



## Proposals for organization of events for monitoring other CFS policy recommendations

### Italy's proposal

#### Topic

Monitoring the implementation of the following policy recommendations and their contribution to the achievement of SDG6:

- "Water for FSN"; and
- "Sustainable agricultural development including livestock"

#### Rationale

SDG6 is one the SDGs under review at the HLPF 2018, and exploring the contribution of CFS products to the implementation of this specific SDG (and targets), closely related to SDG2, is important to highlight how CFS concretely contributes (or could contribute) to the achievement of the Agenda 2030, and how CFS products can impact on multiple and interrelated SDGs/targets. "Water for FSN" is related to all the targets of SDG6; 6.1 and 6.2 are widely covered by these policy recommendations, while the other targets are partially covered. "Sustainable agricultural development including livestock" partially covers 6.3, 6.4, 6.6, 6.b. These references are taken from the CFS document "Mapping of SDG targets in relation to CFS scope and products"<sup>1</sup>.

**When the event is planned to be organized:** during Plenary

#### Process and expected output

The process envisaged would be lighter and less expensive than the one used for the GTE. In particular no global call for inputs would be launched on the two Policy Recommendations, but a TTT will work to submit a few interesting case studies, producing an analysis that summarizes the case studies and best practices, highlighting where possible interrelations and synergies between the two Policy Recommendations. The expected document produced by the TTT is of 15,000 words.

#### Budget (USD)

Staff and technical support (4 months staff time)	40,000
Translation (document) – 15,000 words	30,000
Session costs (travel of four panelists)	10,500
TOTAL	80,000

<sup>1</sup> [Information Note CFS-OEWG-SDGs/2016/02/24/05](#)



## **Civil Society Mechanism's proposal**

### **Topic**

Monitoring the implementation of the CFS policy recommendations on “Connecting Smallholders to Markets” at CFS 46.

### **Rationale**

These policy recommendations are of great relevance to all CFS stakeholders. They were negotiated and adopted in an exemplary spirit of dialogue which facilitated reaching a consensus on the final outcome. The process illustrated how CFS can operate in a coherent and comprehensive way by building on past work, in this case the 2011 recommendations on ‘How to increase food security and smallholder sensitive investments in agriculture’ and the 2013 recommendations on ‘investing in smallholder agriculture for FSN’. It was also an excellent demonstration of how the CFS can promote synergies among different kinds of evidence brought to the table by different CFS actors – from small-scale producers themselves to governmental policy decision-makers and RBA experts – to enhance understanding of key FSN issues. The recommendations revealed the importance for FSN and smallholder livelihoods of markets rooted in local, national and regional food systems and indicated a series of policy measures to be taken in order to strengthen them, starting with the need to fill the data gap.

As indicated in the flyer on the ‘Connecting Smallholders to Markets’ published by the CFS secretariat<sup>2</sup>, these recommendations have a core focus on SDGs 1, 2, 7, 8, 16 and 17 and contribute to 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15. In synthesis, support for markets that are remunerative for small-scale producers, beneficial for consumers and stimulating for rural economies makes a cross-cutting contribution to the entire SDG package. Regarding 2019 more specifically, the draft CFS contribution to the 2019 in-depth SDG review cites them as being particularly relevant to SDGs 8 and 10 among the goals that will be targeted next year.

The suggested pilot would provide an opportunity to implement the CFS decision adopted at the Plenary Session 2016 when endorsing these recommendations, to “*organize a stock-taking event in a future CFS Plenary Session, subject to available resources, to share lessons and assess the continued relevance, effectiveness and the use of the recommendations*”<sup>3</sup>. It would take stock of initiatives undertaken by various CFS members, including those that involve collaboration among different actors, such as the FAO-promoted project to develop participatory methodologies for data collection and other initiatives, and would seek to learn from these experiences. Countries that undertake SDG voluntary reviews in 2019 could be

---

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.fao.org/3/a-bq853e.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> CFS 2016/43 Report, para. 20e



encouraged to include these CFS policy outcomes in their assessments, feeding into both the 2019 HLPF session and CFS 46.

**When the event is planned to be organized:** CFS 46

### **Process and expected output**

The proposed process would include the following steps:

- The call for experiences and best practices would be launched through the CFS members and participants; no additional call would be made through the FSN forum to save cost and keep the process light.
- The secretariat would work with support of a technical task team in summarizing these experiences in a background document of no more than 12,500 words.
- The task team would work with the secretariat to prepare the call for inputs and outline of the event and criteria for selection of experiences to present.
- The background paper and event outline from the technical task team would be discussed in a joint meeting of the CFS Bureau and Advisory Group; the Bureau would then have to take note of the background paper and agree on the outline of the event.
- The presentation of experiences during the stocktaking event would be followed by a plenary discussion aimed at drawing lessons and making proposals to enhance use and application of these CFS policy recommendations.
- The output of the process would be the stocktaking exercise in the plenary with conclusions on the lessons learned and suggestions for the further use and application of these recommendations.

Based on these elements, the CFS Secretariat provided the following cost estimate:

### **Budget (USD)**

Staff and technical support (3 months staff time)	30,000
Issuance of a call	7,000
Translation (document) – 12,500 words	25,000
Translation of submissions not in English	5,000
Session costs (travel of two panelists and one moderator)	7,500
TOTAL	74,500