

**CSM Contributions to the Joint Meeting of the CFS Advisory Group and Bureau
31 March 2016**

Regarding the Draft agenda of the Meeting:

- The CSM suggests postponing agenda item n. 5 on Policy Convergence to the next meeting of the AG and Bureau in July. The agenda of today's meeting is already quite ambitious and includes many points that need reasonable time for a substantial discussion. The other agenda items are all related to priority issues and workstreams of the CFS and should be prioritized. The agenda item n.5 deals with an interesting challenge, but there is no urgent need to discuss it now.

Agenda Item n. 1: Draft CFS 43 Annotated Agenda, Timetable and suggestions for the opening themes, keynotes and Special Events

- Regarding the revised draft timetable of CFS 43:
 - CSM welcomes the improvement of the draft timetable which now allows for the appropriate time for each of the themes on the agenda.
 - The Forum on Urbanization and Rural transformation is not only for Decision, but also for Information and Discussion. This should be added.
- On the draft Annotated Agenda the CSM would like to make the following remarks:
 - *On draft Agenda item VI b) ii. :* The first global thematic event on Monitoring, on the Voluntary Guidelines on Governance of Tenure (VGGT), now scheduled for Wednesday morning, 19 October, is now "for information and discussion". As just agreed in the OEWG on monitoring, the event aims to arrive at lessons learned from this first monitoring exercise of a major CFS decision. We suggest to include the notion of lessons learned into the annotated outline, by adding the last sentence of the new terms of reference into the annotated agenda: *"The lessons learned from this CFS global thematic event will be communicated to FSN stakeholders at all levels"*.
 - *On draft Agenda item VI d) related to MYPoW:* in accordance with the outcomes of the last OEWG on MYPOW regarding the moments by when the CFS agrees on the requests of HLPE reports in 2018 and 2019, we would suggest to introduce the word "possibly" before 2019. It would then read: *"At CFS 43, the Committee is requested to make a decision on the themes and the technical issues to be produced by the HLPE in 2018, and possibly 2019."* It was agreed during the last OEWG Meeting that a final decision on this issue should only be taken by the OEWG on MYPOW at its next meeting on 20 June. The draft annotated agenda should not preempt this decision.

- *On draft Agenda item VI f)* related to the Global Strategic Framework: A sentence should be added to the text that makes clear that the Decision Box of CFS 43 on GSF will provide a specific guidance on how the Periodic Update process will be conducted in 2016-2017. This aspect is missing in the current draft, but foreseen for 2016-2017. The details will be clarified by the OEWG meeting on GSF on 2 May.
- *On agenda item VIII, Other matters, regarding the CFS 40th Birthday Exhibit:* we believe that the exhibit can be instrumental to understand better the strengths and weaknesses of the CFS during the past decades. We recall that this year 2016 marks as well the World Food Summit 1996 plus 20. This fact should have a special place in the CFS exhibition, particularly as the WFS 1996 is an important aspect of the CFS history and gave birth to the elaboration of the Voluntary Guidelines on the Right to Food, which were elaborated in an unprecedented inclusive and participatory way. The model and content of this process was essential for the CFS reform in 2009.
- On the Proposal for the Opening and the Special event during CFS 43:
 - CSM would like to propose a more participative format for the Opening Session: the selected high level key note speaker should be followed by a short panel of CFS actors, which then could open up to the audience.
 - We believe that in this context of climate change and food security and nutrition, the voice of indigenous peoples should be heard, as their experience and wisdom is invaluable for humanity, particularly on the topic of this Opening session.
 - We have also suggested agroecology as a sub-topic of this panel, due to its essential contributions to food security and nutrition in the context of climate change, already today and in future.
 - On the Special event proposed for Friday 21 October: the CSM suggests that the format of this event should include the diversity of views and perspectives from those countries which volunteered to present a first review. Specifically, we believe that the multi-actor nature of CFS implies the full involvement of civil society organizations and movements from these volunteer countries, when realizing this interactive dialogue.

Agenda Item n. 2: Policy Round Table Process – Revised note and Rapporteur

- CSM welcomes the revised proposal for the process which takes into account most of the concerns and suggestions presented at the last AG/Bureau meeting.
- The only, but important change we want to suggest is on the last page of the revised note: we would propose to give more time for introducing new topics. The proposed deadline of 10 of August is too short, given the fact that

the HLPE report is only launched beginning of July. We suggest instead the following formulation: “No new thematic proposals will be accepted after the negotiation scheduled for 28-29 of September”. This would give reasonable time to all CFS members and participants and would allow for concentrated final negotiations during CFS 43.

Agenda Item n. 3: Smallholders – Zero draft of recommendations

- We reaffirm the significance of this issue for small-scale producers and our appreciation for the work done by the TT and secretariat. We are particularly pleased that importance of markets linked to territories and of specific, supportive public policies has been recognized. The discovery of territorial markets is the real innovation and value-added of this CFS work stream and can make a big contribution to policy and programme work at all levels, including the SDGs. The data gap about these markets would not have been identified and highlighted without the multi-actor participation that distinguishes the CFS.
- There are other points on which we feel Zero Draft should be strengthened but we will keep our detailed suggestions for Informal Consultation on 28 April. For now we underline only two of them:
 - Prevailing food safety rules are not suited to the circumstances of smallholders and put them at a disadvantage. Specific hygienic and sanitary public policies adapted to small-scale food producers should be developed.
 - It is essential that a document on smallholders and markets address the issue of pricing policies, which should provide full remuneration of smallholders’ work and their own investments.
- In general we feel that:
 - The recommendations should be strengthened as an overall policy package, recalling that, as stated in the 2013 HLPE report, supporting smallholder agriculture and markets for food and nutrition security requires dedicated policies determined with participation of smallholders.
- More attention is needed to how and by whom follow-up and monitoring will be undertaken.

Regarding process:

- We suggest that the mails received by the secretariat containing comments on the Zero Draft be posted in the CFS Working Space so that they are visible to all CFS members and participants.
- We would like assurance that the TT will be asked to assist the secretariat in preparing the Draft 1 of the outcome document.
- We would like information on the methodology that will be followed on 28 April (not line-by-line discussion, but collecting initial comments and views on the document as a whole and on each section).
- It is absolutely essential that interpretation be secured for the actual negotiation of the Draft 1 on 8-9 June.

Agenda Item n. 4: Forum on Urbanization and Rural Transformation

We believe that the Technical Workshop held on 22-23 February was an important exchange which provided important inputs for the further process on this new CFS workstream. However, we would like to raise three key concerns at this point:

First, on the process so far:

- We wish to strongly raise our concern regarding the key documents only being provided in English. This includes the ongoing online consultation about an extensive zero draft background document, available only in English. This is unacceptable and greatly limits the ability for many actors, not just civil society, to meaningfully participate and contribute. It runs counter to the CFS's long track record of success in producing policy through inclusion and consensus.
- We expect the policy formulation process on Urbanization and Rural transformation and the preparation for the Forum to be fully inclusive of civil society including communities from rural and urban areas.
- Timeframes for consultation going forward must take into account these two core needs. In this sense, we request for extending the timeline of the current online consultation.

Second, on the current zero draft:

- With respect to ongoing work, there is a need to reflect existing past and ongoing relevant work within the CFS, such as but not limited to policy on social protection, access to markets for smallholders, and tenure. The current zero draft is lacking in this regard.
- Incorporating existing work would help to rephrase the key questions to ensure a holistic approach towards both rural and urban communities; and help sharpen the focus and purpose of this policy workstream, which at the moment is unresolved and hindering good policy development.

Third, on the proposed structure of the HLF during CFS 43, the CSM suggests:

- That the format of the Forum being more participative than only one keynote speaker in order to reflect both the urban and rural perspectives, and ensure that lived experiences and a diversity of views are heard and included. The CSM is willing to assist in the identification of appropriate speakers.
- We seek clarity on the proposed policy development process and timelines subsequent to the Forum. This includes in the first instance, a clarification about the way how the respective decisions of CFS 43 will be prepared and discussed.

Agenda Item n. 5: CFS Approach to Policy Convergence

See above.

Agenda Item n. 6: Questions for the Advisory Group reporting exercise

- The CSM welcomes the proposed format for reporting. The experience of last year was certainly positive and helpful for everybody.
- The idea to encourage also Bureau members to join this exercise is as well a good one.
- We suggest to include a fifth question, asking for suggestions towards the future: *“e) Proposals for building a long-term vision for the CFS”*

Agenda Item n. 7: Dissemination of the Framework for Action – Update from Bur/AG members and Secretariat

A- CSO actions for the dissemination of the FFA

- 1- CSOs started disseminating the FFA in national, regional and international CSO networks.
- 2- CSOs have presented the FFA and advocated for its use in regional conferences such as the FAO multistakeholder workshop on Food Security and Nutrition in April in Amman
- 3- CSOs have started including the FFA in their outreach materials (articles, blogs, newsletters, etc) on issues relevant to food security and nutrition.
- 4- CSOs have stressed on the need to implement the FFA in bilateral meetings with other stakeholders. For example CSOs have started a discussion with the Ministry of Agriculture in Jordan to work together on organizing a multi-stakeholder awareness workshop on the FFA.
- 5- Building on principles 6, 8, 9 and 11 of the FFA, the Peoples Coalition on Food Sovereignty and the Arab Network for Food Sovereignty has decided to embark on a research project that will focus on the impact and efficiency of Aid and Development Cooperation in situations of conflict particularly on advancing peace and development.

B-Comments on the “CFS and RBA update” on the FFA

- 1- The focus of the RBAs appears to be around the resilience aspects of the FFA only. The other dimensions in the FFA, including the rest of the principles that include among others the protection of communities, strengthening of country ownership, participation and accountability, managing resources and reducing risk, and the need to address underlying causes of food insecurity in protracted crises are being lost or downplayed.
- 2- There has been no CSO engagement in the FFA dissemination and implementation by the RBAs. This includes both in the development of FFA-related materials (such as

the series of thematic Guidance Notes unpacking the CFS-FFA principles, and the CFS-FFA Implementation Quick Guide), nor in the linking of the FFA to RBA programming and strategies (such as the Strategy for Engagement in Countries with Fragile Situations).

3-As much as we appreciate the disseminating efforts done so far, the CFS Secretariat and RBA strategies have been inward looking. The dissemination should be wide and broad to other stakeholders otherwise the FFA will not have resounding and effective impact as intended and it will remain abstract.

4-At this stage it would be necessary to see what other stakeholders apart from the CFS Secretariat and the RBA (i.e. member states, multilateral and financial organizations, private sector, etc.) have planned to disseminate the FFA.

5- There is a mention of the “specific CFS-FFA homepage ... on the CFS homepage” – we are unable to find this (we can only find the PDF of the FFA). What is the link to the homepage, and how can CSOs contribute to it?

C-Proposals for moving forward on the FFA

1- For a comprehensive outreach strategy we should start by building awareness and disseminating to the broad range of intended users of this FFA which are clear in paragraph 17 of the FFA¹, and encourage them to further disseminate among their constituencies.

2- The FFA needs to be integrated and mainstreamed across various UN specialized organizations (not only the RBAs), including the UN Human Rights System and System of Special Procedures and linked with wider platforms, events and global agendas including the ECOSOC, the SDGS and the World Humanitarian Summit. The UN Secretary General should be approached in order to advocate for and mainstream the FFA. The FFA should also be shared with regional human rights bodies.

4-Multistakeholder workshops are needed at the global, regional and national levels in order to outline and clearly identify the specific roles and responsibilities of different stakeholders. We reiterate our suggestion that as a first step we need to hold a CFS multistakeholder workshop to elaborate further on the roles of stakeholders in the dissemination and implementation of the FFA.

5-Involve CSO and communities that are suffering from and living in crises in the RBA activities of dissemination and implementation including the development of FFA related guides.

¹17. **Stakeholders include:**

“Public institutions and local authorities; Political, peacekeeping, and peace-building actors; Traditional authorities; Inter-governmental and regional organizations; Financial institutions, donors, foundations and funds; Civil society organizations; Research organizations, universities and extension organizations; Private sector entities; Farmers, family farmers, in particular smallholders and their organizations; Communities and members of affected populations; Consumer organizations.”

6- Building on paragraph 36 (ii) of the FFA, support is needed to facilitate CSO and communities access and understanding of the FFA. This should include supporting both CSO production of relevant materials and the holding of CSO-led workshops on the regional and national levels

7-Ensure that the different dimensions of the FFA are sufficiently addressed by stakeholders in their dissemination, policy development and programming including the protection of communities, strengthening of country ownership, participation and accountability, managing resources and reducing risk, and the need to address underlying causes of food insecurity in protracted crises.

8- Development of a reference guide to existing human rights norms and international laws applicable to food security and nutrition in situations of protracted crises.

Agenda Item n. 8: Workstream Updates and approval of OEWG Workplans; a) Monitoring; b) MYPoW

On Workstream Updates:

- *Regarding the Budget:* As said in the previous occasions, the CSM and others have defended the integrity of the MYPoW of this biennium, expressing concern that the funding gap is still very high. In this regard, we continue to have some specific questions on which we request detailed information:
 - Which are the confirmed sources of funding (how much by whom)?
 - Which kind of the progress can we expect in the coming months with regard to the CFS Budget?
 - Which funds are earmarked to which process?
 - Is there any possibility of a possible conflict of interest arising?
 - Has any of the CFS workstream difficulties to be funded properly? We are strongly concerned about the lack of funding for the OEWG negotiations on smallholders to markets.
 - What measures are envisaged in case the budget gap cannot be significantly reduced in the next two months?

On MYPoW Workplan:

- We agree with the workplan of MYPoW and agree to define the themes of the 2018 HLPE reports in 2016.
- We continue to believe that the themes of HLPE reports should be strongly connected to the most important future workstreams of the CFS, as the CFS Guidance note says, and should therefore not be de-coupled from the more broader MYPoW consultations.
- In this sense, we insist in defining the themes of 2019 HLPE reports only in October 2017, as part of the whole MYPoW 2018/2019. There is absolutely no need to define this before. As agreed during the last OEWG Meeting, a final agreement on this issue shall be reached by the OEWG on MYPoW at its next meeting on 20 June.

Agenda Item n. 9: Any Other Business – a) WFO: Presentation and Exchange of Views; b) Upcoming High-Level Meetings and events relevant for CFS

Announcement: As circulated to the CFS Bureau and Advisory Group already, the CSM kindly invites you to an Informational Meeting on: “The Role of the CFS in the Global Architecture of Nutrition Governance”. Date and Venue: *Monday, 4 April, 9:30-11:30am, Lebanon Room, FAO HQ*. The event is open to all members and participants of the CFS.