

CSM Advisory Group
Draft Contributions to the Joint Meeting of the CFS Bureau and Advisory Group,
8 July 2016

Remarks and proposals regarding the Provisional agenda:

- The CSM had requested to be given the opportunity to share a presentation of the CSM and its work to this meeting. We would like to reiterate this request and hope that a presentation of the CSM can be included into the agenda of the next Joint Meeting of the CFS Bureau and Advisory Group on September 12.

Agenda Item 1: CFS 43 Draft Decisions

1a) Decision box SDG:

The CSM agrees with the draft decision box and the draft document on CFS engagement with the SDGs, as negotiated by the OEWG.

Regarding the preparation of the CFS 43 session which also provides guidance for the CFS report to the High Level Political Forum, we suggest that the Technical Task Team be reconvened by the Secretariat in order to prepare a background document that can inform plenary debate at CFS 43. Given the limited plenary time, an initial discussion among all CFS constituencies should be organized by reconvening the OEWG on SDGs in September. These proposals would allow the Plenary to provide clear guidance on the further process for the preparation of the CFS report to the High Level Political Forum.

1b) Decision box on Nutrition:

No further remark from our side needed. We can agree with the Decision Box and the draft document as negotiated and approved by the OEWG on Nutrition.

1c) Decision Box on Smallholders to Markets:

The CSM Working Group that participated in the negotiations, has seen the result of the negotiations as generally positive. A more specific assessment is still under way.

Regarding the decision box, the CSM generally supports the proposed text, but suggests to improve the description of the follow-up to the policy recommendations by introducing the following language to the paragraph d)

d) encourages all stakeholders to document experiences and lessons from using these recommendations and requests the CFS ~~MYPoW~~ OEWG to consider in a future **plenary session** ~~work programme~~ inclusion of a stock-taking event, subject to available resources, to share lessons and assess **progress in the use and application** ~~continued relevance, effectiveness and impact~~ of the recommendations;

These changes would make clear that a future plenary session would include a stock-taking event on the use and application of the recommendations. There is no need to include a suggestion for a new workstream into the future MYPoW. The decision to include a stock-taking event can be taken within the annual planning of the CFS Plenary in the regular meetings of the CFS Bureau and Advisory Group.

Two additional remarks:

- we believe that interpretation during CFS negotiations is fundamental. The lack of interpretation provided by the CFS, as experienced during these negotiations, should not be repeated.
- The new methodology for negotiations, as applied during the negotiations on smallholders to markets, should be carefully evaluated, before applied in another occasion.

Agenda Item 2: MYPoW

- On the MYPOW process: as expressed in the MYPOW meeting, we believe that the ranking exercise was useful to narrow down the list of themes for an OEWG discussion. However, we underline that taking the outcome of the ranking as the final result of the process, was not an adequate conclusion. A proper process would rather require a substantial discussion on the most supported themes, in order to achieve consensus.
- Now, the draft proposal for the theme and scope for the request to the HLPE was circulated on Wednesday this week. Today, there is not sufficient time for a substantial discussion on the details of the new proposal.
- We suggest to broaden the title from “partnerships” to “platforms”, and to not focus the report on the financial aspect. It would then read: *HLPE report on multi-stakeholder platforms to advance food security and nutrition in the context of the 2030 Agenda*
- The proposed scope of the request needs a thorough discussion and revision. The text as it is proposed now, is far too detailed and prescriptive. The scope of the report should outline the CFS request for the report, not the content of the requested report. The independency of the HLPE needs to be respected.
- We suggest to discuss the proposal circulated this Wednesday at the MYPOW meeting on September 12, and not to take a decision today, rather to approve the final text at the Bureau meeting on September 15.
- We also expect the MYPOW meeting in September to properly address two other issues:
 - o The methodology for the broader consultation on the MYPOW 2018-2019, to be conducted between September and December 2016;
 - o A substantial discussion on the other topics which as well received strong 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. If the current process is maintained for the selection of the HLPE 2018 request, then the ranking outcomes should equally be maintained for the selection of the HLPE 2019 decision.

Agenda Item 3: GSF

No further remark from our side. We can support the proposed draft decision box and workplan.

Agenda Item 4: Monitoring

4a): Monitoring Draft Decision and 4b): Monitoring Terms of Reference

The CSM appreciates the work done by the OEWG on monitoring and welcomes the draft decision box as well as the Terms of Reference. The CSM regards these Terms of Reference as an important first step in incrementally building the long expected CFS monitoring mechanism. The CSM expresses its commitment to promote the organization of monitoring events at national and regional levels according to the Terms of Reference that CFS 43 will adopt. The CSM encourages other CFS actors, particularly CFS members to plan for holding this kind of monitoring events in 2017. The CSM also invites the CFS to think about the theme and date of the next global monitoring event to be held during a CFS Plenary.

Agenda Item 5: VGGT – Multi-stakeholder stocktaking dialogue

The CSM thanks the CFS Secretariat for organizing the first Global Thematic Event on VGGT as decided by CFS 42 (C 2017/19, paragraph 35 h) using the agreed Terms of Reference by the OEWG on monitoring.

The CSM WG calls the Bureau to change the title of the event from “VGGT – Multi-stakeholder stocktaking dialogue” to “Global Thematic Event on VGGT”. Global thematic event is the denomination used in the decision of CFS 42 as well as in the Terms of Reference. Putting a different title to this event would disconnect it from the mandate given by CFS 42 and from the Terms of Reference and the efforts to incrementally build a CFS monitoring mechanism.

The CSM proposes that the revised version of the event outline explicitly includes in section 3 on the way forward the following questions:

- 1) how to continue monitoring the implementation of VGGT on a regular basis; and
- 2) what could be the topic of the next CFS global thematic event and when should it be hold?

In order to seriously continue establishing the monitoring and learning function of the CFS, the holding of global thematic events need to be regular and include all the CFS major decisions. We call on member states to discuss about these two questions during the upcoming VGGT global thematic event.

Regarding our own contribution to this event:

We are pleased to inform the CFS Bureau and Advisory Group that the CSM Monitoring Working Group is currently finalizing a broad civil society report on the use and the application of the VGGT, which has been produced with collaboration of small-scale food producers and other civil society organizations around the globe. We expect to be given the due time and space for presenting this report to the Plenary during the monitoring session on the VGGT. For this reason, our contribution to the panel better fits into the category global and not regional. We kindly request to change the geographical coverage of our speaker from regional to global.

We have been informed by the Secretariat that our report will be posted as background document to CFS 43. We highly appreciate this and invite all CFS members and participants to engage with our report.

Agenda Item 6: Urbanization and Rural Transformation

On the draft decision box:

Point c) and d) are the substantial points.

Point c) includes the description of what could happen during the two-days of CFS meetings dedicated to these workstreams in 2017. It is very unclear what will be achieved during these 2 days. How is this different from the recent process? What is the added value? Sharing of experiences and practices is not enough. A compendium of good practices is also not a satisfactory CFS result. The process of this workstream needs a clear objective and purpose until October 2017.

Point d) includes a proposal for an HLPE report on the topic: while the idea for such a report is something to be discussed, it is not a good idea to include it into the Decision Box that is to be approved by the Plenary. It is the role of the MYPOW process to discuss the future workstreams and HLPE reports of the CFS. A plenary decision would make it difficult for the MYPOW OEWG to freely decide. Therefore, the idea for an HLPE report should be kept in the background document.

Possibly, the draft decision box should be discussed today only, but not approved. It should be tabled in a revised version at the AG/Bureau meeting on September 12, and approved by the Bureau on September 15.

On the draft Agenda of the Forum:

- The CSM WG on Urbanization and Rural Transformation strongly suggest to strengthen the methodological concept of the Forum through guiding questions, particularly for part 1 and 2. We believe that we need leading questions to guide the debate, based also on the dynamics of the discussions during the Technical Workshops. We have provided the CFS Secretariat with specific proposals for guiding questions which are based on the previous workshops towards the development of the background paper and linked to other key policy products and work areas of the CFS. They would be important to inform the next steps/role of the CFS on this topic.
- Regarding the proposed Panelists:
 - We would like to clarify again that the Civil Society panelist is proposed and chosen by the CSM (the CFS Reform Document recognizes the autonomy of the CSM to nominate its spokespersons and to designate its representatives in communicating with CFS by its internal self-selection process (CFS:2009/2 Rev. 2 paragraph 15, 16). Our WG has already made a proposal for speakers from Kenya (Davinder Lamba) and Brazil (Christiane Costa). We ask the CFS to provide us the date by which this person should be chosen.
 - Regarding the other possible discussants and panelists, the CSM WG has expressed preferences:
 - For Corinna Hawkes as discussant in Part 1.
 - For Tim Land and Harriet Friedman as panelists from the Research community.
 - For Wayne Roberts as panelist from local governments.

- Our Working Group also proposes a moderator for the session: Henk Renting or Marielle Duebbling from the RUAF Foundation
- More detailed information on the rationale for these suggestions has been provided to the CFS Secretariat in written form.

Agenda Item 7: Workstream Updates

Updates on Workstreams and CFS 43

- The CSM is concluding today the internal process for the Side events proposals for CFS 43. This is a complex process that involves several CSM Policy Working Groups which together count with the participation of more than 300 national, regional and global civil society organizations from all constituencies. We have limited and clustered the huge interest into 5 side event proposals and hope that the CFS Chair will be in a position to approve them.
- Regarding the Special Event on Monday evening, 17 October: we would like to ask for clarification, how, where and when the theme of this event was discussed and approved. This very evening could also offer the space for several parallel side events.

On Budget update:

- The update is very clear and the CSM appreciates the effort of the CFS secretariat to make fully transparent the financial picture of the CFS.
- We do not agree with an exercise to prioritize themes within the MYPOW. We rather recall the strong position of the former Chair of the MYPOW, Luca Fratini, to defend the integrity of the MYPOW, as a matter of principle of the CFS. The CFS cannot be donor-driven, not in the development, and not in the implementation of its work program.
- Regarding the overview, we have some remarks:
 - What will happen with those workstreams that are not funded: women's empowerment, monitoring, nutrition, outreach? The CFS might face a severe crisis in 2017, if this work cannot be advanced.
 - We've seen the problem of lacking interpretation in the negotiations on smallholders to markets already. We know that no interpretation budget is available for the upcoming negotiations in September on sustainable agricultural development and livestock. The urgent interpretation problem has been raised by several member states. We must find a solution to it so that the reality does not contradict the inclusive nature of the CFS.
- In that sense, a solid long-term solution and funding strategy for the CFS is clearly needed.