

## Speaking points for GSF OEWG – May 2 2016

1. Regarding the agenda, our understanding is that the purpose of the paper is to preliminary guidance to the CFS secretariat and OEWG chair for providing inputs for the zero draft, not a decision-making document ; use this time to have an open discussion to put forward suggestions and critical feedback; revised document after this meeting should help give input to the zero draft.

-We would also suggest that we first discuss the workplan, then move to the proposal for updating.

2. On the workplan: the AG/Bureau meeting in July should approve/take a decisions on the workplan only
  - a. They will decide instead of the “Scope” it should be on the objective
  - b. We are concerned also with the process - there needs to be a Step before the December meeting– the input for the zero draft are provided by the Secretariat and OEWG chair by September– guided by the preliminary discussion of the OEWG today and written inputs. This input will be the basis of the discussion in December
    - i. possibly the OEWG might need an additional WG meeting in the first semester of 2017- please schedule a tentative meeting for April --- May 2017 should be reserved for a more focused discussion on the dissemination and communication of the GSF
  - c. Question for the OEWG chair and CFS secretariat: Is there a budget secured for the GSF process? What is the budget for the translation of the document? Is this included in the budget estimate in the document

3. Proposal for update

The purpose of the update proposal is to provide guidance to the OEWG chair and CFS secretariat, and stimulate discussion and feedback from the members of the OEWG. This needs to be made clear in the proposal

- a. Frameworks:
  - i. UN agreed- not “globally agreed”
    1. Also a clear criteria—as a UN agreed document- in section H we need to think about what is in there/what will be inserted
    2. We have to put into question whether or not the references proposed can serve as reference documents and can meet the criteria that we agree on
- b. Case studies
  - i. We support the proposal of the document’s proposal to remove the case studies as a part of the GSF, as they are outdated and not negotiated policy documents, and we support that we do not add new case studies.
  - ii. (if needed) Case studies can sometimes be useful to guide governments and could be included separately in a different space, but not in the main body of the GSF. This would require a clear selection criteria and processes within the

OEWG, and it would need to be made clear that the space of the case studies holds a different status than the GSF

4. Communications plan –

- a. We encourage the chair to convene the proposed informal brainstorming process earlier than proposed, possibly in combination with next OEWG on GSF in December- with the interested members of the OEWG to reinforce and strengthen the communications strategy proposed in this document
- b. Some suggested elements of strong communications strategy include how governments and their platforms, ministries and national agencies can better use the GSF most relevant to them, and how the RBAs and their national and regional office can better support and integrate the GSF into their work, and how other actors including civil society can better contribute to this as well
- c. Specific effort should be made to link the communications and dissemination strategy of the GSF with the work of the OEWG on monitoring, as the GSF is a clear reference point for policy coherence and monitoring CFS decisions.