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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBD</td>
<td>Convention on Biodiversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFS</td>
<td>Committee on World Food Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGRFA</td>
<td>Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COAG</td>
<td>FAO Committee on Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COFI</td>
<td>FAO Committee on Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>Civil Society Mechanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Civil Society Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMF</td>
<td>International Monetary Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IYAF</td>
<td>International Year of Artisanal Fisheries and Aquaculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IYFF</td>
<td>International Year of Family Farming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>UN Food and Agriculture Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC</td>
<td>Facilitating Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRULAC</td>
<td>Group of Latin America and Caribbean Countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G77</td>
<td>Group of 77 and China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPC</td>
<td>International Planning Committee for Food Sovereignty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITPGRFA</td>
<td>International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NENA</td>
<td>Near East &amp; North Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHCHR</td>
<td>Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSF Guidelines</td>
<td>Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries in the Context of Food Security and Poverty Eradication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDFF</td>
<td>UN Decade of Family Farming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VGGT</td>
<td>Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG</td>
<td>Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFS</td>
<td>World Food Summit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTO</td>
<td>World Trade Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The International Planning Committee for Food Sovereignty (IPC) is the world’s largest alliance of small-scale food producers, including peasants, artisanal fisher folks, pastoralists and herders, nomads, indigenous peoples and indigenous organizations, forest dwellers, landless people, urban producers, rural workers. The IPC represents more than 6,000 national organizations and 300 million small-scale food producers. Through this platform, they aim to defend the interests of those who supply 70% of global food production and yet, at the same time, continue to suffer from food insecurity, malnutrition and the non-recognition of their fundamental role in feeding the planet. Those constituencies\(^1\) are represented by specific Civil society organizations (CSOs), both regional and global. Together with consumer movements, support NGOs and other grassroots organizations, they aim at advancing the food sovereignty agenda at the global and regional level.

The IPC facilitates dialogue and debate among actors from civil society, governments and others actors in the field of food security, food sovereignty and nutrition, creating an autonomous space from political parties, institutions, governments and the private sector. The legitimacy of the IPC is based on the ability to voice the concerns and struggles that a wide variety of civil society organizations and social movements face in their daily practice of advocacy at local, sub-national, regional and global levels.

\(^1\) The term “constituency” refers to all the different categories of small-scale food producers as peasants, artisanal fisher folks, pastoralists and herders, nomads, indigenous peoples and indigenous organizations, forest dwellers, landless people, urban producers, rural workers, and consumers.
Milestones

1996 Organization and coordination of the NGO/CSO Forum to the World Food Summit. It is the first time small-scale farmers and peasants, Indigenous Peoples, artisanal fisherfolk, food and rural workers, youth, the urban poor, environmental organisations, human rights defenders, NGOs and other CSOs work together for the realization of the right to food and food sovereignty, gather in Rome to organize themselves to influence the world food policies.

2002 The FAO Committee on Fisheries adopts the Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries in the Context of Food Security and Poverty Eradication (SSF Guidelines). For the first time, social movements and fisherfolks are key actors of the agreement and the implementation of an international tool that can change policy frameworks at national level. In the same year, the FAO facilitates CSOs participation at the International Symposium on Agroecology for Food Security and Nutrition and at the International Year of Family Farming.

2003 First Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between FAO and IPC, in order to support the agenda of social movements. The IPC is recognized as the platform that represent social movements and, starting from this year, it will coordinate the CSOs regional consultations and their participation in the FAO Regional Conferences.

2004 The IPC organizes the Nyabihu Forum on Food Sovereignty, a global meeting of social movements and other CSOs to set up the pillars of food sovereignty and define a global strategy to mainstream them in all international, regional and national decision-making spaces. The IPC also coordinates the CSOs participation at the 11th Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (CGRFA) and the 2nd meeting of the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA) and, in the Special Forum during the 32nd Session of the Committee on World Food Security (CFS).

2007 The IPC organizes the People’s Food Sovereignty Forum, an NGO/CSOs Parallel Forum to the World Food Summit on Food Security. The IPC works for the realization of the right to food and food sovereignty in the context of the World Food Summit, and for a multipolar space within the CFS, asking for a solid mechanism of participation, to have the opportunity to effectively influence the decisions of the CFS.

2008 The IPC organizes “Terra Preta Forum on the food crisis, climate change, agrofuels and food sovereignty” parallel to the “High-Level Conference on World Food Security: the Challenges of Climate Change and Bioenergy” at FAO, Rome. Hundreds of farmers, fisherfolk, broader and activists from environmental groups and other civil society organisations gather in Rome demanding governments and the FAO to take responsibility for the food crisis.

2009 The IPC leads a CSO discussion on a zero-draft proposal on the functioning of the Civil Society Mechanism (CSM) to facilitate an inclusive and meaningful participation of CSOs in the CFS.

2010 The IPC meets with the new Director General of the FAO, Qu Dongyu, to have a particulars in the collaboration with the FAO. The IPC Working Group on Agricultural Biodiversity organizes a meeting with IPC organizations and other CSOs to set up the future of biodiversity and strategize the influence of the Post-2020 Biodiversity Framework of the CBD. The IPC participates in the launch of the United Nations International Decade of Family Farming (UNIFF) and will lead its implementation at national level.

2011 Organization of the First meeting of the Coordination Committee of the CSM and the political seminars in Cordoba, Spain. At the same time, the discussion on the “Voluntary Guidelines for Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security” (Tenure Guidelines) begins in the context of the CFS.

2012 The IPC leads the CSO consultation on “New FAO strategy in collaboration with civil society”.

2013 The IPC organizes its General Meeting in Brazil to set up the priorities and the strategies of the Working Groups. The IPC Working Group on Fisheries participates at the intersessional Technical Consultation on International Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-scale Fisheries, actively defining the content and the principles of the guidelines.

2014 The IPC organizes the General Meeting in Cape Town, South Africa, to review the priorities and the strategies of the Working Groups.

2015 The IPC organizes the General Meeting in Jharkhand, India, to review the priorities and the strategies of the Working Groups.

2016 The IPC organizes the General Meeting in Colombo, Sri Lanka, to review the priorities and the strategies of the Working Groups.

2017 The IPC organizes the General Meeting in Lima, Peru, to review the priorities and the strategies of the Working Groups.

2018 The IPC organizes the General Meeting in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, to review the priorities and the strategies of the Working Groups.

2019 The IPC organizes the General Meeting in Brussels, Belgium, to review the priorities and the strategies of the Working Groups.

2020 The IPC organizes the General Meeting in Bogota, Colombia, to review the priorities and the strategies of the Working Groups.
What we stand for

The organizations participating in the IPC share the principles and the six pillars of Food Sovereignty as outlined in the Nyéléni 2007 Declaration. IPC Members agree to:

Focus on food for people: the right to food, which is healthy and culturally appropriate, is the basic legal demand underpinning food sovereignty. Guaranteeing it requires policies which support diversified food production in each region and country. Food is not simply another commodity to be traded or speculated on for profit.

Value food providers: many smallholder farmers suffer violence, marginalization and racism from corporate landowners and governments. People are often pushed off their land by mining concerns or agribusiness. Agricultural workers can face severe exploitation and even bonded labour. Although women produce most of the food in the global South, their role and knowledge are often ignored, and their rights to resources and as workers are violated. Food sovereignty asserts food providers’ right to live and work in dignity.

Localize food systems: food must be seen primarily as sustenance for the community and only secondarily as something to be traded. Under food sovereignty, local and regional provision takes precedence over supplying distant markets, and export-orientated agriculture is rejected. The ‘free trade’ policies which prevent developing countries from protecting their own agriculture, for example through subsidies and tariffs, are also inimical to food sovereignty.

Keep control local: food sovereignty places control over territory, land, grazing, water, seeds, livestock and fish populations on local food providers and respects their rights. They can use and share them in socially and environmentally sustainable ways which conserve diversity. Privatization of such resources, for example through intellectual property rights regimes or commercial contracts, is explicitly rejected.

Build knowledge and skills: technologies, such as genetic engineering, that undermine food providers’ ability to develop and pass on knowledge and skills needed for localized food systems are rejected. Instead, food sovereignty calls for appropriate research systems to support the development of agricultural knowledge and skills.
**Work with nature:** food sovereignty requires production and distribution systems that protect natural resources and reduce greenhouse gas emissions, avoiding energy-intensive industrial methods that damage the environment and the health of those that inhabit it.

Food sovereignty is the right of peoples to healthy and culturally appropriate food produced through ecologically sound and sustainable methods, and their right to define their own food and agriculture systems. It puts the aspirations and needs of those who produce, distribute and consume food at the heart of food systems and policies, rather than the demands of markets and corporations. It defends the interests and inclusion of the next generation. It offers a strategy to resist and dismantle the current corporate trade and food regime, and provides direction for food, farming, pastoral and fishery systems determined by local producers and consumers.

Food sovereignty prioritizes local and national economies and markets, empowering peasant-and family-farmer-driven agriculture, artisanal fishing, pastoralist-led grazing, and food production. It supports food processing, distribution and consumption based on environmental, social and economic sustainability.

Food sovereignty promotes transparent trade that guarantees just incomes and a living wage to all people involved, as well as the rights of consumers to assume responsibility for their food and nutrition. It ensures that the rights to use and manage lands, territories, waters, seeds, livestock and biodiversity are in the hands of those who produce food. Food sovereignty implies new social relations free of oppression and inequality between men and women, peoples, racial groups, social and economic classes and generations.

What we do

The IPC facilitates dialogue and debate among diverse civil actors in the field of food, food sovereignty and nutrition, creating an autonomous space for substantive deliberations outside the influence of large institutions, governments, political parties and the private sector. IPC derives its legitimacy from its ability to give voice to the concerns, priorities and struggles facing civil society and social movements in their daily practice at local, national and regional levels.

Through its evolution as a global food sovereignty platform (see Our History), IPC has maintained a close relationship with the Food and Agriculture Organisation of the UN (FAO), facilitating the participation of thousands of small-scale food producers and other relevant constituencies (see Who we are). The IPC has enabled Members to channel their various competences to FAO and other relevant forums and processes. The platform has organized these into five specializations: Agricultural Biodiversity, Agroecology, Fisheries, Indigenous Peoples, and Land, Forests, Water and Territory (see Working Groups).

The IPC’s cumulative knowledge, principled food-sovereignty approach and diverse local experience across the broad food and nutrition field has largely served the normative and operational dimensions of FAO. However, the IPC’s global perspective also has accompanied Member contributions to such relevant developments as the High-level Political Forum, SDG progress, negotiating the New Urban Agenda and the UN Declaration on the Rights of Peasants and Other People Working in Rural Areas.

IPC increasingly mobilizes and channels the indispensable voices of civil society, social movements and communities of practice to processes and fields of practice related to food, food sovereignty, agriculture, food security and nutrition well beyond the UN and related global processes:

- **The IPC and its Members are involved** in knowledge creation, involving academia and research.

- **The diversity of IPC Member experience** addresses all aspects of the market, including production, consumption and trade in the local sphere, as well as those involving global value chains.

- **Throughout these diverse spheres of operation**, the IPC brings particular relevance to policy formulation and governance processes in various spheres of public administration.
• **The IPC has accumulated a pool of expertise** in standard setting and norm development that includes monitoring implementation of the human right to food and nutrition with its corresponding state obligations.

• **While the 2030 Agenda’s Sustainable Development Goals** and the Paris Agreement on climate change are high priorities in all sectors of endeavour, the IPC has engaged especially in the implementing, monitoring and reporting on performance across these commitments. Within this framework, its attention is keenly focused on SDG2: “End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture” and specific targets.
Our History

The IPC originates back to the World Food Summit organised in Rome in 1996 by the UN Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO), as a part of global civil society’s reaction to ongoing global processes on food and agriculture, and to engage actively with them.

The eighth round of the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT), held in 1986 in Uruguay, which led to the creation of the World Trade Organization (WTO), included agriculture in multilateral trade negotiations, together with intellectual property and dispute settlement. GATT’s primary purpose was to increase international trade by eliminating or reducing various tariffs, quotas, and subsidies, while maintaining meaningful regulations. Although GATT did apply to agriculture, it was incomplete: as a result, signatory states (or ‘contracting parties’) excluded this sector from the scope of the principles stated in the General Agreement.

In 1994 the Marrakesh Agreement enabled a new multilateral framework to encourage the gradual liberalization of agriculture. It facilitated corporate access to (financial) markets and raw materials through international standard rules, removing many national social protections. The Marrakesh Agreement on Agriculture and the formation of the WTO accelerated global coordination by civil society, in particular small-scale food producer organizations. The November 1996 FAO World Food Summit (WFS) held in Rome addressed the 800 million people without adequate food through the neoliberal vision of trade policies fostering food security for all through a fair and market-oriented world trade.

At this juncture, global civil society and social movements felt FAO to be a politically interesting intergovernmental forum for advocacy, and an alternative to the WTO and international financial institutions such as the World Bank (WB) and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). There were several reasons for this: as a UN body, FAO stood for more-democratic governance with universal membership and, formally, a one country/one vote decision-making process. FAO maintains a specific focus on food and agriculture and a mission to eliminate hunger, a mandate that includes a strong normative dimension and relative openness to the engagement with civil society and rural people’s organizations.

The parallel NGO Forum, held on 11–17 November 1996, gathered more than 1,300 delegates of food producer organizations from some 80 countries. They were asking for a review of the Uruguay Round and a departure from both market-led solutions dominated by transnational corporations operating within the global economy and from the policy framework created by the Structural Adjustment Programs of the WB and IMF.

Their aim was to counter-propose a new agenda based on Right to Food and Food sovereignty to overcome the social injustices rooted in the governance of food production and marketing.

The 1990s were the decade of global UN summits, starting with the UN Conference on Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro in 1992, each accompanied by a parallel civil society event. The Rome civil society forum held in connection with the WFS, however, was the only one in which a deliberate political choice was made by the organizing committee to put social movements in the majority among the delegates. They had the deciding voice in determining the statement that was being adopted, which highlighted the autonomy and self-organisation of civil society as principles. The forum gave the newly established organisation La Via Campesina its first global opportunity to present the principle of food sovereignty. The forum also pushed for the recognition of the “right to food” in a dedicated legal initiative. In effect, civil society advocacy’s greatest success in influencing the outcome of the official Summit was the identification of freedom from hunger as a fundamental human right.

The coordination among the different food producers’ organisations continued until the NGO/CSO “Forum for Food sovereignty: a right for all”, held in parallel to the “World Food Summit: five years later” in Rome (June 8–13 2002). This forum led to the institutionalisation of the International Planning Committee for Food Sovereignty (IPC) as a space of coordination among different food producer organisations, with a formal recognition from FAO through an Exchange of Letters defining common priorities, such as the drafting of Right to Food Guidelines.

In the following years, the IPC facilitated the participation of thousands of small-scale food producers in various FAO processes such as in the International Conference on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development (ICARRD), held in Porto Alegre in March 2006, which recognized the collective right to control land and acknowledged land’s cultural, social and historical dimensions.

In 2007, the IPC co-organised a global gathering during the Nyéléni Forum in Mali to address the absence of global food policy coherence and a global body deliberating on food issues, as well as the necessity not to leave the regulating power to WTO, the World Bank, the G8, or transnational corporations. The Nyéléni Forum was intended as an occasion for reflection by some 500 delegates representing peasants, family farmers, fisher folk, indigenous peoples, pastoralists, women’s groups, workers, environmentalists, consumers, NGOs and youth groups from around the world who had subscribed to the concept of food sovereignty and were taking action to put it into practice in their respective territories. The Forum’s objective was to develop a common understanding of what food sovereignty entails, starting from the concrete practices of the participants, and to develop collective strategies and action plans on that basis.

The venue was a village in southern Mali and the name given to the forum (Nyéléni) was that of a legendary Malian peasant woman who had farmed and fed her people well.

The forum, which took place from 23 to 27 February 2007, adopted a Declaration and an action plan covering seven themes:

- Local knowledge and technology;
- Access to and control over natural resources—land, water, seeds, livestock breeds;
- Sharing territories and land, water, fishing rights, aquaculture and forest use, between sectors;
- Conflict and disaster: responding at local and international levels;
- Social conditions and forced migration; and
- Production models: impacts on people, livelihoods and environment.

The eruption of the food price crisis in 2006/2008 opened another phase in IPC-FAO relations. For the first time in years, the governance of food and agriculture and food policy were at the top of the official global agenda. The IPC and social movements organized a civil society conference, Terra Preta, in June 2008, in parallel to an official FAO conference addressing the crisis.

The civil society conference called for “a paradigm shift toward food sovereignty and small-scale sustainable food production that, unlike industrial agriculture, can feed the world, while making a positive contribution to ‘cooling’ the climate and for a fundamental restructuring of the multilateral organizations involved in food and agriculture.” Over the succeeding months, the IPC and social movements sided with the G77/GRULAC and FAO Director-General Jacques Diouf against donor and bureaucracy-driven responses to the governance vacuum that the crisis revealed.

The IPC/FAO/GRULAC proposal was the only one that sought a political response to the causes of the crisis. It called for a profound reform of the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) to turn it into an authoritative, inclusive forum for ensuring policy coherence in the name of food security and the human right to food.

As a result of the IPC’s work, the G77 and the Transnational Agrarian Movements, with FAO support, proposed to transform the CFS into an inclusive global policy forum deliberating on food security and nutrition. It ensured a strong presence of small-scale food producers contributing to the definition of the agenda through a Civil Society Mechanism (CSM)\(^6\) that replicated the regional and constituency structure of the IPC. The first outcome of the reformed CFS was the approval of the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security (Tenure Guidelines/VGGT)\(^7\) in May 2012. This new international instrument has been actively used since then by peasant, fishing and pastoralist organizations, indigenous peoples, the landless, women and youth, and civil society as a whole, to assert their rights to access land and other natural resources.\(^8\)

After the CFS reform, the IPC worked with FAO to disclose a similar space for Civil Society in the other FAO processes. The first step was the IPC contribution in drafting the FAO Strategy for Partnership with CSOs\(^9\), operationalizing the principles of autonomy and self-organization, the technical and grassroots knowledge of CSOs participating in FAO processes, and recognizing that their concerns and work often coincide with FAO’s work and mandate.

After the approval of the FAO strategy, the IPC focused on the FAO plan of work. It sought to implement the Tenure Guidelines, negotiate and implement the Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries in the Context of Food Security and Poverty Eradication (SSF Guidelines), bring agroecology in the FAO regular programme through two International Symposia and six Regional Dialogues, open the negotiation on the implementation of the Art. 9 of ITPGRFA on the Farmers’ Rights to seeds, recognize the role of peasant agriculture, oppose false biotech solutions, open a strong institutional debate on Digital Sequencing Information and to facilitate CSOs participation and priority setting in all the FAO Regional Conferences. Following the mandate of the last IPC General Meeting, IPC Working Groups started to open work stream in other forums such as the Convention on Biodiversity (CBD) or the UN Human Rights System.

---

\(^6\) Civil Society and Indigenous Peoples’ Mechanism for relations with the UN Committee on World Food Security, at: http://www.cms4cfs.org.
Structure of the IPC
General Meeting

The General Meeting is the biannual space where international and regional organizations and representatives of regional processes update the work plan and agree on the political lines developed to advance food sovereignty. During the meeting, the actions and achievements of the Facilitating Committee, Secretariat and Working Groups are evaluated.

In the General Meeting, all international and regional Member organizations and representatives of all regional processes participate; invited NGOs participate only as observers.

Regional Processes

The IPC has set up regional processes on all continents. The regional processes of the IPC follow the general principles and lines of actions agreed upon at the General Meetings. Regional organizations and all regional formations (branches) of the international Member organizations organize the process by setting up a coordination structure of all the different organizations at the regional level. The regional processes define the regional priorities and facilitate the full participation of the regional organizations in the IPC Working Groups (WGs) and the participation in all institutional regional processes where the IPC is involved.

Working Groups

The IPC WGs are endorsed by the General Meeting. They have the legitimacy to operate with the full support of all the IPC organizations on a specific priority theme. WGs are open and flexible structures, formed on an ad hoc basis and with an open working methodology. The WGs are led by the social movements (at least two different IPC organizations, while all the IPC organizations are invited to actively participate) and should encourage the participation of youth and women. The WGs should work in coordination with the Facilitating Committee and report to the General Meeting. They should function with financial autonomy, under control of the Facilitating Committee, and contribute to the general functioning of the Secretariat.

Relevant information should be regularly disseminated and circulated among regions and organizations and within the Facilitating Committee. Each WG selects a supporting NGO to facilitate the daily implementation of the work plan. Additionally, other NGOs can support the work of the WG. The WG can also be open to other organizations that are not part of IPC, on the basis of the Facilitating Committee decision, as ratified by the General Meeting. Those WGs will be denominated as “IPC-plus WGs.”
In the last General Meeting, it was decided to set the IPC priorities into 5 working group, each one of them specializing in a specific topic and sharing with the other the knowledge acquired on crosscutting issues. The current IPC working groups are the following:

- **Working Group on Agricultural biodiversity**
  Agricultural biodiversity is defined as encompassing the variety and variability of cultivated and ‘wild’ species – plants, animals, and microorganisms – which are necessary to sustain key functions of the agroecosystem. To face the threats posed to those ecosystems by the industrial genetic manipulations aimed to increase production and profit at the expense of biodiversity, the WG on Agricultural biodiversity is engaged in several international processes – among which the Convention on Biodiversity (CBD).

- **Working Group on Agroecology**
  Identified as the path to pursue food sovereignty and environmental preservation, agroecology is advocated by this ad hoc Working Group in the UN space. Its objective is to highlight the beneficial results of this socio-economic practice and recollect examples of ancestral knowledge and innovations from communities of all over the world. It also works in spreading a clear and unanimous vision of agroecology, so to avoid the co-optation of the term by agribusiness.

- **Working Group on Fisheries**
  Small-scale fisheries communities have a unique bond with water, the element shaping their local culture and around which social and economic life revolves. Those communities provide for proteins supply in their regions, and represent an economic value all too often forgotten. Nevertheless, they are threatened by intensive fishing, water pollution, industrial aquaculture and land grabbing. In 2014, the IPC WG on Fisheries successfully negotiated the approval by the FAO Committee on Fisheries (COFI) of the SSF Guidelines. The work of the WG received additional recognition with the appointment by COFI to provide guidance for the implementation process within the Global Strategic Framework (SSF-GSF).

- **Working Group on Indigenous peoples**
  Bearers of ancestral knowledge developed over the centuries in harmony with their ecosystems, indigenous peoples today find themselves too often in situations of social, political and economic marginalization. The work of the WG on Indigenous peoples deeply intertwines the struggle for food sovereignty, defence of human rights and preservation of their cultures.
Working Group on Land, Water, Forests and Territory

One of the main threats to small-scale producers around the world is represented by the industrial exploitation of raw materials and land grabbing. The IPC WG on Land negotiated the Tenure Guidelines and now works in training communities to use them, hence enabling people to have control over their land and territories, in particular through the development of a People’s Manual. The WG is also active in advocating in the UN spaces for the national implementation of the Tenure Guidelines.

Facilitating Committee

The Facilitating Committee (FC) is composed of 5 to 9 representatives of international/global Member organizations and regional process, while maintaining a constituency, gender and regional balance. The FC has the political mandate to organize the internal communication, prepare the meetings, control and monitor fund allocation, facilitate the IPC processes, initiate (if needed), coordinate and monitor the WGs, and take on the formal responsibilities. The FC is accountable to the General Meeting. Following the decision of the last IPC General Meeting, the current FC is composed of an Operative Group, formed by three representatives of global Member organizations that have been particularly active in the IPC process, and a Regional Group composed by one representative from each IPC region (currently Africa, Asia and Pacific, Europe and Central Asia, the Americas, and Near East/North Africa), considering gender and youth balance.

The three global organizations that have affirmed their availability and commitment to facilitate the work of the IPC are the International Indian Treaty Council (IITC), La Via Campesina, and World Forum of Fisher Peoples (WFFP).

Secretariat

The Secretariat communicates with the FC on a regular basis, informing the IPC Member organizations. For daily and urgent matters, the Secretariat contacts the Operative Group first, which communicates with, consults and/or informs the regional Members of the FC whenever it is appropriate.

The Secretariat is shared among the regions, following the decision of the IPC General Meeting. It is an operative structure that is mandated to organize communications via the IPC web site and mailing lists, etc., and to fulfill an administrative role for financial issues related to the General Meeting, resource mobilization and support to WGs, etc. The Secretariat also prepares the IPC biannual General Meeting.
The Secretariat is a shared responsibility between the Rome-based International Secretariat and the Regional Secretariats, which have been set up in the different regions on the basis of the ongoing regional processes.

A Rome-based organisation has been given the responsibility to facilitate these relations on a regular basis with the Rome-based UN agencies, in ongoing communication with, and reporting to the Facilitating Committee.

The last IPC General Meeting confirmed that the Rome-based Secretariat is operated by Centro Internazionale Crocevia, with the responsibility to implement the tasks previously mentioned and facilitate the relations with the UN Rome based agencies on a regular base.
IPC Facilitating Committee@foodsovereignty.org

IPC Secretariats

Rome-based:
ipc-cip@foodsovereignty.org
Africa:
africa@foodsovereignty.org
Asia & Pacific:
asia@foodsovereignty.org

Europe & Central Asia:
europe@foodsovereignty.org
Latin America & Caribbean:
alianza@foodsovereignty.org
Near East & North Africa:
nena@foodsovereignty.org