Joint Meeting of the CFS Bureau and Advisory Group, 25-05-22

CSIPM Key Messages

Agenda of Substantive segment A: Impacts on global food security of the conflict in Ukraine (III).
Fostering coordinated global policy responses at the CFS

- Updates on the UN Global Crisis Response Group
- Briefing on the Security Council meetings and related activities
- Update on the special CFS HL intersessional event

CSIPM Messages

- We thank the CFS Chair for his leadership and commitment to develop a robust and democratic response to the existing food crisis. The CFS is exactly the right place in the UN system to seek coordination and convergence of the different international, regional and national initiatives to respond to this crisis; as well as to agree on normative and policy changes urgently needed in order to address the structural causes of a long-standing, multilayered and systemic food crisis. We also thank the CFS Chair for his commitment to especially listen to the demands of the countries and constituencies most affected by the multiple ongoing crises; and to find coordinated multilateral policy responses to them.

- We also appreciate the UN SG’s initiative in establishing a Global Crisis Response Group to provide him with broad and well-grounded information and analysis on the multiple ongoing crises, principally from UN system agencies and programmes but also from most affected constituencies. We appreciate his invitation to us, echoed by the CFS Chair, to participate in the food network of this Group. We understand that this Group is complementary to the CFS since it is directed inwardly to the UN system whereas the CFS is an inclusive multilateral body in which MSs are the final decision-makers. Our engagement in the GCRG is based on transparency of information sharing, clear reporting lines and political accountability to UN decision-making bodies, including the CFS. We hope to be able to clarify soon how our analysis and contributions will be effectively taken up in this GCRG.

- In our view, the responses from FAO, Bretton Woods Institutions and WTO, WFP, G7, G20, Global Food Security Call for action are insufficient and flawed because:
  - They focus on increasing large-scale industrial food production (e.g. maintaining dependency of synthetic fertilizers) and maintaining a food security strategy based on dependence on global trade to access a handful of cereal crops, despite the proven vulnerabilities and failures of this production system, and its enormous climate footprint.
  - They do not take into account and build on the relevant policy outcomes of the CFS over the past decade, and in particular the demonstrated reality that small-scale producers are responsible for most of the food consumed in the world, which reaches consumers through territorially-embedded food systems rather than global chains.
  - They are not proposing any policy or normative changes aimed at addressing the structural drivers of the multilayered global food crisis, particularly on such issues as deregulated trade, trade rules that protect exporters but not importers, global financial markets, speculation on agricultural commodity futures prices, increasing inequalities, tax injustice, debt and ecological destruction, nor on the need to invest in building climate resilient food systems.
They fail to draw lessons on why the responses to the previous global food price crises were inadequate to prevent a new crisis and there are no proposals for monitoring pertinent trends related to food and nutrition security, and pre-empting/preventing future crises.

There is no meaningful participation of the most marginalized and affected constituencies to shape the responses through their autonomous formations and organisations.

Given these shortcomings of the international responses so far, we think the CFS has a pivotal role to play now.

Most affected countries and constituencies must be at the centre of the CFS High-Level intersessional event. Governments and constituencies from food-import-dependent low- and middle-income countries, from countries with high rates of food insecurity and those hosting many refugees should have a leading role in this Extraordinary Session, in sharing their analysis and proposals, and drafting the conclusions. None of the other international initiatives have offered them such a space.

The session should start with a discussion about the historical context and multidimensional nature of the crisis under discussion (What kind of crisis is this? How to define the new layer of food crisis and how is it related to earlier crises? What are its historical and concurrent responsible factors?) before entering in the discussion on policy recommendations. For many countries, the high and volatile prices for wheat and fertilizer and vegetable oils come on top of high levels of public spending on pandemic responses and depressed economies due to the shut-downs.

Other initiatives which have received international visibility (GCRG, G7, etc.) could report to the session but CFS needs to develop its own ideas and agenda and rebalance these inputs by giving specific space for the proposals and initiatives of most affected countries and constituencies based on its mandate to eradicate food insecurity and realize the right to adequate food.

We propose to focus CFS discussions on developing a new world food security strategy based on measure to:

- Promote re-localised food provisioning through:
  - Support for agroecology with its focus on diversified food systems & small-scale food producers as both short term and long term intervention;
  - Strengthening local food systems and local/national food sovereignty, learning from the resilience that local food systems have shown in times of the pandemic
- Agree on measures to curb speculation, reinforce national and regional strategic food reserves, prioritize the availability of food by limiting the biofuel and feed demands in particular in developed nations and address food price volatility;
- Create a new global trade agenda based on the Right to adequate food and nutrition, as recommended by the Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food;
- That CFS make use of its policy outcomes directly related to food price volatility, social protection, protracted crises, smallholder agriculture and access to markets, and more generally the Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition.
Regular Agenda items of the CFS Bureau and Advisory Group Meeting

1 CFS 50 Planning

CSIPM Messages:
- The Plenary Debate on the new layer of global food crisis needs to address the problem as a multidimensional, systemic crisis. It cannot address the consequences of the crisis without addressing the structural causes.
- The Ministerial Segment of the Plenary is welcome since it can visualize the outstanding political importance of the meeting, but it must give special attention and space to the people and constituencies most affected by this new layer of crisis, our constituencies.
- The Plenary’s Opening and Panels should include among the prominent speakers the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, the UN Special Rapporteur on the right to food and other related Special Procedures of the Human Rights Council.
- Special attention should be given to gender and regional balance of all Panels of the Plenary.
- The Plenary debate on policy responses to the new layer of food crisis cannot end with a descriptive outcome, but with substantive CFS decision on Policy Coordination to address the crisis and its causes. This decision also must have a direct and explicit implication for the Decision on the Rolling Section of the MYPOW.
- We would suggest to invite the directors of the Chicago Mercantile Exchange (CME) and of Euronext Paris in particular come and testify before the CSA on the current state of financial speculation on agricultural commodities and the mechanisms that allow it, in the absence of intervention by stock market regulatory authorities.
- The last Day should be devoted to an exchange of concrete cases studies of how governments, social movements, Indigenous Peoples, Intergovernmental Organisations and other relevant actors are responding to the new layer of food crisis, offering an opportunity to deepen the analysis of day 1.

2 CFS Advisory Group Reporting Exercise

A member of the CSIPM Advisory Group should present a summary of our contribution to the Reporting Exercise document, page 38-41

3 Workstream and Budget Updates

- Our Working Group of Youth and the Working Group of Women and Gender Diversity are preparing for the in-person negotiations at the end of June, and in July. We have shared our concerns with the CFS Chair yesterday, and kindly request the support of the CFS to make these negotiations as inclusive as pre-pandemic CFS negotiations. Concretely we need support for our delegations to access FAO, and to book a room in the building, support to provide visa letters to our participants and a methodology that would allow a rotation of our speakers in a Plenary Hall with a limited number of attendees. We welcome the suggestion of the CFS to send him a Letter for this purpose. If a meaningful and diverse in-presence participation of our constituencies could not be ensured, we would propose to hold the negotiations in a hybrid mode.
- Regarding the CFS and FAO event on Friday, 27 May on the 10th Anniversary of the Voluntary Guidelines on Tenure (VGGT): we would like to recall that the participation of the CSIPM to CFS events cannot be treated as an afterthought. The constituencies of the CSIPM have been key, together with Member States and other actors to build these Guidelines, and have been extremely supportive to the promotion, dissemination, and application of the Tenure Guidelines. It is not appropriate that our constituencies receive an invitation only eight days before a CFS event that had been planned a long time before, and then only to serve as a marginal respondent. We are grateful to the CFS Chair that he has helped correcting this situation and expect that our panellist will be given the due time to share the point of views of our constituencies. We also hope that for future CFS events the appropriate inclusive and participative preparation processes are ensured, in compliance with the basic rules of CFS.

4 Any other business