

CSM Contributions to the OEWG Session on Nutrition, 10 February 2017

We have organized this document to reflect on each of the draft agenda points at the 10 Feb OEWG session. Please let us know if you will need further clarification. Thank you kindly.

1. Presentation of the draft UN Decade of Action on Nutrition Work Programme

- We underscore that our contribution is within limits of the CSM Nutrition WG mandate; more detailed comments will be submitted by the CS platform (ICN2 CSO group) that has been following the ICN2 process more closely.
- **Fragmentation:** ICN2 was a step forward in countering existing fragmentation by bringing food and nutrition together. Now we are fragmenting the situation again by splitting in work areas and action networks from which States can pick and choose to lead/join with no indication on how policy convergence between them (and other areas affecting nutrition) will be achieved.
- **Nutrition actors:** Distinction should be made between the various actors that are to be involved in the Decade and not pretend that we are all equal and all want the same (different roles, interests, legitimacy). We must acknowledge the powerful economic interests that exist in nutrition. The goal should therefore not simply be alignment among actors, as emphasised in the document, but rather work plan must ensure that actions and activities are in alignment with public interest, and human rights-policies/priorities put forward by States.
- **Nutrition governance** (related to previous): A clear government lead space to ensure meaningful, self-organised participation of civil society and especially the groups most affected in all aspects of Decade (ICN2 call for CSM-like mechanism) is necessary, recognition of the risks of collaboration with and financing from the private sector, and need for conflict of interest safeguards is essential. At all stages of the workplan this needs to be emphasized. There is an importance to define the overarching coordination mechanism guiding the Decade, it is not sufficient to simply rely on the multiple, existing coordination platforms to coordinate the Decade (as mentioned in the workplan) with no indication as to how they will work together effectively and ensure against fragmentation.
- **More holistic approach to monitoring impact:** We cannot just monitor indicators focussed on nutrition outcomes but also indicators that would assess improvements (or potential set-backs) in the social, economic, political and environmental determinants of nutrition, as well as indicators that look at the way (process) these have been achieved (e.g., social participation).
- **Critical Reflection:** Discourse of Decade is to promote existing efforts, accelerate actions, build and scale up actions but there also needs to be reflection on whether scaling up existing actions would be beneficial to those most affected and when a change in course is necessary. The Decade should facilitate critical reflection on existing actions and policies that affect nutrition (incl. beyond nutrition) to allow for informed choices on which policies and actions to pursue within the Decade.

2. Identifying CFS Contribution to Nutrition Decade Work Programme

- Current draft circulated for discussion should be discarded (repeats what has already been agreed in CFS 43)
- We need to start engaging in discussing nutrition – what would be substantive contribution of CFS in the areas spelled out by Work Programme? Which is the policy agenda CFS wants to tackle?
- We need a space to discuss this, there is potential to make the Decade more responsive to peoples' realities as informed by CSM constituencies and to consider how CFS can ensure that the work of the Decade looks at FSN from a broader perspective by not only working to ensure nutritious diets but also livelihoods and sustainability.

3. First Intersessional Event “Investments for Healthy Food Systems”

- **Create space for discussion** (not lecture, less structure/articulation), this is capacity-building activity so opportunity should be used to explore and reflect on the issues, through engaged discussion, interaction and a longer audience participation element.
- Suggest **political chairing** (perhaps MS representative) rather than an academic chair to encourage MS discussion and keep the discussion focused on realities on the ground.
- **Suggestion for a panel** rather than presentation format. Panel members should include small-scale production, as they are the largest investors in production systems. In addition to the author of the UNSCN document, the panel should also include a member of the IPES expert committee. This is also an opportunity to discuss the HLPE document and food systems typologies that will be presented in this report so a member of the Expert Team should also be present on the panel.
- **Event should not be framed exclusively by UNSCN docs** – this also relates to second intersessional event – but rather this could be a background doc amongst others. FS categorization of paper should not be starting point of discussion. Divergent perspectives should be promoted.
- Discussion of investments should emphasize the importance of **public investments in food systems and small-scale production**, currently such investment is limited.

4. Second Intersessional Event

- Re-iterate our support for “Impact assessment of policies to support healthy food environments and healthy diets”.

5. Lessons learned & good practice session

- State that we do not believe this should be a session during the plenary, but rather we should preserve plenary time for discussing emerging issues. This should be moved to an intersessional event not linked to CFS44.