systems on (national) food stocks, to follow the food situation in different countries, as a realistic alternative for supra-national stocks.

AREAS OF INTERVENTION

23. Do you think that other areas of intervention could/should be included?

- Most respondents agreed on the four areas in the issues paper and suggested additional points and other areas of intervention to be included. In general all of these points have been mentioned already in the summaries of the respondents' answers to the questions above.

24. Based on your experience how would you see a reformed international governance system? Which reform options that are currently under discussion do you think could be the most appropriate and viable and why? Which alternative options would you propose?

- Most respondents support the ongoing reforms of the various institutions involved, and stress the need for urgent implementation of those reforms. Expectations are high for results in 2010. In particular, the reform of the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) is seen as key to achieving improved global governance. The inclusiveness of the reformed institution must mean that the voices of poor women, the landless and pastoralists are heard.

- Some respondents emphasised the Global Partnership's importance. Some even suggested continuing to develop the Partnership. The majority, however, can be seen to interpret the Partnership as the political commitment to work in a coordinated manner, and the CFS as the institutional basis for doing so.
- On the issue of the Standing Committee on Nutrition (SCN) and the Food Aid Committee (FAC) there is a clear demand, by those that address these institutions, for there to be greater interaction between them and the CFS. Nutrition should be recognised as part of food security. Internal reforms of the Standing Committee on Nutrition are also called for. One proposal is that the FAC should be integrated into the Rome architecture. The WTO should only be involved in relation to ensuring that food assistance is not trade distorting.
- It was also pointed out that EU Member States need to act coherently in the food security and nutrition reform processes. For international governance to function effectively, developing countries need the capacity to participate. Donors could do more to support this capacity building. Many, in particular NGOs, stressed the need to deliver on donors' commitments; tracking is therefore necessary, starting now, to follow-up the L'Aquila Summit. There are calls to agree on an implementation plan for commitments made by the 27 donors.

26. Which could be in your view the main features of a national or regional agriculture and food security strategy? In application of the principle of subsidiarity which could be the respective areas of competence of national policies/strategies vs regional ones?

- The role of regional level cooperation in ensuring peace and stability is stressed by several respondents. Also, the regional level should focus on regional problems, rather than just support national levels: improving trade, transport, markets etc.
- The Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme, CAADP, stands out as the first and foremost example of a regional/continental strategy with functioning national implementation processes and country ownership.
- Food security and sustainable agriculture must be prioritised in national poverty reduction strategies. These strategies should include specific measures to reduce malnutrition, especially targeting the poorest and most vulnerable with a focus on women and children. Strategies need to be based on countries' own assessments of their needs, and these assessments need to involve all the relevant stakeholders in the country in a transparent fashion.
- Most respondents underlined that aid effectiveness principles should apply to food security. Policy coherence featured among many of the replies, and in some it is pointed out that coherence is equally important in partner countries themselves, and that donors need to support this.
- Environmental considerations need to be an integral part and coherence needs to be ensured with national strategies for adaptation to climate change. Finally, many made the point that national and regional strategies (for example on trade, markets or storage) need to be linked in order to be effective.

27. What would you consider to be the key policy issues to be addressed for the successful transition between emergency interventions and long term food security objectives?

- A simple transition from emergency, over recovery to development does not exist. There are constant shifts between the phases. Short and long term needs both have to be addressed by increasing the resilience of households. This can be done by well designed safety nets that are built with a view towards transitioning into longer term food security

programmes. DRR has to be built in food security programmes, therefore the food security and food assistance communications should be consistent with the EU's communication on DRR.

- A programme rather than a project approach would be more useful to address arising needs. This could better focus on objectives and outcomes rather than instruments and approaches. Flexible, rapid and long term funding modalities should be available to link humanitarian, recovery and longer-term development phases. Another proposal is a financing mechanism for transition situations which is more easily accessible by affected governments in partnership with the UN following predefined set procedures, processes and milestones.
- Preventive measures should play a much more important role. This needs to happen at the community level, increasing resilience of communities to withstand future shocks. Local emergency aid mechanisms should include non registered, informal entities, such as local traditional leaders, community based organisations and others. A platform of local NGOs, civil society and governments can help strengthen response mechanisms. These should rely on national early warning and crisis response systems. Success depends on the institutional capacities and policy frameworks at national level. Support to smallholder production is needed. Through credit schemes investments should be facilitated that allow a transition from subsistence agriculture to sustainable agriculture as these may facilitate producing a surplus that can be traded. Credits could equally serve for the diversification of economic activities alongside agriculture.

28. Which common principles could be set out to coordinate emergency and development actions?

- Protracted crises should be handled as development problems and be dealt with in a long term perspective. This may require addressing both the short and the long term dimensions of crises, moving towards strengthening the resilience of households and food systems, well-designed safety nets, involving local partners and institutions when defining and implementing humanitarian responses. Sustainable development has to be understood as a social progress and put in a broader context of risk management and contingency planning.
- The WFP-FAO twin track approach calls for simultaneous short and long term investments, emphasising strategic thinking even in short term responses. Regular needs assessments, as well as impact assessments should be carried out. Policies should be set in a human rights perspective, based on states' accountability in the territorial and the extraterritorial dimension.

29. What are the main challenges to promoting food security in fragile states, and how could the EU best position itself to work in such contexts?

- In fragile contexts a much stronger control of funding and direct support of professional groups, as well as local governments and civil society is needed. Local engagement is needed at all levels from decision making, planning to service delivery. More engagement of civil society is needed in collecting, managing and cross-checking data. The lack of data is a serious problem when targeting interventions. Significant portions of populations are most vulnerable and have no legal status and no legal frameworks they can rely on.
- It is equally important in fragile states that humanitarian interventions are deployed together with longer term interventions. Livelihood needs have to be identified. The EU and Member States' instruments have to cooperate well together, predictable funding

needs to be available (also during conflicts) and the EU has to present a unified diplomatic approach in fragile countries.

30. How could synergies and complementarities and division of labour between the European Commission, the EU Member States and the UN agencies be improved? How could synergies with private foundations be improved?

- There is an urgent need to accelerate progress on the Code of Conduct on the Division of Labour of the EU. This would contribute to improved governance globally and in country.
- Both Commission and EU Member States' activities should be channelled through the national sector strategies, in order to comply with aid effectiveness principles. Increased use of joint programming should be encouraged.
- Country processes already exist but may need to be strengthened particularly in relation to agriculture, food security and nutrition.
- The need to coordinate EU positions in International Financial Institutions, such as IFAD, in order to achieve a coherent and consistent EU approach to food security is recognised by some respondents.
- Synergies and complementarities with UN agencies could be improved if strategic partnership agreements were made operational, or concluded where they do not exist.
- Coordination and policy coherence is crucial, for example through joint strategies, funding mechanisms, indicators and food security assessments, especially between WFP, OCHA, UNICEF, IFAD and the following agencies that have expertise in preparing for and reducing the impact of droughts, floods etc: ISDR, UNDP, BCPR and FAO.
- There needs to be a monitoring mechanism in place for the country level partnerships developed under the UN High Level Task Force for accountability.
- Rural development/agriculture advisors in Delegations should coordinate better with UNDP Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery, International Strategy for Disaster Reduction and the World Bank Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery and Global Action Plan for Nutrition.
- Alternatively, it was mentioned that it may be more important to support the ministries in partner countries to work together. High-level political commitment is essential to start the process. However, sustainable public sector support has to be institutionalised beyond the agricultural sector, including also health, education, social protection, etc.

31. How could synergies amongst different EC/EU policies with an impact of food security (notably trade, energy, agriculture, humanitarian, nutrition etc) be increased?

- Clarity is needed on how the EU policy on agriculture and food security will link with 1) the Communications on DRR and Climate Change, 2) the EUs policies and programmes on LRRD, and 3) how the policy statements will be translated into practice in order to strengthen national and household level resilience to manage food insecurity.
- Many respondents highlight the importance of policy coherence between global food security and European agricultural policy. A suggestion of a mandatory 100% decoupling of subsidies is made. A coherent trade policy, European Partnership Agreements and the conclusion of the Doha round are also seen as important. The EU should further reform the its Common Agriculture Policy through the CAP Health Check and the EU budget review.
- The external dimension of the Common Fisheries Policy, and the timeliness of a coherent policy on food security in view of its forthcoming reform, is also stressed.

- There is also a recognition that development policy itself needs to become more coherent between its policy, implementation and short-term humanitarian parts. Integration of emergency response including food assistance with longer term support is needed. The EU has done substantial work on LRRD and this should be expanded and continued.
- Support for multi-sectoral (horizontal) approaches at the country level. Many respondents emphasise the need for the Commission itself to work more horizontally on food security. The Development Commissioner should take the lead.
- The Commission must improve its internal coherence by stepping up the coordination of its internal organisation, staff, policies and programmes on food security, agriculture, climate change, DRR, social welfare, nutrition, environment, the management of natural resources, emergencies, development, trade and energy, for example through joint programming and synergy between funding instruments and analyses. Mid-term reviews of CSPs should be used as an opportunity to improve coherence of policies at field level.
- There is also recognition that human rights play a role for food security. The rights, the dignity and the protection of women, men and children should be the foundation of all policies. Through the systematic application of a human-rights based approach, synergies between policies could be identified more clearly.
- Appropriate institutional mechanisms could be put in place to translate commitments on PCD to action. These include: Coordination between EC and member states through joint programming, CSPs and financial instruments, enhancing transparency and participation in EU decision-making to include all relevant stakeholders, involving the European Parliament as well as national parliaments, establishing a complaints mechanism at European level, conduct ex-ante and ex-post research on poverty reduction impact of EU policies, including by independent bodies etc.

32. *How could synergies between existing financial instruments be maximised and how should budget support be best used to support food security objectives?*

- Whatever the financing channel, aid should be coordinated at the national level and be based on a national strategy and policy framework. Multilateral agencies' participation in in-country coordination would be important. Food security covers many issues and actors, therefore different approaches are needed. Budget support can be particularly relevant to support long-term, permanent social protection systems. In some cases, such as for reaching the private sector or farmers' organisations, budget support may not be ideal. Synergies and complementarity could also be improved by better monitoring mechanisms, based on transparency and participation, to ensure that all sectors are covered and that funds are not concentrated only in one sector.

33. *What lessons can you share from your work within the area of food security that could be useful for the implementation of the proposed EU policy?*

The following suggestions were put forward:

- Need for long-term engagement
- Targeting poor and marginalised smallholder farmers
- Concentrate on women farmers
- Work and support local agents: for example through community based extension.
- Success generally goes together with policies that create an enabling environment for sustainable development and human well-being.

34. How could in country coordination be improved in line with the principles of the L'Aquila Declaration?

- It should be ensured that the funding will be delivered in line with country led plans, and in line with the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action on aid effectiveness. Capacity development is needed in policy and strategy formulation and implementation as well as in technical areas. Effective in-country coordination is important and involves all concerned, government and civil society, donors and agencies. Mapping at country level could start with who does what, how, why and with what resources. As much as possible, national processes should be consistent with regional processes, such as is the case with CAADP.
- It was also highlighted that the Rome Summit in 2009 endorsed the L'Aquila Principles and commits more partners, so it would be better to refer to Rome rather than L'Aquila.

ANNEX: RESPONDENTS TO THE ISSUES PAPER

1. Rainbow Sustainable Solutions
2. Government of Finland
3. MSF Access campaign
4. Royal Society
5. APRODEV
6. ICFAW – International Coalition for Animal Welfare
7. IEH – Instituto de Estudios del Hambre
8. South West Multi-purpose Farmers Common Initiative Group – Cameroon
9. Unilever
10. FOGAR – Forum Global d’Associations de Régions
11. BTC – Belgian Technical Cooperation
12. Practical Action
13. ONE
14. CFSI – Comité Français pour la Solidarité Internationale
15. Peuples Solidaires
16. GRET – groupe de recherche de recherche et d’échanges technologiques
17. Embassy Mauritius
18. UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to food
19. ANPME – Associação Nacional das Pequenas e Médias Empresas
20. Oxfam Belgium
21. Christian Aid
22. Imperial College London
23. Red Cross
24. FAO – Food and Agriculture Organisation
25. ITUC – International Trade Union Confederation
26. CBM – Christians disability and development organisation
27. PROSALUS
28. German Ministry Economic Cooperation and Development – GTZ
29. IIED – International Institute of Environment and Development
30. Concern Worldwide & Save the Children UK
31. Caritas Europa
32. CIDSE – Coopération Internationale pour le Développement et la Solidarité
33. UK Hunger Alliance
34. Concord
35. ZOA
36. Sida
37. IFSN – International Food Security Network and ActionAid
38. Department for International Development (DfID), UK
39. Tearfund
40. Swedish Board of Fisheries
41. Government of Spain
42. CEHAP
43. Government of the Netherlands
44. Centre for World Food Studies
45. WFP – World Food Programme
46. Government of France
47. World Vision
46. Individual
47. Individual
48. Individual
49. Individual