

**CSM Contributions
to the Joint Meeting of the
CFS Bureau and Advisory Group
2 February 2016**

Agenda Item 1: Draft CFS 43 Timetable

In general, the draft timetable is appreciated. However, the following remarks and suggestions seem important to us:

- 1) More time needs to be allotted for the topic on Smallholder to Markets, which is the CFS work stream that concludes with CFS 43. 45 minutes is not enough to discuss its relevance and follow-up.
- 2) The GSF discussion and decision will also need more time than 45 minutes, as this will open the updating process of the GSF in 2017.
- 3) We welcome the proposal that the Linkages and Coordination session will provide the space for the global thematic monitoring session on the VGGT. However, it should then also be called monitoring and should possibly not be for information only. In any case a Decision Box on the basic terms for national, regional and global events will be prepared by the OEWG on Monitoring. This discussion should not be part of the Monitoring session on VGGT, but will need its own place and time.
- 4) The Forum on Urbanization and rural transformation could be held then on Friday morning and could be seen as the special event of CFS 43. Then, there would be also new space to give more time for the issues of smallholder to markets, GSF and monitoring.
- 5) As there will be certainly again a huge interest for holding side-events, also the slot of Monday evening should be open to 3 or 4 side events, not only one.
- 6) Regarding the opening session on Monday afternoon, a discussion should be held on how to use this session to strengthen the relevance and profile of the CFS, and to build our visions for the CFS. We would like to encourage everybody to reflect about this and would like to know, if there is a deadline for submitting suggestions.

Agenda Item 2: CFS 43 Side Events criteria

- 1) Side events to the CFS is an important space for many actors involved in the CFS to advance the exchange and discussion on topics related to the CFS mandate and most relevant to food security and nutrition in decentralized events outside the plenary.
- 2) Side events have been fundamental to bring the people's voices to the CFS, where the small-scale food producers, social movements and other civil society have been included more than in any other place of the UN System.
- 3) Side events have been essential also for other CFS constituencies that have shown a huge commitment to the CFS processes, as well as the capacity to outreach and foster cooperation with other actors.
- 4) In this sense, we believe that the Criteria n.2 for the prioritization of side events should be reformulated, giving priority to the CFS constituencies and the inclusion of

those sectors and voices most affected by exclusion from policy spaces related to food security and nutrition.

- 5) At the same time, we believe that the composition of the panels of side events should be diverse and reflect a broad spectrum of CFS actors.
- 6) In this sense, we suggest to reformulate the Criteria n.2 in the following way: *“Priority should be given to Side events that are organized by CFS constituencies, giving particular attention to the inclusion of the voices most affected by food insecurity and malnutrition. Organizers are encouraged to reflect the multi-actor nature of the CFS in the composition of the panels aiming at a dialogue of views.”*
- 7) As an additional remark on interpretation: the CSM requests to continue to organize the interpretation of its side events on its own, as it used to be in the past, for financial and practical reasons. The interpretation team that is contracted by the CSM for the CFS week is available for our meetings and activities, and we cannot afford extra-cost for FAO interpreters for the side events.

Agenda Item 3: Policy Round Table Process

- 1) We appreciate the effort to describe the way how the process from the presentation of the HLPE report on Sustainable Agricultural Development, including Livestock could be framed between the launch of the HLPE report and the adoption of the CFS policy recommendation on the theme. We can accept many of the suggested steps, while we also have several proposals for change and improvement.
- 2) We do not share the negative assessment of the previous process on Water and Food Security and Nutrition. The process was really inclusive and effective, but we agree that the negotiations during the CFS Plenary need to be better prepared, to avoid long night sessions during the week.
- 3) We start with the principle that the inclusiveness of the negotiation process must be ensured. And we all know that the sessions of the OEWG-style Task Teams in July and September, even if they are open to all CFS members and participants, were not sufficiently attended by all regions, and CSM also faced severe financial constraints to bring the most knowledgeable practitioners to the meetings.
- 4) We believe that the CFS plenary is the most inclusive space for CFS actors, including the CSM, where the experts from capitals and the field can really participate in the political negotiations. This political role of the CFS plenary is important and should not be dropped. We believe that the actual negotiations should be held and finalized in the week of the CFS.

- 5) However, to better prepare the negotiations of the CFS week, the Rapporteur should use the meetings prior to CFS 43 to get a full feedback on a first draft of a decision box which would allow him to clearly identify those parts where a consensus can be reached easily, and also identifies those parts where the divergent views are most evident. The parts with divergent views could be presented with different wording options to the plenary and would be the focus of the negotiations process during the CFS week.

The CSM can provide the CFS Secretariat with specific alternative wording proposals. We believe that these proposals for change need more discussion, and we suggest to postpone the approval of a revised note to the Bureau Meeting on 31 of March. There is no urgency to conclude the paper in this week, but there is a urgent need to establish a good process on the matter.

Specific wording proposals:

Regarding the specific proposals presented by the CFS Secretariat, we suggest to change the following sentences:

b) *“Encourage the HLPE to prepare evidence based recommendations in a way that reflects the complexity of the issue in the most concise way.”* The idea to reduce the HLPE report recommendation to maximum 2 pages would lead to an unnecessary simplification. Substance is more important than reaching a quick agreement on a superficial text.

d) *delete paragraph d).* CFS members and participants should not be prohibited to introduce a new element if they were not able to attend a previous meeting of the OEWG-like Task Team.

e) *replace the current paragraph e)* by the following sentence: “Use the meetings prior to CFS 43 to get a full feedback on a first draft of a decision box which would allow the Rapporteur to clearly identify those parts where a consensus can be reached easily, and also identifies those parts where the divergent views are most evident.”

f) *replace the current paragraph f)* by the following sentence “Use the first plenary debate to have an exchange of views, and suggestions to the draft decision box. These suggestions will be taken up in the negotiations of the Friends of the Chair group during the first three evening sessions of the CFS plenary.”

g) *replace the current paragraph g)* by the following sentence: “Use the second and final plenary debate to adopt the agreed decision box and discuss the ways to use and apply the policy recommendations on the topic.”

Agenda Item 4: Nutrition – Focus of the HLPE report

- 1) Regarding the Request for the HLPE Document on Nutrition, the CSM Working Group on Nutrition decided not to advance further comments at this stage, also considering the necessity to move the process forward. However, the CSM feels that the document, while comprehensive and substantive, somehow suffers from the lack of logical sequence in advancing the nutrition conversation within the CFS, as this would have been the natural consequence of a larger debate, including a deeper conceptual and political understanding of nutrition in the CFS context, rather than its first step. However, there is nothing we can do about this at this stage. We therefore feel that we should let the HLPE proceed with its work, while the OEWG, under the able leadership of its Chair, can further its process.

Agenda Item 5: Finalization of workplans

Workplan on Nutrition:

- 1) CFS’s engagement with nutrition needs to start from very clear value propositions and should be firmly grounded in a rights-based approach, with special but non-exclusive reference to the Right to Adequate Food and Nutrition, the Right to Water, the Right to Health, Women’s Rights, the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Workers’ Rights, among others.

- 2) CFS work should be based on the common understanding that the challenge of malnutrition in all its forms requires a holistic and multidisciplinary analysis, one that combines the political and technical perspectives. Its first fundamental step is the firm re-connection of nutrition with food, with the understanding that the food is the expression of values, cultures, social relations and people's self-determination. The act of feeding oneself and others embodies our sovereignty, ownership and empowerment. When nourishing oneself and eating with one's family, friends, and community, we reaffirm our cultural identities, our ownership over our life course and our human dignity.
- 3) Regarding the OEWG calendar, we welcome the inclusion - and wish to underline the importance - of one/two intersessional events to foster dialogue and understanding on nutrition in the CFS context. The CSM feels that these events – if planned in an inclusive and participatory manner – could greatly contribute to establishing a common language across all CFS constituencies and build our collective capacity to engage in this new and pivotal work stream. The CSM stands ready to engage in the planning and preparation of these events.

Workplan on SDGs

- 1) We would like to acknowledge the fact that the revised workplan, resulting from the discussion in the SDGs OEWG in January, reflects several proposals presented by the CSM, notably the establishment of the Task Team for the preparation of the draft proposal for the CFS engagement with the SDGs Agenda, as well as the opportunity to include workshops/intersessional activities to address more in depth those aspects of the SDGs agenda that require a common understanding by the CFS participants.
- 2) However, we find useful to reiterate that in our view, the “guiding questions” should be seen rather as inspirational questions for the written submissions. CFS participants should remain free to submit their written inputs in the structure they prefer. As CSM, we adopted and proposed a methodological approach that starts with a general assessment of the SDGs, to then definition of the driving principles that should guide defining the CFS engagement in the 2030 Sustainable development Agenda, and lastly the definition of the different domains of the CFS engagement, in accordance with the mandate and functions set by the CFS reform document.

Workplan on Smallholders to Markets

- We highly appreciate the effort of the Secretariat and the Chair of the OEWG to accommodate the CSM's request to postpone the Informal Consultation in order to facilitate participation by small-scale producer representatives from the different regions and constituencies.

- We reaffirm our commitment to the important appointment of 8-9 June. We note that the Zero Draft will come out on 14 March and this will be the start of the consultation process.
- We have a proposal to make to improve the proposed Work Plan:
 1. Rather than releasing a new Draft 1 on 8 April- following the AG/Bureau discussion on 31 March and the electronic consultation - we propose that the Zero draft continue to circulate up to 25 April, for three reasons:
 - Experience shows that circulating successive drafts of a document in a short lapse of time creates confusion in the consultation – even for governments let alone for our civil society organizations.
 - It would not be possible for our organizations to consult with our base on a document that we receive (in English) on 8 April. It will already be difficult enough to consult on the Draft Zero in the period from mid-March to 25 April.
 - The AG/Bureau meeting and the electronic consultation in themselves are not sufficiently inclusive to provide adequate input for a revised draft.
 2. We propose that the Draft Zero be discussed at the Informal Consultation, which will be an inclusive forum in which to share our viewpoints. Immediately after this, the secretariat and Task Team should prepare the revised Draft 1. We are convinced that this way of proceeding would lead to a better document for discussion on 8-9 June, in which all of us will feel greater ownership.

Agenda Item 6: Workstreams Updates

- 1) On MYPOW: we encourage the CFS Secretariat and the OEWG Chair to carry out, with the support from the Rome based agencies, the stocktaking of outcomes of previous plenary sessions, analyse the HLPE note on emerging issues and elaborate on how these topics meet the criteria of the CFS Guidance note agreed by the CFS last October. We also recall that OEWG members will be invited to respond to these proposals and present their own proposals for topics with a strong rationale to be included into the future CFS agenda.
- 2) On the Budget: CSM and others have clearly defended the integrity of the MYPOW for this biennium and have expressed concern about the still high deficit of 3 million USD in the CFS Budget.
We would like to know in more detail:
 - the confirmed sources of funding (how much by whom);
 - the progress we can expect in the coming months with regard to the CFS Budget;
 - the question which funds are earmarked to which process;
 - the question if possible conflict of interest arise;
 - the question if there is any CFS workstream that has difficulties to be funded properly, particularly the workstream on smallholders to markets; and
 - what measures are envisaged in case the budget gap cannot be significantly reduced in the next few months.