

Draft CSM contributions to the Joint Meeting of the CFS Bureau and Advisory Group on 3 June 2019

Remark on the draft Agenda:

We would like to make some comments on the outcomes of the last discussion in the preparation of the event on sustainable forestry and the relation between commercial tree plantations and food security and nutrition. We therefore kindly request to include an item on this under AOB of today's meeting.

Agenda Item 1: CFS MYPow 2020-2023 (first draft)

We welcome the first draft of the MYPow which includes many improvements and has taken on board many of the comments made by members and participants in previous sessions.

However, we see that some parts of the draft are still weak or not responsive enough to the discussions, comments and suggestions made in previous meetings. Our remarks aim to help improving the current draft in this direction:

- a) We saw with concern that the broadly supported proposal **on reducing inequalities for food security and nutrition** was dropped from the current draft. However, we understand from the information we received from the CFS Secretary, IFAD and FAO that the theme will be reincorporated into the MYPow, and a revised draft is being worked out. We welcome this development and will provide our comments to the revised proposal in due time.
- b) Regarding the policy convergence process on **agroecology and other innovations**:
 1. It is very important that the Objectives and expected outcomes are clearly formulated. Therefore, it should explicitly state that the process will lead to policy recommendations on agroecological approaches and other innovations for adoption at CFS 47
 2. The text should also be slightly corrected by saying that the policy convergence process will not start *after* CFS 46, but *with* the Plenary discussion of CFS 46, taking into account the importance of the Plenary and the substantial debate that will be held in this occasion.
 3. It is fundamental that a proposal for the policy convergence process on agroecology and other innovations is agreed by the Bureau the latest by end of July, so that it can be submitted as a draft decision box to the Plenary in October.
 4. For that purpose, it would be very useful to appoint as soon as possible the rapporteur of this process. As in previous processes, it is important that the rapporteur participates to the deliberations about the way how the policy process is set up.
 5. We would like to remind as well that the design of the policy process on agroecology and other innovations should seek the best possible synergies with the process on food systems and nutrition, as they are interrelated in many aspects. A specific methodology should be worked out for that purpose.
 6. Finally, it is recommendable to also include in this workstream the fact that it will be a contribution of the CFS to the UN Decade on Nutrition and the recently started UN Decade on Family farming.

- c) **On the Youth proposal**, we have the most detailed and substantive contributions to make, mainly due to the fact that many of our most important suggestions as CSM Youth Constituency have not been adequately dealt with so far:
- We need a clear title for this workstream which comprises the theme properly. We propose the title: “Youth Engagement and Employment in Food Systems”.
 - We want to see the scope and direction of this workstream defined in response to needs, rights and demands of our diverse youth constituencies, not in response to an anonymous global agricultural system that sees us only as their current and future workforce. We don’t want to be seen only as an element of the labor market.
 - **The scope of this workstream should therefore address public policies that ensure permanence, retention and return to the rural areas of young people.**
 - We need to talk about employment, especially decent employment and decent salaries and decent working conditions.
 - But we must also talk about the access to territories to natural resources to the means of production, including the ownership of land and natural resources such as water among others, because most of us are food producers, small-scale family farmers, indigenous peoples, pastoralists, fisherfolks, we are part of our communities and territories, and we will determine our future ourselves.
 - We need public policies that allow us to advance in the way we define. Public policies, on means of production, in health, in education, in recreation, social services, access to local markets, to native seeds.
 - But we need public policies that support the way that we choose and we want to stop those policies and practices, such as land grabbing, exploitation, discrimination and destruction of our planet which continues to undermine the livelihoods of our generation as well as of future generation, if we don’t change direction. If we don’t change, we will continue to have social inequalities and have even more hunger in the world.
 - In this sense, we want to see our most pressing priorities to be part of this important policy workstream:
 - The access to land and other natural resources for us young food producers who already live producing food and for those who will come.
 - promote and generate rural education spaces adapting modalities and curricula to peasant life with the promotion of agroecology. Promote young people's access to them.
 - Promote financing programs for the permanence, retention and return to the rural areas of young people.
 - The full recognition of our diversity and autonomy as young peasants, farmers, pastoralists, indigenous peoples, rural and urban youth, workers, consumers, and especially as contributors to the economy.
 - The full recognition of our rights as youth, our women’s rights, our agency of our own development, of us food producers and contributors to the economy; the respect of our human rights, our rights of our identities, in our lands and territories.
 - This also includes our essential role to participate in policy making processes, on all levels, including on the global level.
 - Decent income, decent livelihoods, decent work and working conditions are fundamental to us.
 - We cannot ignore longer the huge challenges of climate change, loss of biodiversity and ecological destruction: they are main drivers of hunger and malnutrition among

present and future generations. It cannot be that this CFS workstream does not address these questions which are so central to food security and nutrition, and so central to our lives and communities and future generations.

- We cannot think about young people only as employees of the labor force: we have to feel proud to live in the countryside and produce, generating our own income and contributing to the economy.
 - If we achieve this, we will have more new generations in the field producing the food, contributing to the economy, we will lower the forced migration, the hunger in the world. For that we must work all together.
- We have been thinking to introduce additional wording into the proposal as it stands now. But we feel that it is wrongly framed. It needs to be partly rewritten. We are willing to provide alternative text within short time. But we want to know first, if you want to listen to our demands, and if you would appreciate receiving alternative text proposals that address these priorities. Please let us know.

d) DATA collection

- It is not clear to us, why this proposal is still considered a full workstream proposal, given the fact that it has received little support from members states.
- As we said in previous occasions: we believe the theme is important, but it is not appropriate for a policy convergence process in the CFS.
- We acknowledge that one option mentioned in the first is to hold a High-Level Forum on this theme (as suggested on age 14, footnote 2). We would support such activity.
- However, we do not support the proposal as it is spelt out as well on page 14 under activity 1.1.2, which includes a full policy workstream with HLPE report and a policy convergence process towards CFS policy recommendations.

e) **UPTAKE:** on this section, we welcome the suggested activities for an enhanced use, application and monitoring. However, we would reiterate two specific suggestions which we already presented before:

- a. We should plan uptake activities for all CFS policy outcomes, which in this case also means that we should plan for an event on the CFS policy recommendations on agroecological approaches and other innovations for 2021
- b. A stocktaking event on the CFS policy recommendations on water and climate change could be scheduled for 2021, in a similar way as the current Stocktaking event at CFS 46 is being prepared on the 3 sets of policy recommendations focusing on smallholders

Agenda item 2: CFS 46 Session Overview

We welcome again that the **Day of Rural Women** is part of the CFS 46 agenda and can support the IFAD proposal of a rural woman who is a small-scale food producer who can speak from the perspective of so many millions of us. Although we do not know her personally, we trust that she will deliver the key messages of the big majority of rural women to the CFS Plenary.

Regarding the agenda item on **Food Systems and Nutrition**, we suggest to provide some space to hear from those regional consultations that will have been held before the plenary (Africa, Asia, Near East, Europe) as this could help informing the further process.

On the MSP agenda item : In our view, the Plenary session on MSP should aim at raising awareness of the participants about the principles that need to be respected and the conditions that should prevail for a MSP to contribute to food security and nutrition and to the progressive realisation of the right to food.

In particular, it would highlight **when and why** a MSP is the most appropriate organizational/ governance arrangement to realize a public interest objective (compared to other governance arrangements such as multi-actor dialogue platforms led by the public sector), **how** to ensure a MSP serves **public interests** (including by guaranteeing participation of the most affected, accountability, respect for human rights principles), and **how** its **internal governance** can address potential power asymmetries and conflicts of interests.

We have discussed with the CFS Secretariat and as well with the Facilitator of this process a short outline for this event (see annex below) which will also be circulated to the CFS Bureau with our written contributions after this meeting.

Regarding the Kick-off meeting of the **“Decade on Family Farming”**, it would be important to explicit the link with the related ongoing and upcoming CFS processes.

Question on the official agenda: At the end of many agenda items of the official CFS 46 agenda, there is a sentence that a summary of the discussion will be forwarded to the Drafting Committee of the Final Report. Our question here is: how will these summaries be prepared?

Regarding the Special event on Youth:

We welcome the proposal to dedicate the Special Event on Friday morning to the Youth. It is an opportunity to present our views as youth constituencies from different constituencies and all regions and engage in a dialogue with the member states and other participants to the Plenary. We hope that the Special event is well attended and participation from member states is strong, in spite of holding this event on the Friday morning.

Together with the CFS Secretariat and the PSM, we have agreed to convene a preparatory group from the youth constituencies of both mechanisms, in order to ensure our involvement as youth into the preparatory discussions for this event, bringing in the diversity of our perspectives. In this group, we can discuss and elaborate a proposal for the format, themes and methodology of this event, which can then be brought to the next Bureau and Advisory group meeting for your consideration.

Any Other Business:

Remark on the Follow-up to the discussions on Sustainable Forestry and the proposed event on the relation between commercial tree plantations and food security and nutrition

We would like to first recall the constructive discussion during the Joint meeting on of the Bureau and Advisory Group on 14 May, with inputs from FAO, CGIAR, Indonesia, Special Rapporteur RtF,

Indonesia, PSM, CSM, Costa Rica, Switzerland, Germany, and others. We feel that the written outcomes of the meeting do not fully reflect the rich discussions of the meeting.

We are particularly concerned because the minutes somehow suggest that the topic of the event should be changed. Now, the topic of the event seems to be “*the importance of tree plantations for FSN*”, highlighting only the positive aspects of plantations for FSN.

Let us recall that the CFS plenary agreement was to give time to discuss key *issues that were not sufficiently addressed* in the policy negotiations. Therefore, the plenary agreement refers to a needed discussion on the ***relation between commercial tree plantations and FSN***.

The CSM strongly recommends to keeping the focus of the event on the topic agreed by the Plenary. We are also happy to support the preparation of the event in collaboration with FAO and CGIAR, if this is considered convenient.

Annex:

Contribution of the CSM to the outline of the CFS plenary session on MSP

Objective:

The session would aim at raising awareness of the participants about the principles that need to be respected and the conditions that should prevail for a MSP to contribute to food security and nutrition and to the progressive realisation of the right to food. In particular, it would highlight **when and why** a MSP is the most appropriate organizational/ governance arrangement to realize a public interest objective (compared to other governance arrangements such as multi-actor dialogue platforms led by the public sector), **how** to ensure a MSP serves **public interests** (including by guaranteeing participation of the most affected, accountability, respect for human rights principles), and **how** its **internal governance** can address potential power asymmetries and conflicts of interests.

Outline of the session:

1. Introduction from the HLPE MSP project team leader: what are MSPs and main conclusions of the HLPE report in terms of opportunities and challenges.
2. Input of 2 experts of MSP governance (one with the perspective of FSN and one with expertise in another sector): framing the debate
situating MSPs within the broader realm of food governance; and in particular:
 - a) when and why a MSP is the most appropriate organizational/ governance arrangement to realize a public interest objective;
 - b) how to ensure a MSP serves public interests;
 - c) how its internal governance can address potential power asymmetries and conflicts of interests
3. Exchange with the plenary on the framework
4. Experiences and perspectives by different stakeholders (one government, one PSM, one International institution, one CSM) addressing the 3 questions above.
5. Exchange with the plenary and with the experts on the cases and perspectives addressing gaps and way forward
6. Conclusions