

On agenda item 1: CFS 44 Drafts decision

a) Nutrition

No comments

b) SDGs

No comments

c) MYPoW

No comments

d) GSF

- CSM would like to highlight again the importance of the GSF for the CFS, and particularly the need to promote dissemination, use and application of the GSF on all levels, in order to advance the progressive realization of the right to adequate food.
- The new online-version of the GSF allows a much better access to the CFS decisions, but now it is the responsibility of all members and participants to effectively make the GSF better known and within all constituencies.

e) Monitoring

- CSM wants to recall the importance of the monitoring function for the CFS. CSM looks forward to the discussion on the follow-up on the CFS decision taken on monitoring in the context of the CFS evaluation, to particularly advance the incremental development of the innovative monitoring mechanism of the CFS.
- One important step ahead is the process towards the Global Thematic Event on Monitoring de use and application of the Right to Food Guidelines in October 2018. We want to specifically encourage member states and participants to promote national monitoring events that will feed into the Global Thematic Event. And we also encourage members states and FAO to include regional monitoring events on the Right to Food Guidelines into the agendas of the upcoming FAO regional conferences. All these inputs will contribute to a substantial and successful Global Thematic Event at CFS 45.

f) Urbanization and Rural Transformation

- After the long discussions on the way ahead, we can live with the final formulation as it is suggested now. The CSM welcomes the themes of the two intersessional events scheduled for 2018.
- However, for the CSM Working Group on urbanization and Rural Transformation, it is very important to have concrete and relevant policy conclusions of this process in the future. We very much hope that such policy convergence process will be envisaged at CFS 45 for 2019. The participating organizations of the CSM cannot afford to invest their time into a process without a substantial policy relevant outcome.

On agenda item 2: CFS Evaluation: roadmap and consultation report

The CSM appreciates the way how the evaluation process has been conducted in the June and July meetings and wants to particularly thank Egypt and Iceland for co-facilitating the process.

With regards to the revised consultation report that aims to summarize the outcomes of the discussions last week and was circulated two days back, we have some key remarks. However, due to the short time since its circulation, we have not had the chance to fully analyze the document and its annexes in its revised version, and we were not able to translate the fourteen pages into the other languages and consult the CSM governing bodies. Therefore, our comments at this stage can only be preliminary. A more comprehensive comment on these documents will be provided by the CSM in a few weeks.

The main observations and suggestions we want to make at this point are:

- 1) **All important decisions of the CFS in response to the CFS must be endorsed by the CFS Plenary.** This principle was repeatedly reaffirmed during the evaluation meetings, also last Friday. This means that the responses on the politically important recommendations will either be endorsed during CFS 44, as part of the Consultation Report, or by the CFS 45, as Part of the Plan of Action.

This principle is recognized in the draft decision box presented to this meeting, but not fully operationalized through the document. This still needs to be done. This implies particularly significant changes to Annex 2 of the document.

We strongly believe that the **Plenary, not the Bureau should take decisions on politically important responses that affect the CFS as a whole.** This includes the responses to the Composition of the Advisory Group (recommendation 4), the role of the members (recommendation 7), the role of the Chair (recommendation 8), the role of the Secretariat (recommendation 9), and the response to the Monitoring function (recommendation 10), and to the HLPE Steering Committee (recommendation 14). The Bureau can develop a proposal for such decision, as part of the Plan of Action, but should not take a definitive decision on them.

The **only recommendations on which the Bureau should develop and implement a response on its own**, are in our view the more operational recommendation on communication (recommendation 11), dissemination of HLPE reports (recommendation 12, and Updates on HLPE and Bureau/AG work (recommendation 13).

- 2) There is a contradiction between paragraph d) of the draft decision box and the roadmap. The draft decision box states that the decision on the new composition of the Advisory Group should be taken until in March 2018 and after having discussed recommendation 4. However, these discussions are scheduled in the roadmap for the period February to May 2018.

In any case, as the response to the recommendation 4 will only be preliminarily discussed before CFS 44, and will need to be endorsed by the Plenary of CFS 45, it is very difficult to already give a mandate and timeline to the Bureau for a decision on this topic. What will happen, if the outcome of the policy discussions on recommendation 4 is that the number of Advisory Group members should be increased, and therefore a change of the CFS rules and procedure is needed? This is not an unrealistic scenario.

In this sense, paragraph d) of the draft decision box should not mention a specific date for the Bureau decision. **Our proposal is that the decision box should exceptionally extend the mandate of the current Advisory Group, without setting a specific date, and request the Bureau to take a decision on its new Advisory Group after concluding the response to recommendation 4.**

- 3) If we look today into the column of the Consultation Report and the draft Roadmap that indicates the implementing body of this action, we find an **overwhelming list of tasks for the CFS Bureau and Advisory Group**. We recognize that this was generally agreed during the meeting last Friday. However, looking with fresh eyes at the full table of tasks of the consultation report and the roadmap particularly for the CFS Bureau, it seems that the Bureau will be strongly overloaded during the intersessional period of 2018. It might be good to first **calculate the number of meetings that might be required and then reconsider this decision**.
- 4) Paragraphs 26 and 28 of the consultation report need revision. It was not agreed, as paragraph 26 says, that the CFS Bureau and Advisory Group would take on issues such as “CFS agenda setting and resources, monitoring and accountability” etc, including tasks of the OEWG on MYPOW and monitoring. Also, the last sentence of paragraph 28 is unclear, as it refers to a “multi-functional OEWG” that was not mentioned before. Our understanding of the outcome of last Friday on this matter is much better captured in the table after paragraph 29. **The chapeau to this table, including paragraph 26 and 28 should be adjusted to the actions to be taken as outlined in the table.**
- 5) Finally, the **formulation on the robust safeguards to prevent conflict of interest** (Paragraph 18 (i) and Action A3.1: We would suggest to slightly adjust the formulation: *“The strategy will include robust safeguards to prevent potential conflict of interest, taking into account related guidelines and experiences from FAO and other UN agencies”* .

On agenda item 3: CFS Policy Convergence. Sustainable Forestry for FSN: process and expected outcomes

- We welcome the HLPE Report as the basis for a meaningful policy convergence process, and we welcome the fact that this policy convergence

process can still be conducted before the CFS 44, thanks to the last-minute efforts of several countries to overcome the funding constraints.

- We believe that the whole process and the resulting CFS Policy recommendations should have a strong focus on the people who live in, with and from the forests. Therefore, the policy outcomes should communicate to local communities, forest people and other forest dependent people, particularly indigenous peoples, peasants, pastoralists, fisherfolks, forest dwellers, forest workers, and particularly women in all these groups.
- The livelihood of these people, their relation to the forests and their contributions to food security and nutrition should be at the center of the debate.
- The practices and achievements of Community Forest Management need to be recognized, respected and supported.
- The policy recommendation need to name clear roles and responsibilities for the different actors, so that they can be implemented and monitored. Our constituencies have huge expectations on this process. They are willing to engage with the CFS in a way that the outcomes of this process make a real difference for the communities on the ground.
- The process proposal that is now presented, shows that the actual negotiation period is very short. This shall not affect the quality and substance of its outcome. The process needs still methodological guidance, which we expect the rapporteur to outline at the consultation meeting on 19 September. We are looking forward to fully engage in this important process.

On agenda item 4: Forum on Women's Empowerment. Draft agenda and background document

- We welcome the background document and the agenda and format of the Forum, and we would like to express our appreciation for the hard work done and the fruitful collaboration of the Technical Task Team.
- We particularly appreciation the comprehensive and holistic vision of the background paper and the Forum that addresses both the opportunities and challenges of the global trends and persistent barriers rural women continue to face when advancing towards women empowerment, women's rights and gender equality for food security.
- One methodological remark and suggestion for first guiding question that is proposed for the afternoon discussions of the Forum. We suggest that it should be an open, not a closed question. The question should not be, **if** CFS policy outcomes have been promoting women's empowerment, women's rights and gender quality as a pre-requisite for food security and nutrition, but rather **how** this has been done.

On agenda item 5: CFS Annual Progress Report

No comment from our side.

On agenda item 6: Updates on CFS 44 preparations and workstream updates

Several questions on the agenda of the CFS 44:

- How will the discussion on the situation of food insecurity and malnutrition in the world be discussed on the first day of the Plenary, and how will the discussion on food emergencies and food crises be conducted in this context?
- How will the session on Urbanization and Rural Transformation (Day 4 of CFS 44) be conducted?
- How will the session on critical and emerging issues be conducted (Day 5 morning)?

On agenda item 7: CFS Budget Update

No further comment needed, was broadly discussed in the MYPOW meeting.

On agenda item 8: Enhancing foresight and scenario analysis for food systems – Possible discussion at CFS 44

This proposal for discussion is interesting and might be included as one among other issues in the session of CFS 44 on critical and emerging issues. We would, however, request that also other emerging and critical issues, such as the impact of the ongoing corporate concentration within the agri-food sector and their impact on food security and nutrition can be brought up and discussed in this part of the CFS 44.