

Intervention of Thierry Kesteloot, Oxfam Solidarité, Belgium on behalf of CSM Working Group on MYPoW – 11 October 2017

We would like to congratulate the Chair, Dr Mafizur Rahman for having been able to conclude the MYPoW 18-19.

We welcome the decision to request an HLPE report on Agroecological approaches and other innovations for sustainable agriculture and food systems that enhance food security and nutrition. Agroecology comes with a holistic social, economic, and political dimension that respects the natural balance and guarantees the food sovereignty of the peoples, while allowing the recreation of biodiversity of native seeds, animal and plant species, soil microorganisms and pollinators, in a coevolution with the people in a dynamic management of territories. The agro-ecological transition provides an essential solution in achieving the strategy of the Decade of Nutrition and the Sustainable Development Agenda, in relation to food security, nutrition, sustainable food systems, water management, responsible consumption and production, climate change, sustainability of the oceans, and terrestrial ecosystems, to mention but a few.

The elaboration process of the MYPoW 2018/19 was not easy. We would like to underline the following elements in order to strengthen the MYPoW process:

We are concerned by the increasing use of so called “red lines” to dispute the centrality of human rights and to block topics from discussion at the CFS or reports by its expert body. We believe that the use of “red lines” that challenge the normative basis of the United Nations or intent to prevent a debate on relevant but controversial issues to happen, is not in line with the spirit of CFS and undermines the CFS’ position as the foremost inclusive policy platform on food security and nutrition.

Furthermore, as highlighted by the adopted outcomes of the Forum on Women’s Empowerment, we request the Chair to include in the report that the CFS requests the MYPoW OEWG to mainstream gender equality, women’s and girls’ rights and women’s empowerment in all workstreams, products and documents of the CFS.

In relation to the monitoring workstream, we recall that the CFS reform document defines the promotion of accountability, particularly through an innovative monitoring mechanism, as one of six key functions of the CFS. The work of the OEWG on monitoring is a fundamental component of the structure of the CFS, and its work should go beyond organizing the global thematic event. It remains the necessary space to reflect and advance the incremental development of the innovative monitoring mechanism, which is at the heart of the CFS reform process.

For the upcoming discussions on new Terms of Reference for the CFS MYPoW process, we suggest to duly consider the HLPE note and the discussion on critical and emerging issues on Friday of this CFS Plenary week in the future planning. However,, we request the OEWG to develop the space to reflect on how to address critical urgent emerging issues as they arise, including but not limited to, the CFS policy response to famines.

Last but not least, we need to address the chronic budget deficit of the CFS. It is unacceptable that the foremost inclusive intergovernmental and international political platform on food security and nutrition is not able to find a solution to this problem. In line with the special meeting on sustainable funding convened by the CFS Chair in March, we call for a slightly increased contribution of the Rome-Based Agencies. We request all States to contribute, according to their capacity. We also call for prioritisation of budgetary allocation towards HLPE and policy convergence processes, over intersessional events that do not lead to policy convergence. This happened for instance in the

nutrition workstream where 3 intersessional events were funded but no translation of the HLPE report. Finally, the CSM has always underlined that a donor-driven agenda of the CFS weakens the CFS as a whole. We will continue the discussions on a sustainable budget mechanism in the coming year in the framework of the CFS response to the CFS evaluation.