

**CSM Draft Contributions to the Consultation meeting on
Implementing the CFS Evaluation Recommendations 1 & 2
24 January 2018**

Agenda item 1: Introduction and discussion on the proposed approach:

The mandate agreed by the CFS 45 for the discussions that start today is: to *“Develop the strategic content of a medium to long term MYPoW; and clarify the contribution of the six roles set out in the Reform Document to achieving CFS vision, and how and by whom they should be implemented, based on experience gained since the CFS reform”*.

This was agreed after discussing the recommendations 1+2 of the CFS evaluation report that had suggested to draft a Strategic Framework for the CFS. This proposal was not accepted, recognizing that the CFS is not an organization but a platform, and underlining that there won't be a reform of the CFS reform. It was agreed to

- develop the strategic content of the MYPoW,
- clarify the contribution of the 6 roles of the CFS and their contribution to the CFS vision, and to
- clarify how and by whom they should be implemented (modalities).

We propose to start the discussion on a strategic MYPoW with the discussion on clarifying the roles in relation to their contribution to the CFS vision. This discussion needs to be conducted first, to reach a common understanding what they mean and how they can be best implemented to achieve the CFS vision to strive for a world without hunger and where countries implement the progressive realization of the right to food.

The proposed discussion on a draft results chain and the strategic objectives should be a second step in this discussion, as they should be based on the CFS vision and the clarified contributions of CFS roles to achieve it. In addition, we suggest that discussions should not be limited to only 3 out of 6 CFS roles. All of them are interconnected and should jointly contribute to the CFS vision.

Our proposal for the methodology of discussions is therefore:

- 1) to clarify the contribution of all 6 roles for achieving the CFS vision
- 2) to clarify how and by whom they should be implemented
- 3) define the strategic objectives and expected outcomes and the results chain based on these clarifications, as the basis for the strategic content of the future MYPoW.

In that sense, we suggest to start discussions on the contributions of all 6 roles to achieving the CFS vision.

On agenda item 2: Clarification of what CFS seeks to achieve, how and by whom

The CFS Reform defined clearly the **Vision of the CFS: this is exactly what the CFS seeks to achieve.**

The CFS “constitutes the **foremost inclusive international and intergovernmental platform** for a broad range of committed stakeholders to work together in a **coordinated manner** and in support of **country-led** processes towards the **elimination of hunger and ensuring food security and nutrition for all human beings**. CFS strives for a **world free from hunger** where countries implement the voluntary guidelines for the **progressive realization of the right to adequate food** in the context of national food security”.

The **aim of the whole exercise is to strengthen the CFS in achieving its Vision**. All six roles should contribute to this mandate and particularly to this **global objective of the CFS** to work together in a coordinated manner towards the elimination of hunger, ensuring food security and nutrition for all and promoting the progressive realization of the right to food.

From this perspective, we suggest considering the **following methodological framework**:

| Roles | Understanding of its contribution to the CFS vision | Experiences, Challenges and opportunities | Strategies to address these challenges and opportunities | Clarification how and by whom these roles should be implemented |
|--|---|---|--|---|
| Policy coordination on the global level | | | | |
| Policy convergence | | | | |
| Support to the country and regional level | | | | |
| Coordination with the country and regional level | | | | |
| Promoting accountability and best practices | | | | |
| Global Strategic Framework | | | | |

This methodology would have the following **advantages**:

- the **CFS roles would be clarified in their contribution to the CFS vision, as requested by the Plenary**, in how they contribute to the elimination of hunger, ensuring food security and nutrition and promoting the progressive realization of the right to adequate food;
- The CFS roles would be fully connected with the CFS vision, topics and priorities would not be discussed separated from the mandate given. **The center of concern in the CFS will therefore be the people most affected by food insecurity, those most at risk**. The voice of their organizations will enjoy a special attention in the CFS, as agreed with the reform.
- The **challenges and opportunities in exercising these roles** would be identified and **could be strategically addressed**. The findings from the evaluation can be used for this endeavor.
- The **modalities and responsibilities** of how and by whom to implement the roles would be **clarified, as requested by the Plenary**.
- This clarification provides the **best possible basis to formulate time-bound objectives and expected outcomes for a 4-years MYPOW**.

Next steps:

We suggest that this meeting agrees on the methodological format for the further process on clarifying the roles in achieving the CFS vision. This format could take into account what we just proposed.

In any case, after this meeting, CFS members and participants should be requested to contribute to fill the agreed format with their suggestions. A draft filled format could be organized by the two Co-facilitators of the process, with support from the CFS Secretariat, and circulated before the 19/20 March meeting for discussion and final adoption.

Examples for the clarification of roles exercise:

Example 1: Policy coordination for coordinated action

Understanding of its contribution to CFS vision:

Policy coordination, as all other roles of the CFS, must contribute to eliminate hunger (not only reducing it), to achieve food security and nutrition and the realization of the right to food. The convergence work already done by the CFS through its policy outcomes, can help to:

- achieve stronger coordination and synchronized action of all relevant actors in a specific area (for example tenure of land, forest or fisheries, or FSN in protracted crises), and
- support policy coherence in global, regional or national policies that directly or indirectly affect FSN and the Right to Food through the GSF and its components.

In doing so, the CFS can contribute to reduce the fragmentation of FSN policies and to overcome the widespread silo approaches around relevant issues that impact the right to adequate food of millions of people.

Challenges and opportunities:

The Policy Coordination role would have to address essential challenges of today: one of the most important ones the fact that more and more people living in conflicts and protracted crises suffer from hunger and malnutrition. The CFS was founded in 1975 in response to a global food crisis and was reformed in 2009 in response to a global food crisis. The CFS must be able to respond effectively to the food crises of today. We therefore have suggested that the CFS should become the central platform to assess among all relevant actors the policy responses given to the severe food crises and even famines of today, as part of its policy coordination function, and discuss and agree on the needed corrective measures.

This is also true for the general worsening of the food security situation worldwide. Policy coordination towards the realization of the right to food and the achievement of SDG 2 means a fundamental change in global politics that directly or indirectly affect food security and nutrition worldwide. Policy coordination and coordinated action for policy coherence with the right to food and human rights in general require a radical revision of the ongoing policies. Without these changes, it will be impossible to reach SDG 2 in 2030. We firmly believe that the CFS has to play a critical role in this context.

Example 2: a common understanding of the **policy convergence function**, of the related challenges and opportunities, and corresponding strategies need to be developed. This includes many elements, including an analysis why the policy convergence function has been partly very successful in achieving substantial policy outcomes, but also recognizing the limitations of some negotiation processes. The **policy convergence function of the CFS should particularly address the most critical, urgent, emergent and often conflictive issues, and always guided and assessed by its contributions to the CFS vision.**

Example 3: With regards to the **CFS roles 3,4 and 5 on support to countries, coordination with the country level and promoting accountability and best practices**, it is of particular importance to **clearly define the responsibilities of the different CFS actors in the dissemination, use, application and monitoring of CFS policy outcomes.** The CFS is not and should not become the implementing body for its decisions. The role of Member countries has been discussed during last week's discussions.

However, the role of the RBA in the implementation of these roles can hardly be overestimated. Currently, this is **one of the main challenges and opportunities: the RBA should systematically integrate the use and application of CFS policy outcomes in their work program**. It is the responsibility of the senior management of these institutions, but also of the country representatives in the governing bodies of these institutions to make sure that this step is effectively taken and implemented.

The contributions of RBAs to a better use and application of CFS policy outcomes should particularly emphasize the national and regional level. RBA offices at the national and regional level can nominate CFS focal points who can be approached by governments or other actors for joint efforts on use and application. CFS policy outcomes could also be included into regional and national workshops, to make them known to the potential user groups.

Regional and continental organizations (FAO regional Conferences, AU Summits, SAARC, CELAC, and others, should allocate in their Annual meetings or regular Summits, a segment to discuss how to foster implementation of CFS policy outcomes, and what are the implications of the application of a specific instrument in the respective regional and/continental context). Using existing spaces and regular meetings would foster coordination, maximize the use of resources and support dissemination and awareness on the CFS policy outcomes outside Rome.

With regards to the **proposed results chain**: we appreciate the efforts to trigger discussions on how such a result chain should look like in the case of the CFS. We understand

- that the results chain should be explicitly anchored in the CFS vision, which means that the formulation of impact should be aligned with the CFS vision statement
- that the roles of the CFS should not be confused with the expected outcomes: these are two different categories that relate to each other, but they are different in nature: the effective implementation of the CFS roles would lead to the expected outcomes in the direction to achieving the CFS vision
- that the discussion on strategic objectives and related expected outcomes will influence the wording of the CFS results chain.
- In summary, that the sequence of reflection should be:
 - a) clarification of roles in relation to their contribution to achieving the CFS vision,
 - b) formulation of strategic objectives and expected outcomes based on the clarified roles, and
 - c) formulation of the results chain should be based on the elements outlined before.

On agenda item 3: Identification of strategic objectives to provide direction towards achieving CFS vision

On Strategic Objectives:

- As said before, we believe that the formulation of strategic objectives and expected outcomes should be formulated with a strong nexus to the CFS vision and the roles, the identified challenges and opportunities and responsibilities in implementation.
- Against these requirements, the proposed strategic objectives fall short in several aspects: the link to the CFS vision and the roles is unclear; in fact, the formulation does not even mention key CFS functions such as policy coordination, policy convergence, right to food, monitoring and accountability; the description of the CFS as “platform for exchange” does not capture the nature and mandate of the CFS.
- In reformulating the strategic objectives, two options could be considered, following the methodological framework presented before: one option could be to formulate the strategic objectives and expected outcomes in relation to each of the 6 roles. A second option could

be to concentrate the formulation of objectives and expected in three strategic areas: 1) contribution to the progressive realization of the right to adequate food and to the elimination of hunger; 2) promoting policy coordination, convergence and coherence; 3) promoting the use, application, and monitoring of CFS policy outcomes.

On MYPOW:

- MYPOW should be designed for a 4-year cycle with a foreseen biannual assessment and reviewing process. Any further MYPOW should also indicate how and by whom its elements will be implemented, and indicate the specific timeline so that it can be easily assessed and reviewed on a biannual basis.
- The standing section should include the CFS vision and the clarified contribution of the six roles to achieve it, and should include the decision agreed at CFS 44 on mainstreaming women's rights, gender equality and women's empowerment in CFS processes and policy work. The operationalization of this decision should be ensured throughout the MYPOW process.
- The strategic objectives and expected outcomes should be time-bound, so that they can be evaluated and eventually revised after 4 years.
- The rolling section should include a section on members and participants' efforts to strengthen the use, application and monitoring of CFS policy outcomes.
- The global objective of CFS is well defined in its vision statement: to work together in a coordinated manner towards the elimination of hunger, ensuring food security and nutrition for all and the promoting progressive realization of the right to food.

On Criteria for the selection of topics for MYPOW

- The Criteria should be revised in light of the clarified roles, and strategic components of the MYPOW
- The mandate and added value criteria should spell out and take into account the inclusive nature of CFS and the full vision statement of the CFS, including the relevance of the proposed topic for the achieving food security and nutrition and the progressive realization of the right to food for all.
- The non-duplication criteria should be either eliminated or well explained: it cannot imply that the CFS should work only on issues that are not worked on by others; this would be in contradiction to its policy coordination role. CFS should be able to provide other bodies the food security and nutrition perspectives on any issue relevant to hunger and malnutrition.
- The relevance criterion is fundamental, but the question is: relevant to whom? Relevance should also be explicitly linked to the demands of those most affected by food insecurity and malnutrition.
- The relevance of the topic for women's rights, women's empowerment and gender equality should be introduced as a new criterion.
- The global impact criterion needs a more careful formulation as well: again, within the context of the CFS, the main attention must be on the possible impact on the ground for communities, who usually face a diversity of challenges that are mostly a combination of local context and global features.
- The consensus criterion should be reformulated in a way that this concept must not be used to prevent a relevant theme to be discussed in the CFS.
- The criterion on availability of resources is not appropriate here. It applies to the whole CFS, but it should not be used for choosing a specific theme or not. This would lead to a "money-supply" driven agenda setting of the CFS. While the CFS needs to consider its overall budget when defining the number of workstreams, it should not use the availability of resources criterion for the prioritization exercise for one topic before others.