

**CSM Contributions to the Meeting of the CFS Advisory Group and Bureau  
4 March 2019**

We would like to propose a topic under Any Other Business related to the CFS Advisory Group renewal. We have seen that this topic is on the agenda of the CFS Bureau meeting on Wednesday this week and would like to make a short comment for Bureau's consideration. We also would like to include an invitation for a CSM public briefing in the AOB section today.

**CFS Multi-Year Programme of Work (MYPoW) for 2020-2023 - Prioritization**

For this next moment on prioritization, we urge all members and participants to again look very seriously to the criteria for the prioritization process that were adopted in response to the CFS evaluation report, Annex B, as shared by the CFS Secretariat. These criteria include the relevance for the CFS Vision, the Strategic Objectives, the focus on the people most affected by food insecurity and malnutrition, and the root causes of food insecurity and malnutrition. In this light, our considerations are:

- We understand and welcome that the Bureau decided to start the *policy convergence process on agroecology and other innovations* with the CFS Plenary this year. We believe that the realization of this important policy process should be explicitly scheduled for 2020, and the parameters of this process should be further defined in the coming months.
- *Proposal A*: We fully support the proposal "Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment in the context of Food Security and Nutrition" and welcome that CSM comments were taken on board.
- *Proposal B*: We are also glad that the merging process for the now joint proposal of IFAD, CSM, Hungary, Indonesia and South Africa on Reducing Inequalities for Food Security and Nutrition was easy and smooth as both proposals were very similar, and the spirit of collaboration was very constructive.
- *Proposal C*: We support the proposal on water and climate change, and we are glad to acknowledge that our comments have been integrated into the revised proposal.
- *Proposal D*: We also want to express again our support on the proposal for migration but would also reiterate our suggestion to widen its scope to Migration and Food Security and Nutrition, with conflict being one among other root causes for migration.
- *Proposal E*: Regarding the youth proposal, we have expressed support and the high expectations from the CSM Youth Constituency on this topic. The CSM Youth made substantial oral and written suggestions for the proposed workstream on Youth. The CSM Youth has also expressed at the first Open MYPoW consultation meeting in January that they would be willing to support with their views the merging process of the three previous proposals. Unfortunately, we have to transmit to you today the disappointment of the CSM Youth Constituency about the fact, that they were not allowed to join the discussions for a joint proposal. They also regret that several of their key written suggestions were not included in the merged proposal that is now on the table. The CSM continues to support the theme as a workstream of the CFS, but strongly requests that the CSM Youth can fully participate in the further development of the proposal.

Concerning the other proposals, we would like to express the additional remarks:

- Data analysis – it is an important topic but is more a topic for methodological and technical discussion than for a CFS policy convergence process. We believe it could be an interesting topic for a methodological discussion at an event during Plenary or the intersessional period.
- The proposal on access to innovation is, in our view, already an important topic foreseen for the upcoming CFS process on agroecology and other innovations.
- In our view, the topic on urbanization and rural transformation is very important, and it is a pity that it has not proved possible to conduct the work in a way that led easily to a policy outcome. At this point we would propose to include key aspects of this process into the proposal on youth, as the French proposal already suggested.

Concerning the so-called “non-survey”, we understand that this is just an additional tool to get opinions but cannot be seen and taken as a formal or agreed ranking exercise. It is important that you know, that the CSM Forum and Coordinating Committee has discussed over five months the five priorities that we finally supported: women, inequalities, youth, water and migration. We believe that the weight of serious participative consultations of member countries or mechanism should be acknowledged and valued.

Finally, on the supporting activities we would like to particularly underline the importance of the proposed activities on monitoring and uptake of the new CFS guidelines on food systems and nutrition.

If the most prioritized proposals are to be the ones presented on gender equality, youth and inequalities, as the discussions and feedback so far show, it could be an option to design less ambitious activities with a bit less political support, particularly the proposals on water and climate change and migration and conflict, by

- Scheduling a stock-taking event on the CFS policy recommendations on water, climate change for 2021, possibly adding the CFS recommendations on sustainable fisheries for a monitoring exercise in 2021.
- Foreseeing an HLPE report on Migration and Food Security and Nutrition for the end of this MYPOW period, for example 2023, but already start including the topic of migration already in some of the current proposals such as youth, women and inequalities.

#### **CFS 46 Provisional Agenda, Timetable and Planning notes**

We welcome that the Bureau took up several of the proposals made at the last AG Bureau meeting in January. On the revised draft agenda and timetable, we have the following questions and remarks:

- We are glad to see that the Bureau has agreed to the intervention of the SRRtF in the Plenary Session, but we do not see reflected that decision in the current draft agenda and timetable.
- Based on lessons learned from previous years, we believe that Tuesday afternoon foresees too many agenda items which might be problematic in terms of timing.
- On the Friday morning session, it seems not so easy to do a reporting of 40 or side events to a Plenary session. As an alternative, we suggest dedicating the Friday morning session for a broad and participative Youth consultation, given the great interest and expectations that

CFS members and participants have expressed on this topic. Another option could be to use this time for the discussion event on tree plantations and food security and nutrition.

- We think that there is still not enough clarity about two topics for including them into the agenda and timetable: this is the item on urbanization and rural transformation, and the one on multi-stakeholder partnerships. Both need to be further discussed, before a decision on how they should be included into the Plenary agenda can be taken.

### **Multi-stakeholder Partnerships – Options Paper**

In our view, the added value and key role of the CFS on this topic is to give clear advice to member states on how they can establish the principles and conditions for MPSs that can make them conducive to foster food security and nutrition and advance the realization of the right to food.

This is the rationale for Option 4. As a first step, the independent evidence gap needs to be addressed; in a second step, a focused and light policy process should agree on key principles and conditions for MPSs.

It seems to us that Option 2 and 3 are not feasible at this point. They can only be implemented once a political consensus is reached on how the CFS should address Multi-stakeholder partnerships.

Option 1 only makes sense if is framed as a first step towards the implementation of Option 4, by offering a space and opportunity to address the independent evidence gap, before engaging into a policy process.

If only Option 1 is taken, it might lead to a repetition of some elements of the HLPE report, without leading to a critical political result. The risk of inefficiency might be in the room.

However, if Option 1 was taken in spite of all doubts, the concept of the event should at least address some critical issues, such as conflict of interests, power asymmetries and accountability gaps within MPSs. The proposed concept for an event should incorporate these elements. The event would need to be very well prepared, in order to generate a meaningful and in-depth discussion.

If no decision can be taken now on Option 4, maybe a decision can be deferred to a later stage, also considering other debates in the MYPOW.

### **CFS Workstream Updates**

Thanks for these updates, we would like to ask for updates on two additional items:

- We would like to ask for guidance on how the process and timeline for the preparation of the event on the relation of commercial tree plantation and food security and nutrition plantations will be prepared in the upcoming months.
- We would also like to request an update on the CFS budget 2019/2020 for the next joint meeting of the CFS Bureau and Advisory Group.

## Any Other Business

We have seen that the Renewal of the Advisory Group is on the agenda of the Bureau meeting on Wednesday.

We would like to inform you that CSM invited WFO for a good and thoughtful conversation which we held four weeks ago. We reiterated the invitation to WFO to join the CSM and had an exchange about how to overcome possible difficulties for their integration into the CSM.

We also exchanged about the fact that the farmers' and smallholders' organizations of the CSM work together with WFO in other fora, such as the IFAD Farmers Forum or the UN Decade on Family Farming. The working relations there are good and constructive, even if there are sometimes different views. Why should this not be possible in the CFS context? We also underlined that a huge diversity of farmers is represented by the organizations that are active in the CSM. We asked WFO to discuss this invitation again internally and are awaiting a response. We also suggested that WFO could just test the collaboration, in order to know if and how it could work.

On the proposal for a so-called Farmers' cluster in parallel to the two Mechanisms, we have deep concerns. It is unclear how such cluster would be constituted and work. Would the farmers' organizations that now participate in the CSM and PSM join it? If so, what would be the consequences? Possibly, its effects would be more divisive than inclusive. Would an artificial divide between food producers who are farmers, and food producers who are fisherfolks or pastoralists, make any sense in the CFS context? Why should we create a cluster for farmers and not a cluster for indigenous peoples? These are only a few of many more questions that might arise.

Instead of going very far and losing more time and energy, we should effectively address the very specific problem on the table: how can we make sure that WFO can join and contribute to CFS without further tensions? Why don't we test it? Both Mechanisms are open.