

## CSM Submission to OEWG MYPoW

1 July 2016

The CSM has always been very active on the MYPoW, because of the importance of being part of this inclusive process leading to the agenda-setting of the CFS, and in order to ensure that the priorities set by the CFS respond to the real needs and challenges of the constituencies most affected by food insecurity and malnutrition.

We know that since the reform, the process to discuss and agree on the CFS biannual workplans has changed from time to time, to pursue further improvements, and we acknowledge that regarding the current process for the MYPoW 2018-19, there is still a need to discuss an improved methodology and process. It is the responsibility of all the members and participants to contribute with ideas and proposals to the discussion at the additional OEWG meeting now scheduled for September.

However, in this occasion, and after consultation within our constituencies, we would like to reiterate our concern about the situation at this stage of the process, regarding the selection of the HLPE 2018 theme.

We believe that the methodology agreed at the OEWG March meeting, including the presentation of proposals, the ranking exercise and the Chair's proposal were useful to narrow down the list of themes that the CFS members and participants submitted, in order to come up with a manageable list of topics to discuss in the OEWG. However, we still believe that taking the outcome of the current ranking as the final result of the process, particularly considering the limited and unbalanced participation, was not an adequate conclusion. A proper process would rather require a substantial discussion on the most supported themes (as per ranking), in order to achieve consensus, and a discussion on the scope of the theme being selected.

Now, as we understand that this more appropriate and inclusive approach will not be followed, we want to at least express the following remarks and suggestions:

1. During the meeting, we expressed our concerns around the scope of the topic proposed "*HLPE report on multi-stakeholder partnerships to finance food security and nutrition in the framework of the 2030 Agenda*". Some member states did also question if this topic, while considered an important theme, should be subject for an HLPE report.
2. We would like to clearly voice that the theme and scope, as it stand now in the proposal, is not acceptable to the CSM. The theme needs to be broadened, and the scope of the request needs a proper discussion. The subject as proposed is very much donor-driven, and it clearly does not respond to the priority interests of social movements, being so distant from their daily life and the food security challenges of small-scale producers.
3. In this sense, we would like to propose an alternative formulation for the HLPE report, which might reflect better the interest of our constituencies, as well as possibly of many CFS members. It would read as follows: "*HLPE report on multi-stakeholder platforms to advance food security and nutrition in the context of the 2030 Agenda*". The scope of the request would include many different platforms (including some national experiences and regional platforms, not only partnerships) and

would not only focus on financial aspects and their logics. It would rather look at the broader perspective on how these platforms foster FSN towards the progressive realization of the right to adequate food. It would include aspects of clarity of roles and responsibilities of different actors in food security and nutrition governance, and would also assess the central challenges of some of such settings, including the tensions between rights-holders and stakeholders and issues related to conflicts of interest. An HLPE report could be important to take a critical view in order to learn from the challenges and the constraints of such platforms.

4. In order to further advance this theme, we suggest to discuss the specific theme and the scope of this thematic request at the OEWG meeting in September, based on a Chair's revised proposal for the theme and scope of this HLPE request, which would take into account the different views and submissions on the topic. On this basis, the OEWG would build consensus on the theme and scope of the report that everyone would find useful and appropriate.
5. We would also expect the September OEWG meeting to hold a substantial discussion on the other topics which received most support during the ranking exercise, as envisaged by the OEWG Chair, namely the topics of "*Agroecology for FSN*" and "*The impact of trade agreements on FSN*", in order to advance the discussion on the HLPE requests for 2019.
6. Finally, we suggest to revise the current guidance note and propose to dedicate one meeting of the OEWG in 2017 to assess and improve the methodology for the biennium 2020-2021.