

**Draft Contributions of the CSM  
to the CFS Advisory Group and Bureau Meeting  
29 November 2016**

**Agenda Item 1 Feedback on CFS 43**

- The CSM has expressed already at the end of the CFS 43 our overall positive assessment of the Plenary Session and of most of the decisions taken, also our appreciation for the inclusive, participatory, and transparent way the CFS Chair facilitated the process throughout the session.
- The Global Thematic Event on Monitoring the use and application of the VGGT was an outstanding and promising start for the CFS monitoring exercise. A more thorough evaluation will be done in the OEWG on Monitoring. An important improvement to suggest is, however, that future monitoring sessions should finalize with conclusion and lessons learned from the monitoring exercise.
- The Special Event on SDG was also interesting and substantial, particular due to the national experiences and well managed discussion of the many different actors and perspectives.
- One the other side, we strongly suggest that in future, all Special events foreseen for the Plenary week should be properly consulted with the Advisory Group, which was not the case this time for the Special event on value chains and nutrition. By doing so, their consistency with other CFS workstreams, particularly the concluding process on smallholder to markets could have been better ensured.
- We also need to mention, that there was an initial confusion between participants and observers during the first day of the Plenary Session. It was important that this was corrected afterwards by the Chair, and should also be kept clear in the future.
- We suggest to revise the way how conclusions of the CFS sessions for discussion are drawn. We do not believe that pre-written conclusions can capture the wealth of the debate and are also sometimes too long for the plenary to fully follow.
- The Plenary is the broadest and most participative space for discussion and decision-making in the CFS. It should not be limited to the approval of already pre-negotiated decisions. We suggest that proposals for such a concept of a “living Plenary” should be gathered and discussed.
- Regarding the preparation of the Plenary during the inter-sessional period: we would like to stress again the demand that all negotiations should be interpreted to ensure inclusiveness and effective participation. We also could see this year again that the support of OEWG through Technical Task Teams did work better than other, less open and effective modalities.

**Agenda Item 2 CFS 44 Timetable**

- We understand that the proposed timetable is a very preliminary illustration and cannot replace a proper process to set the agenda for the CFS 44.
- In our view, the different OEWGs will first have to discuss their processes, particularly the OEWGs on Nutrition, on Monitoring, on Urbanization and Rural Transformation, to define which kind of Plenary discussion and time will be needed for them.
- The proposed time window for the MYPOW 2018/19 and the next HLPE note on Critical and Emerging issues will certainly need more time, as well as probably the time for the response to the CFS evaluation.
- We suggest to leave a window in the CFS 44 timetable open for a discussion on a topic of global attention with high relevance for food security and nutrition. The topic

should be discussed and agreed by the Bureau/AG during the first half of 2017. This window of the special event could be used as a space to address emerging global issues for an open discussion, without the need of arriving at conclusions and with the effect to strengthen the CFS as a discussion platform of global visibility.

### **Agenda Item 3 Forum on Women's Empowerment**

- In preparation of this important workstream, the CSM Forum 2016 dedicated a broad public panel debate, and also part of our internal discussions on the struggle of women for land and resources, the full realization of women's rights, particularly of the rights of rural women in relation to food security and nutrition.
- During these discussions, we could clearly see that much more is needed than only identifying good practices. While it is important and useful to identify, and share good practices, there is also a challenge to effectively address the obstacles for the full enjoyment of women's rights.
- These obstacles include the lack of equal access, rights and ownership of land and natural resources; the lack of implementation of existing legal and policy frameworks that recognize women's rights; the lack of autonomous spaces and platforms of women to dialogue with decision-makers in governments; the frequent cases of criminalization against women's leaders; the lack of protection of women against violence in all its forms.
- There is still a huge need to make women's rights more known to women at local level, to make them aware of their rights, especially those enshrined in international human rights treaties, particularly CEDAW. The recently adopted General recommendation 34 of CEDAW on the Rights of Rural Women (on Article 14 of CEDAW) is a clear example for this need and potential of this approach for improving food security and nutrition.
- In this sense, CSM would support the proposed Option 1 for Forum back to back or during CFS 44 with several amendments to substantially strengthen the proposal:
  - It should identify good practices but also identify the obstacles and challenges to women's rights and particularly their right to adequate food;
  - It should include a reporting component to draw lessons learned from the implementation, and the lack of implementation, of already existing legal and policy frameworks;
  - It should include the promotion of new policy instruments with high relevance for food security and nutrition, particularly from CEDAW on the Rights of Rural Women.

#### ***Proposal for next steps:***

- The Technical Task Team which would be constituted to support the process should be open to the members of the Advisory Group, including CSM, PSM and Rome Based Agencies, but also include other specialized UN bodies such as UN Women and CEDAW.
- The TTT should draft an outline for the format and the roadmap for the Forum, for discussion at the next AG/Bureau meeting and approval by the Bureau in February 2017.

### **Agenda Item 4 Advisory Group Reporting Exercise**

### **Agenda Item 5 Ad-hoc Participants voluntary reporting**

----- CSM contributions - see reporting exercise

## Agenda Item 6 Workstream Updates

- We stress the importance of the Nairobi Workshop for the Framework for Action for Food Security and Nutrition in Protracted Crises: it shows how the promotion of the use and application of CFS Outcomes can be done and needs to be strengthened in future.
- On Monitoring, it would be good to know which countries and regional plan to hold national monitoring events in 2017 in line with the approved terms of reference for monitoring events on the use and applications of CFS outcomes.
- On MYPOW, CSM has presented three proposals: agroecology for food security and nutrition as an HLPE report in 2019, the labor conditions of plantation workers and market concentration as proposals for other workstreams. We encourage CFS members and participants to support these proposals for their extraordinary relevance for food security and nutrition.

## Agenda Item 7 Budget

### ***a) Updates for 2016-2017***

- The CFS budget gap for 2017 continues to be very concerning.
- If no major financial contributions are made available, the financial deficit of the HLPE will have the consequence that the two upcoming HLPE Reports for 2017 can only be published in English. This is not acceptable. We call on Members states and RBA to make an emergency extra-effort to support the HLPE.
- Concerning CSM: we've been active engaging in talks with governments and RBAs, to address the deficit, we face for 2017. We still hope that we can bridge the gap, but we do not have certainty yet.

### ***b) Sustainable funding to implement agreed MYPoW Activities***

CSM has stated repeatedly that a solid and sustainable funding structure of the CFS should reflect the support of all members and the RBA to the CFS. The CFS must be funded by public funds. The integrity of the MYPOW is important, a donor-driven CFS would be a weak CFS. We look at the note from the CFS secretariat from that perspective and ask, how the public funding sources of the CFS can be increased, secured and better shared in future.

Regarding specific suggestions, we propose to explore the following pathways:

- 1) A first option could be that CFS is fully funded by its members through a Scale-based suggested contribution of all its members.
- 2) A second, mixed model could be to maintain the current support from RBA to the CFS and to cover the missing part through a Scale-based suggest contribution of all its members.
- 3) A third, combined-mixed option could combine the support from RBA and members countries in a Scale-based model in which the RBA cover the contributions of the low-income countries.
- 4) A fourth option would be to increase the contribution of each of the three RBA to the CFS by 1 million per year. For such a decision, CFS members should agree to propose such solution jointly in the governing bodies of the RBA.

In any case, CSM would like to support Afghanistan's proposal made during the AG/Bureau Meeting in July to set-up a one-off OEWG on CFS Budget which could draft and agree on concrete proposals for a long-term funding strategy for the CFS.

#### Agenda Item 8 Any other business

- The CSM would like to invite to the event “**The Right to Adequate Food: promoting accountability of food security actions to the people most affected by food insecurity and malnutrition**” that is promoted jointly by Norway and the CSM and co-hosted by Brazil, Switzerland and South Africa. The event will take place on the 24<sup>th</sup> of January from 9.00 am to 1.00 pm in the German Room. A written invitation will be circulated soon.

## CSM Preliminary Remarks on CFS Evaluation Workshop on Preliminary Findings

### **On the Timeline:**

Due to the fact that the preliminary findings arrived only last Wednesday, translations were only ready by the weekend. Therefore, our comments are very preliminary, and time should be given for internal consultation and to hand in comments in written.

This also calls attention again on the fact that the meeting date of 10<sup>th</sup> of February for the discussion of the first draft evaluation report is very soon, if the draft is released only on January 31. There will be not time for translation and consultation. Therefore, we propose that the meeting of the AG/bureau on the draft evaluation to take place one week later, around the 17 of February.

### **Some preliminary comments on the preliminary findings:**

The mandate of the evaluation is about the question if the CFS is effectively advancing in line with the vision and roles established in the CFS Reform 2009. So, it does not evaluate the reform, but if it has been effectively implemented and how to improve the CFS in the spirit of its reform.

The document is quite descriptive, and documents the responses to the questions of the evaluation, but does not really analyse or assess them. So, possibly the document is rather meant to share with CFS members and participants the first impressions of the Evaluation team and to generate comments on them.

We have seen and appreciate that, in this sense a number of remarks and concerns from our side have been incorporated in the document, for further discussion and analysis.

Some key aspects are however still missing and should be included in the further work:

- the question if the CFS does achieve its vision includes the contribution to the progressive realization of the right to adequate food. This important part and all the dimension of rights is missing in the analysis so far.
- the assessment refers to the six roles of the CFS, this is important, but does not systematically analyze them.
- the aspect of gender is missing: it is very important to analyze the way how gender equality, women's empowerment and women's rights have been discussed in the CFS and what have been the outcomes of it.
- the role of the member states and their involvement in the CFS in Rome is not sufficiently considered. Given their essential key role as the members and decision-makers in the CFS, it is important needs to assess achievements but also limitations of their participation.
- the topic of possible conflicts of interest is also missing yet.

Some facts need to be corrected. For example the commitment of other UN bodies outside the RBA is indeed there, through SCN or the HLTF which are strongly involved. Also the fact that the four seats of the CSM refer to the CFS Advisory Group only, not to the participation in OEWG.

Some aspects need a more comprehensive analysis, particularly the parts on monitoring, policy convergence and coordination. They should be assessed against what was foreseen in the Reform and should consider both the progress achieved and identify the obstacles.

Regarding CSM itself: we will further work with the Evaluation team and continue to provide the needed information. But we also would expect that the evaluation assesses the contributions of the civil society organizations through the CSM to the CFS in a more comprehensive way. We also expect recommendations that helps strengthening and broadening the participation of all CSM constituencies in the CFS process.

Key CSM positions as presented to the CFS 43 final plenary session include the following considerations:

**The CFS is at the crossroads:** We have seen during the past two years and also during this session, that there are two possible pathways for the CFS: either it goes in the direction of erosion of the CFS Reform, or in the direction of strengthening the CFS in the spirit of its Reform. The eight actions here are:

- Affirming the Vision of the CFS: the CFS is committed to contribute to the progressive realization of the right to adequate food. The centrality of human rights, particularly the indivisibility, universality, interdependency and interrelatedness of all human rights are fundamental for the CFS. There is no way to comply with the right to food without respecting, protecting and fulfilling women's rights.
- Preserving the Focus of the CFS. Everybody is invited to contribute to the CFS. But special attention is given to the organizations of smallholders and small-scale food producers, agricultural and food workers, who are the most important contributors to world food security and nutrition, and often the groups most at risk of food insecurity. This focus must not be lost.
- Strengthening the use and application of CFS outcomes: without a much stronger commitment of governments and all actors in the CFS to actually put into practice the CFS decisions and instruments, the CFS will lose its relevance.
- Developing and activating the monitoring mechanism of the CFS, including encouraging the realization of national and regional monitoring events and promoting regular Global Thematic monitoring events during CFS Plenaries.
- Addressing the most relevant issues for food security and nutrition, and of particular interest to the small-scale food producers, agricultural and food workers and other rights holders. The policy convergence and policy coherence functions of the CFS require that members and participants do not shy away from topics that are controversial or complicated, and from serious negotiations on these topics. We strongly hope that this attitude will prevail in the upcoming MYPOW discussions.
- Ensure that any organization that is interested to participate in the CFS has to choose to which category of participants it belongs, according to the CFS Reform Document, and then participate through the respective Mechanism.
- Clarifying the terms of participation of the private and corporate sector within the CFS and developing robust safeguards to protect the space from undue conflict of interest to ensure that the concerns of rights-holders are always considered above and before those of other actors pursuing private interests. Actions within this space must always be aligned with the primary mandate of CFS to ensure food and nutrition security.
- Establishing a solid and sustainable funding structure of the CFS which reflects the support of all members and the RBA to the CFS, and ensure the full implementation of the agreed MYPOW. The CFS must be funded by public funds. The integrity of the MYPOW is important, a donor-driven CFS would be a weak CFS.