
Thank you Chair. Looking at the Guide to the Preparation of the Report, we note that a new category of ‘types’ has been added to the list this year as compared with past plenaries: Type D. We feel that it is inappropriate to reduce what we expect will be a rich discussion on the key challenge that the CFS is facing today – coordinated policy responses to the food crisis – to a list of speakers, reference to a Chair’s Summary, and a link to the transcript of the session which few if any will consult. We strongly feel that this important agenda item should be considered Type B, as in the past. We understand that contrasting views on the topic may be expressed, but this is to be expected and should be reflected in the report. Debate should not be suffocated out of fear that some Member States may seek to use the CFS as a space for geopolitical positioning to the detriment of those countries and constituencies who are most affected by the food crisis and most need the CFS to develop coordinated policy responses.

2. CFS 51 Side Events Guidance Note

In this point the comparison with the last years is important to raise difficulties:

- For the CSIPM, having only virtual side events is very problematic. There will be a CSIPM delegation in Rome and meeting in person, also for the side events, is important. For this reason we would like to ask the possibility to have all side events as hybrid in order to make the side events as inclusive as possible.
- Last year, the CSIPM as tried to self-organize hybrid side events because technical support could not be fully insured due to bureaucratic and logistical issues. We hope that this year we can solve these issues together and be able to organize hybrid side events with the participation of many CSOs and IPOs. It is necessary to have a side event about the coordination function of the CFS as a consolidation of all the annual process.

3. CFS 51 Provisional Timetable

- We are not pleased with the fact that we will not be able to celebrate the International Day of Rural Women this year because it will be during the World Food Forum. However, we would like to propose a moment to celebrate rural women anyway.
- The discussion on the two main policy Workstreams has been split between Tuesday and Wednesday (women and data). We would like to ask for more information to
understand why. Are you envisaging to split the discussion between two days or will this change later on in the planning of the Plenary?

- Another important point for us is that the CSIPM needs to have a space for the organization of the CC meeting and the CSIPM forum. We raised this point in the last AG and Bureau meeting and the Chair ensured the CSIPM that we will have access to the FAO facilities. And we know that the Chair and CFS Secretariat will do everything possible to support us. We really hope that the FAO, IFAD or WFP facilities will be accessible for the CSIPM on the week prior to the plenary, including the weekend before the plenary, as this is essential for us to facilitate an effective CSOs and IPOs participation.

4) Coordinated policy responses to the global food crisis

As CSIPM we would like to thank the Chair and the Secretariat for kick-starting the to operazionalize the agreements made in the Plenary last year. The space of the substantive segments of the CFS Bureau and Advisory Group are of utmost importance in this time of multilayered crisis. The regional popular consultations carried out by the CSIPM and their results, presented at CFS 50, continue to offer a living proof that a food system transformation is urgently needed. Any transformation, however, is a process that starts with a primary step of understanding the point of departure. And to understand our point of departure as CFS, we need to answer the following question: which kind of crisis does the transformation of food systems need to address? People and countries are faced with a crisis of inequalities, a crisis of debt, a crisis of dependencies, a crisis of climate warming and increasing natural disasters. Our starting point here today in the CFS is that we are facing not only a crisis of the cost of food and living but a crisis with intersecting facets and that we need to transform our food system putting people and mother earth at the centre.

Therefore, the CSIPM has stressed the need to talk about structural crisis. Advancing on a common agreement on how the debt crisis, dependency on food imports and dependency on chemical inputs are exacerbating inequalities in a context of climate change can no longer be put on hold by the CFS, as the main and central platform reformed for the precise purpose of addressing and preventing food crises.

Chair, we believe that with a small effort of reframing the main issues -taking this rationale into account- we can advance in the right direction.

We would like to repeat the suggestions already made in the previous AG/B meeting.

In terms of the thematic issues:

- Session 2 should focus on the debt burden and fiscal spaces as a systemic challenge for advancing social protection, expanding and going beyond the “nutrition-sensitive” focus for social protection.
Session 3: the entry point here needs to acknowledge the need to reduce food import dependency and diversify food provisioning through local food systems in order to support livelihoods. This is a priority for many countries in the global south.

Session 4: should discuss how today’s economic model based on agricultural efficiency has led to a dependency on chemical inputs which have been proven to be harmful for both people and nature. In a context of climate crisis and increasing natural disasters these discussions need to highlight how agroecology has proved to be a practice to break from these dependencies.

On Session 1, we do not believe the GCRG and UNCTAD SG should be so central in framing the crisis. The GCRG has emerged only last year, and, unfortunately, the crisis has been ongoing for longer than that. Although the GCRG has been a useful space to share information, as CSIPM we have experienced that it is limited and does not provide the adequate time for in-depth discussions. We believe that any discussion on the question the question “Who is suffering the most and where” should come from the people most affected and by the Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food who has a specific mandate to take an integrated and coordinated approach to promoting and protecting people’s right to food, in line with the CFS work that is about to start on strengthening coordinated policy responses.

An adequate methodology for the different segments with guiding questions should be put forward so that they result in meaningful debates.

Finally regarding the proposal that the High Level Special Event take place in Rome in July, in the framework of the UN Food Systems Summit Stocktaking Moment, the CSIPM would like to express its deep concern and strong disagreement.

• We don’t think that the CFS should be subsumed into an activity organized by the Coordination Hub of the Food Systems Summit. It is important to recall that there was no intergovernmental agreed outcome of the Food Systems Summit, and strong tensions within the CFS about this initiative of the Secretary General.

• Despite all public promises of UN senior management that no new structure would be established with the UNFSS, a new structure has effectively been institutionalized with the Coordination Hub and its own governance architecture, including a system of partnerships with civil society and Indigenous Peoples and private sector, its own Science-Policy-Interface, and a budget that is more than double of the budget of the CFS.

• Members States are not part of the governance structure of the Coordination Hub, which is a stark contrast to the intergovernmental decision-making set-up in the CFS. Members States have repeatedly expressed concerns within the CFS about the FSS. In addition, its confusing and non-transparent governance model of multistakeholderism has sidelined Member States, especially from the Global South.

• We also recall the global counter-mobilization organized by social movements, Indigenous Peoples and civil society against the Food Systems Summit in 2021, with large resonance within the CFS, the academic world and media networks. What sense does it make to hold the High-Level Special Event in a setting in which a major
component of the CFS, and a foundation of its renowned inclusiveness, does not feel at home? What can possibly be gained in comparison with what could be lost?

• The Stocktaking Moment of July increasingly appears like a huge global conference that aims to be a “Food Systems Summit plus 2”. How can we justify all the resources spent on this double structure and next huge event? What could have been done with these resources to promote the use and application of CFS policy outcomes that have not played any substantial role in the Summit and its follow-up?

For these reasons and more, we do not support the proposal to hold the Special Event during the FSS Stocktaking Moment. We evaluated positively last year’s organization of the High Level Segment in the context of the UN General Assembly, and we do not understand why this year the effort to “interlink” has gone into a process that presented and still presents so many controversies.