

Remarks on the revised Chair proposal

Section II: this Section is called in the table of contents “Vision and roles”, but in the text (page 2-3) it is called “CFS Objectives and Outcomes”. The text does include the vision of the CFS, but then it reproduced a contested description of three CFS outcomes that, as said in previous occasions, does not capture the six roles of the CFS (by leaving out the reference to the right to food, the reference to accountability and monitoring, and the reference to the GSF/policy coherence).

Based on the discussion on the CFS evaluation and the agreement to formulate a strategic MYPoW in the coming year, and taking into account that we have not had a discussion on this part of the MYPoW during the last meetings, we propose to take these outcomes out here, in order to avoid a lengthy discussion on this today.

Section III:

No comments on a) Evaluation, b) Nutrition, c) Urbanization and Rural transformation and d) SDGs

Comment on point e) “Sharing experiences and best practices”

The activities agreed under this workstream were agreed by the OEWG on monitoring. The activities here will be implemented as contributions to CFS monitoring function

The CFS monitoring function is an essential role of the CFS, as reaffirmed in paragraph a) of the draft decision box on monitoring agreed on by the OEWG on monitoring.

We understand that this section in MYPoW should be in line with the Decision Box and the Working Document on Monitoring that was agreed on in the OEWG on monitoring. In this sense, we suggest:

- 1) Adjust the name of this workstream to this decision box: This would then read: **“Monitoring the use and application of the CFS Policy recommendations”**.

Or, alternatively, the full title of the document of the OEWG that is for the proposed for endorsement by CFS 44 could be considered: **“Monitoring the implementation of CFS main policy products and other policy recommendation”**. In any case, the proposed title *“Sharing experiences and good practices”* does only cover a part of that function.

- 2) The **monitoring of the specific CFS policy recommendations needs to be included into the MYPoW**, as defined by the OEWG. This means that the

respective paragraph from the draft decision box (paragraph b, second part) should be included into the MYPOW text.

f) Comment on Partnerships:

- Remark on Paragraph 52: this paragraph deviates from the way, how HLPE reports have been taken up by the CFS so far. The last sentence of this paragraph suggests the possibility of opening a full CFS workstream on this topic.
- This sounds a bit anachronic in a time when many voices call for a prioritization and reduction of workstreams.
- It is better to take this last half-sentence out here and to frame the process after the HLPE report in the way as it has been done so far: the HLPE report informs a convergence process towards policy recommendations of the CFS.

On decision Box on MYPoW

Remarks on paragraphs d) and e)

We've said many times that a donor-driven CFS agenda, or a donor-driven implementation of the CFS is not acceptable. The integrity of the MYPOW should be respected.

The Plenary of CFS 44 should not take a decision that already indicates the way to a donor-driven revision of the MYPOW 2018/19. The risk for a selective, donor-driven agenda is clearly there. A CFS that has to accept such a proceeding, is a weak CFS.

Therefore, we cannot support the approach proposed in the draft decision box. We suggest to delete paragraph d) and to amend paragraph e) in the following way:

The CFS

e) Recognizes the key role of CFS Members in contributing to closing the existing financial gap, **and invites the Rome-Based Agencies to consider increasing their contributions to the CFS.**

If, due to a persistent lack of funding, a reprioritization process was unavoidable for the second year of the biennium, the CFS Plenary 45 should take a decision on it in October 2018. For such case, no specific provision needs to be included here. The decision would be taken by the Plenary.

At the same time, it is important to periodically assess the financially situation of the CFS, as it has been handled in the recent past as well: the CFS Secretariat informs the

CFS Bureau and Advisory Group. This proceeding does not need a provision in the Decision box either, it should just be continued as a good, regular practice.