

CSM positions for the MYPOW Meeting, June 20

Regarding the Chair's Proposal on MYPOW:

• Comment on participation and process of the survey and ranking:

1) 29 members and participants of the CFS participated in the survey, among them 16 OECD countries and only 7 of the Global South. The results therefore do not adequately reflect the balance of countries and regions participating in the CFS. It would have been advisable to reflect more on the methodology of the survey and ranking, to ensure greater participation and objectivity.

2) Therefore, it is clear that the result cannot be considered as the last word, but as a preliminary reflection of opinions expressed among some of the members and participants of the CFS, which now requires further deliberation and participation. In particular, the consultation with the delegations of the Global South should be intensified.

3) We propose not to take a final decision on this same day, but leave room for another round of consultation on the two or three themes that got most support in the survey, and to take a final decision on the theme of the HLPE report later, possibly leaving it to the plenary to choose between two options.

• On the proposed topics:

1. It is important to assess the proposals of themes against the selection criteria adopted by the CFS in 2015 on MYPOW, and particularly to take into consideration the function of an HLPE report 2018 for a policy convergence process in the CFS.

2. Regarding the proposed theme on "multi-stakeholder partnerships for financing food security and nutrition, within the framework of the 2030 agenda", we consider this being rather a political challenge than a gap of knowledge which would require an HLPE report. It is clearly a practical challenge particularly for the Rome-based agencies, and the CFS itself. It involves, among others, discussions on how to ensure food security and nutrition becoming a priority for the international financial cooperation agenda, how to avoid conflicts of interest, and how to ensure planning security for the CFS itself. In that sense, it seems more the subject for a practical political discussion than a topic for a scientific study of the HLPE.

3. The proposed theme of "agroecology for food security and nutrition", however, does require an evidence-based analysis, as important input for an informed discussion and policy convergence within the CFS (the elaborated argument can be found in the proposals submitted by the CSM for this topic).

Regarding the Draft decision box:

- The proposed format seems acceptable to us;
- However, the proposed paragraph e) should be deleted. It says "Requests the HLPE to ensure that the advices and recommendations included in its reports are strongly supported by the evidence presented in the reports themselves;"

The sentence is a tautology. There is no need to ask the HLPE to do its work well. It is obvious that the HLPE has to ensure that their reports are consistent in themselves. If the proposed

sentence aims to express a criticism of previous reports, it should be expressed in a proper way and place, but not in a box decision directed towards the future. We should perhaps recall that the reputation and independence of HLPE should be appreciated and respected by the CFS.