

CSM Comments on Draft ToR for the Nutrition Guidelines – 8 May 2018

The CSM appreciated the revised draft ToR, which provided an adequate response to the outcomes of the March OEWG Session. The CSM believes the level of details of the document is appropriate and no further specifications should be provided with respect to the actual content of the guidelines (section IV) in order not to limit the scope of the regional consultations. The CSM however suggested, as captured by the OEWG April Session outcomes, that the Secretariat could establish a running “Elements Paper” to collect concrete input and suggestions by Member States and CFS constituencies. Such paper would remain an open document, not to be endorsed, and will inform the elaboration of the Zero Draft. Furthermore, the ToR should explicitly establish that the guidelines be inspired and directed by a set of “Guiding Principles”, following the example of the VGGT. In this respect, the CSM would also like to propose that the current draft ToR could be further improved by addressing the following elements:

1. **Human rights as the foundations of the guidelines:** The ToR need to unambiguously frame the guidelines within the human rights framework, with explicit references not only to the right to adequate food and nutrition, but also to the right to health and to women’s rights, among others in the context of the indivisibility of human rights;
2. **Women’s rights, gender equality and gender analysis:** The ToR need to be explicit in calling for the guidelines to be grounded in multidimensional gender analysis in order to expose the tensions between productive, reproductive and care functions and proposing clear pathways for the respecting, protecting and fulfilling women’s rights and pursuing gender equality;
3. **Centrality of people and their agency:** The ToR need to re-affirm and expose the centrality of people and their agency – women and men, youth and elders, small-scale farmers and fisherfolk, Indigenous Peoples, pastoralists, urban dwellers, consumers and many others. It is their agency, as well as the constraints and challenges they encounter, that shape food systems and their nutritional outcomes. In this context, it is essential to restate the consumers are citizens holding rights rather than exclusively food buyers with purchasing power;
4. **Ecological foundations of the guidelines:** The ToR need to frame the relation between food systems and nutrition within holistic ecological foundations that recognize the intimate and essential relations that nutrition maintains with the ecosystems;
5. **Power dynamics and conflicts of interest:** The guidelines should also be based on an adequate power mapping and analysis as their adequacy and effectiveness will be strongly related to their capacity to suggest pathways that can erode the current political economies. In this respect, and consistently with the ICN2 outcomes and the CFS Plenary decisions, it is also essential to establish robust safeguards against conflicts of interest (CoI) in the elaboration of the guidelines (in terms of integrity of the policy process, trustworthiness of the knowledge base and financial independence) as well as ensure that CoI are adequately addressed within the actual content of the guidelines;
6. **Budget:** The way in which the budget is designed may suggest a resource-constrained option that eliminates the regional consultation. This is no option for the CSM. Similarly, translation needs to be provided throughout the negotiations rather than exclusively at the final stage of the process;
7. **Annex 1:** Regarding the “guidance informing CFS policy convergence process”, it should be noted that only guidance generated by intergovernmental normative bodies with universal membership can be considered. Technical policies generated by UN agencies, while possibly providing valuable inputs for consideration, cannot be considered at the same level as universal decisions by Member States.

CSM Comments on Intersessional Events – 8 May 2018

The CSM proposal is to devote the intersessional events to advance the policy discussion on the underlying paradigms that will inform the guidelines, namely the food system framework and typologies proposed by the HLPE. This would also strengthen the science-policy interface, as clearly suggested by the CFS evaluation process, and initiate the process to build policy convergence.