We once again welcome the publication of this report and thank the HLPE team for providing a strong grounding for strategic thinking for the future of food systems based on in depth knowledge and evidence. It comes at a crucial moment in the history of food governance during a year in which the food system will come under great scrutiny in several UN conferences.

There is no other body in the UN system like the HLPE with its scientific multidisciplinary expertise) + CFS (HR based, democratic, with mandate on policy coherence and ensuring the voice of food producers and rights holders in decision making) This combination provides a depth of analysis and breadth of historical and current considerations on food security and nutrition. Yet as the HLPE shows, we can only make progress with all four recommendations – cementing the Right to Food, strengthening conceptually the dimensions of pillars food security, adopting a food system analysis and making important policy shifts.

We are worried about the current direction to fold all the most important CFS achievements, knowledge and potentially future roles into the UN FSS. The UNFSS is taking the place of the democratic multilateral system, including the CFS and the Rome Based Agencies for the governance of food yet without recognising their leading role, and without upholding the rights and responsibilities of States, the rights of peoples and instead giving a leading role to the corporate sector via the World Economic Forum.

We in the CSM and with wide support from many CSOs are clear that in its current form the UNFSS in no way addresses the challenges or recommendations made by the HLPE global narrative report.

The format and content of the summit undermines rather than promotes the Right to Food – it gets just a passing mention in one of 5 action tracks and human rights principles more broadly are not mainstreamed in any of the FSS processes to date or in the action trach papers. While paying lip service to the need for transformation the Action Tracks are still narrowly focused on productivity and market led solutions instead of a deep food systems analysis.

The UNFSS wants to talk about sustainability without cementing State’s responsibility for implementing Human Rights. It claims to address equitable livelihoods but without the tackling the fundamental issue of corporate concentration in the food system and corporate capture of policy making spaces. In fact, it consolidates further corporate capture of policy spaces. The Summit claims to be a peoples’ summit but without recognizing our autonomy or self-determination in our participation.

The summit undermines the agency of the most marginalized in its process and content. The current process is based on the notion of multiple stakeholders. However, this approach disregards power asymmetries and unequal ways in which people are impacted by inequalities and access to rights, including the right of social participation in the decisive processes for the elaboration and implementation of food policies.
We remind the CFS plenary that the letter sent by 550 global CS and IP organizations to the UN Secretary General outlining our concerns remains unanswered. I hope the delegates gathered here can appreciate that because of these fundamental concerns the CSM cannot not participate in or endorse the summit in its current form. We will be communicating a letter with the CFS chair with more detail on our positions on the UNFSS this week.