

CSM messages to the Advisory Group and Bureau meeting 4 March 2021

Suggestions on the Agenda of the Bureau and Advisory Group meeting:

We suggest to including the Food Systems Summit as a point under AOB in which we would like to refer to the CFS Letter to the CFS Chair on the Food Systems Summit

Agenda item 2 – CFS 47 feedback

- In general terms, the virtual modality heavily affected the inclusiveness and participation to the Plenary. Time zones have been challenging and put big obstacles to the participation from the territories and entire regions. The next plenary needs to be prepared in a more open, inclusive and collective way.
- Important to recall the deep disappointment and reservations of the CSM on the adoption of the VGFSyN. The CSM has not yet finalized its internal evaluation process regarding the outcome and process of the guidelines to decide whether we support the endorsement or not. This process includes participating organizations of all constituencies and regions and the CSM Coordination Committee. We will duly notify the CFS of our decision and ask the CFS to publish it on the CFS website.
- The way how the Plenary session on the adoption of the Guidelines conducted, was as well worrying. The concerns expressed by the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, the Director of Nutrition of WHO, and members states from Africa, Latin America and Europe were simply ignored.
- The need for a strong role of CFS in developing a multilateral and coordinated policy response to Covid-19 Policy was articulated by many members and participants, including by the CSM Youth speakers from the audience, as a matter of urgency. The fact that the MYPOW decision box includes a further deliberation and high attention of CFS to Covid-19, has been an important step, which now needs a thorough follow-up.
- We note with appreciation that the Global Thematic Event on monitoring the use and application of the Framework for Action on Protracted Crises was an important moment to looking into most pressing and terrible realities in which millions of people live. It was an important event, and it was also key that the decision box includes enhanced efforts for dissemination, use and applications and the need for a coordinated implementation plan. These decisions should now be followed up as well.
- The Thursday morning event was important to give more attention to the use and application of CFS policy instruments. In our view, the key question here is: How can these processes been done in a more collaborative way, including members states, the Rome Based agencies, the people most at risk? The CFS response to its evaluation had agreed to important steps, but they need to be better implemented. The CFS Monitoring exercise has clearly shown the achievements and the shortcomings, we now need to concentrate on overcoming the identified impediments. Member states engagement and a more active role of the RBAs are as important as ensuring inclusiveness, participation and transparency in this endeavor.

Agenda item 3 | CFS 48 Provisional Agenda

- We would like to know the timeline for registration for the Plenary.

Agenda item 4 | CFS input to HLPF 2021

- We had submitted a contribution that basically referred to three aspects: a) the enhanced use of existing CFS policy outcomes that are now highly relevant to the response to Covid-19; b) the fact that the text from the HLPE Issue paper is an important contribution to HLPF but needs a clear disclaimer so that it is well understood that HLPE recommendations are not equivalent to politically agreed text in the CFS; and c) make reference to the global Covid-19 impact reports presented by the CSM.
- With this in mind, we can support the revised draft contributions as presented, including the references of the HLPE reports on agency, sustainability and agroecology.
- What is missing is a clearer reference to human rights, to the use of CFS policy instruments, and the essential role of local authorities.
- In this context, we also recall the speech of the UN Secretary General in opening the Human Rights Council last week, strongly emphasizing that the response and recovery strategies to Covid-19 must be “guided by human rights”.

Agenda item 5 | Monitoring of the CFS Policy recommendations on Climate Change and Water

- We suggest that a Technical task team should be invited to prepare the CFS report and the stock taking event at the Plenary. This has been a fruitful practice in past years.

Agenda item 6 | Intersessional events on data systems and Inequalities

- The intersessional events should be prepared through an inclusive process with participation of members from the Advisory Group.
- When talking about data, we need to take into account many aspects: ensure qualitative data and not only quantitative; data on participation and on who is making the decisions; for example: women’s participation as agents in decision making require collecting social data, not only physical data.
- On the other side, the megatrend on data is very related to digital economy dreams that are likely to become nightmares for humanity in terms of who owns the data, who controls them, how will data be treated in intellectual property regimes, making huge commercial profits at the expense of privacy and people’s rights, digital gap and digital exclusion. There are huge questions about how to effectively ensure human rights and public interest against the interests of the Big Data corporates.
- Inequalities are one of the main features of the Covid-19 pandemic. No need to explain this here more broadly. Just to point to the scandalously unequal distribution of vaccines which should be urgently treated as public goods: 75% of all vaccines are handled by 10 countries and 130 countries are without access to them, as pointed out by WHO and the UN Secretary General. This is a gross and ongoing human rights violation and systemic discrimination, which the Global South and all of us cannot miss to denounce, also for the tremendous implications for food security and nutrition around the world. Growing inequalities are main drivers of the new food crises in the Covid-19 context and should be addressed by the planned CFS activities in this context.

Agenda item 7 | Impact assessment working group

We have a lot of questions about this initiative: What do you want to achieve with that? What is the assumption behind the proposal? How is this linked to outcomes of the CFS Evaluation and the response to it? Three main remarks:

- 1) The rationale and purpose of the documents departs from an unfounded and in fact dangerous assumption, stating that the innovative monitoring framework of the CFS, which was finally agreed in the [response to the CFS evaluation](#), after five years of debate, is not effective.

Where is the analysis, the evidence to state that? Let us first discuss what was done, and what was deliberately not done to implement this monitoring framework? In general, the feedback to the CFS monitoring framework has been clearly positive. The annual SOFI reports belong to this monitoring framework as well as the Global Thematic Events, the monitoring Stocktaking events. Would anybody say that these pillars of the CFS monitoring framework are not useful? No. Therefore, the rationale of this proposal departs from a misconception.

- 2) The document is not clear when it speaks about CFS effectiveness. Which aspect of CFS effectiveness would be assessed? Would it be how effective certain CFS policy instruments are used and applied? This is periodically assessed in the CFS monitoring exercise and now also part of the AG-Bureau agenda. Or would it be to measure the effectiveness of the interaction between the global level and the national level? On this question, there is an interesting part of the response to the CFS evaluation on use and application that has good ideas but has not been implemented properly (Paragraphs 28-31 and Annex E). Would the effectiveness assessment focus on that?
- 3) The CFS should first build on the huge efforts of the recent past, particularly the CFS evaluation and the CFS response to it, as approved by the Plenary in 2018, and then ensure a more thorough implementation and follow-up on previous decisions and agreements. The leading question would be: what has been done to effectively implement what was agreed by the response to the CFS evaluation? We suggest the Bureau request the CFS Secretariat to prepare a background document for such discussion at one of the next Bureau and Advisory Group meetings.

Agenda item 8 | Advisory Group reporting exercise

[CSM Key Messages](#).

Agenda item 9 | Any other Business

Key messages from the [CSM Letter to the CFS Chair on the Food Systems Summit \(Nettie\)](#)