

## **Draft speaking points for CFS evaluation meeting 29 March:**

### **Agenda item 1: Zero draft implementation reports**

#### **General remarks:**

##### On the process:

- CSM comments today are all only initial remarks and have a preliminary character. This refers to all documents presented to this meeting, as it was impossible to translate and consult properly within less than one week the four documents with together 40 pages.
- The further time planning of the CFS evaluation process should take into account the translation needs for inclusive consultation of CFS actors. This is a problem that is a common concern for many delegations.

##### On the general direction of the process:

We all agreed that all discussions on the CFS evaluation should be directed towards the strengthening of the CFS, and that the general direction of the CFS reform will not be diluted, rather reaffirmed and enhanced.

In this sense, we suggested to have a strong and logical sequence between the following four element: the renewed commitment to the CFS vision and the clarification of its roles, the formulation of strategic objectives and the process for the new MYPOW process. If these four elements are well connected to each other, the CFS could make a significant step towards a stronger future.

However, we cannot see that this logic and strategic sequence (from CFS Vision to Roles to Strategic Objectives to MYPOW) is guiding the conceptual structure of the draft implementation report. While the draft report does contain a good number of important elements, they are rather disperse and remain partly unconnected. This particularly true for the nexus between Vision, roles and strategic objectives.

For example:

- the operationalization of the policy coordination function falls short in the strategic objectives. Policy coordination is more than being a platform. The Strategic objectives, in fact do not say anything substantial about this first function of the CFS.
- The right to food dimension of the CFS vision is referenced, but it remains unclear how this essential element is operationalized into the roles and strategic objectives of the CFS.
- The idea to redefine the monitoring function of the CFS by avoiding the term “monitoring” and call it instead: “promoting accountability and sharing best practices”, is not convincing: it is very difficult (if not impossible) to promote accountability without monitoring.

The conceptual framework for the breakthrough towards a strengthened CFS needs to overcome these inconsistencies and contradictions. It needs to take into account first and foremost that the CFS has a fundamental role to play in relation to the real world, especially the global response to increasing hunger and malnutrition, to contribute to overcoming their structural and root causes, in response to the hundreds of millions of people who go food insecure and malnourished, who see their human right to adequate food violated throughout the year.

The urgent need for strengthened policy coordination, policy convergence and policy coherence with the right to adequate is not a theoretical issue. It is an urgent need and fundamental demand also for a strategic, effective and demand-driven CFS. The CFS must be better connected to these realities, these struggles of the people.

The global food governance architecture, including the CFS and the RBAs, needs to support the actors on the national level with a better use, application and monitoring of policies that are conducive to foster food security and nutrition. Without substantially strengthening the commitments of CFS members and participants, the CFS will not be able to respond to the function it was created and reformed for.

A breakthrough for the CFS is very much needed. We have made suggestions to formulate strategic objectives into this direction which are available on the CFS workspace. We hope that we can still discuss them and agree on concrete steps towards a significantly strengthened CFS.

**Specific remarks on the zero draft text:**

- Paragraph 3, 1): Direction: strategic direction should explicitly include the CFS vision
- Paragraph 3, 2): Demand is driven by the needs and right of the most affected by food insecurity and malnutrition. They are not beneficiaries, they are rights-holders
- Paragraph 3, 6): Uptake and monitoring: we cannot separate use, application and monitoring of CFS policy outcomes
- Paragraph 4: this paragraph is important, should also reaffirm that the reform of the CFS will be kept and the CFS will be strengthened through the response to the CFS evaluation.
- Paragraph 6: The roles and responsibilities of the CFS as a Committee and the roles and responsibilities of its members and participants regarding roles 3,4, and 5 are not well described here. They need to be further discussed and revised.
- Paragraph 7: strategic objectives need to be reformulated; see CSM proposals submitted on 5 February;
- Paragraph 8/9: after para 8, the CFS Plenary decision on mainstreaming gender equality, women's and girls' right and empowerment in all CFS processes should be included;
- Paragraph 10: delete "beneficiaries", replace by the "most affected by food insecurity and malnutrition"; reference to SDGs should either be kept general or say SDG 2 and other FSN related SDGs.
- Paragraph 15: need to clarify that the CFS should not engage with more than one major policy convergence process
- Paragraph 16: MYPOW process should be open and inclusive and therefore conducted through an OEWG on MYPOW, not only the Bureau and AG
- Paragraph 18: the role and function of the HLPE should be correctly described, its independence acknowledged.
- Paragraph 22: the CFS plenary needs to be open to not also include critical and emergent issues, but also urgent issues; High-level ministerial participation should be accompanied with the inclusiveness of the CFS through the voices of the constituencies of the most important contributors to FSN who are often as well affected by food security and malnutrition.
- Paragraph 26: title should be use, application and monitoring, not uptake;
- Paragraph 32: Monitoring function of the CFS must be considerably strengthened, in line with the CFS decisions taken on that matter;
- Paragraph 33-37: not sufficient to ensure a sustainable funding for CFS; paragraph 37 should consider a four years' timeframe (not only two years)

## **Agenda item 2: Comments on Response to Recommendation 1**

- Process: what is the status of these documents? Will they become annexes? How will they be consulted?
- Human rights approach, Right to Food is only referenced once, then not operationalized
- Women's rights, gender equality and women's empowerment are not even mentioned
- Roles clarification exercise: we suggested a methodological framework for the clarification of the roles, which was originally welcomed in January, but now unfortunately not used. Would still be important to apply it.
- Reiterate our proposals for strategic objectives and expected outcomes, as submitted 5 February
- Examples for clarification of roles:
  - o Role 1-2 on policy coordination and policy convergence: see examples from last meeting (CSM statement 24 January), and relate them to our conceptual framework and expectations for the CFS evaluation process
  - o Roles 3, 4 and 5: need complete revision (CSM statement 24 January);
  - o Role 5: promoting accountability and sharing best practices – not acceptable to ignore the CFS decisions on monitoring;
- Draft CFS Results Chain table was meant to trigger the discussions, as mentioned in the last meeting; it is still full of inconsistencies and confusions and should be removed.

## **Agenda item 3: Comments on Response to Recommendation 2**

- The MYPOW needs to go through an OEWG, as an open and inclusive process.

## **Agenda item 4: Comments on Response to Recommendation 10**

- Last Friday, the workshop on monitoring of the use and application of the Right to Food Guidelines was a positive experience and showed the usefulness and feasibility of the monitoring exercise.
- The monitoring function of the reformed CFS is part of the role on promoting accountability and sharing best practices and is also connected to other roles of the CFS. Monitoring is not an option, but an obligation for an effective CFS, and an opportunity for making its outcomes useful and allow collective learning from progress and shortcomings identified.
- The proposed response on Recommendation 10 needs a complete revision in light of the CFS decisions on monitoring agreed during the past four years.
- The history of CFS decisions on monitoring is a selective view of the process so far and misses to acknowledge the fundamental change in the monitoring function of the CFS in the context of its reform, in response to the food crisis in 2008/09 and the lessons learnt from a useless reporting process before.
- The selective view on the monitoring history in CFS also does not properly reflect some of the most important CFS policy decisions on this matter, including
  - o the reiterated Plenary decisions on the incremental development of the innovative monitoring mechanism,
  - o the GSF principles on monitoring and accountability, and
  - o the Terms of Reference for the sharing experiences and best practices in applying CFS decisions and recommendations through organizing events on the national, regional and global level
- The draft table needs to be reworked in this sense as well.