



## Open Ended Working Group (OEWG)

## Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)

Document No: CFS OEWG-SDGs/2016/06/22/05

CFS OEWG-SDGs Meeting # 4

Date: 22 June 2016, Time: 14:30-17:30

Location: IFAD, Oval room

Webcast link: [http://webcasting.ifad.org/CFS\\_OEWG](http://webcasting.ifad.org/CFS_OEWG)

### Written inputs to draft proposal circulated on 2 June 2016

#### AFGHANISTAN

Thank you for circulating the revised proposal on "CFS engagement in advancing the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development" for comments. Afghanistan is pleased with the revised proposal and gives it its strong support.

With respect to paragraph 10, Afghanistan suggests that the OEWG on MYPoW consider two options. Option one will be what is proposed in the paragraph, namely "the nexus between SDG2 and other SDGs and targets of Agenda 2030".

Option two will be "Core Issues in incorporating SDG2 targets in national development plans".

With respect to engagement with HLPF, Afghanistan gives preference to 19.bis .

For contribution to the 2017 HLPF meeting, Afghanistan gives preference to Alternative 21.bis .

Thank you and best regards.

#### CSM

##### **Para 6: Structure of the Functions with regard to "Global Coordination"**

The CSM reiterates its concern that, despite some progress in the text, there remains a significant underestimation of the global coordination function, as it is merely presented as the sum of everything else with no specific activities assigned to it. The CSM believes that this does not reflect the CFS mandate as per Reform Document, the need to overcome the significant fragmentation in programme implementation, and the desire for concrete action by Member States and other constituencies. Indeed, many new activities and programmes will be designed to advance the 2030 Agenda and the CFS could offer a vibrant space for collaborative action in this respect. Furthermore, the need for coordination, harmonization and coherence will therefore increase even further and the CFS could offer a space for all to share and harmonize action agendas. While the CSM's proposal remains that of articulating a separate function on "Global Coordination", the CSM second-best proposal would be to include an additional activity in the table related to policy convergence:

<p>2.1.6 All CFS workstreams to explore how to increase the coherence and responsiveness of the FSN programming and how to promote collaborative action among all CFS constituencies</p>	<p>MYPOW OEWGs CFS Plenary</p>	<p>Ongoing (intersessionally and plenary)</p>	<p>Progressive harmonization of FSN programmes at all levels (promoting coordination among all actors, timely responsiveness to the new challenges being identified and coherence with CSF policy recommendations) and development of collaborative initiatives among CFS members and stakeholders (within the domains of established CFS workstreams)</p>
--	--	---	--

This activity would aim to create spaces for discussion within all established workstreams on how to increase the coherence and responsiveness of the FSN programming and how to promote collaborative action among all CFS constituencies within the particular focus of each workstream.

**Para 8: Proper referencing to Global Strategic Framework**

The proposal should specify that the Global Strategic Framework is not merely a repository of CFS policy instruments, but it also contains a specific chapter (chapter 2) on “*the root causes of hunger, lessons learned, and emerging challenges*”, with the following sub-chapters: *structural causes of hunger and malnutrition, past experiences and lessons learned, emerging challenges and looking ahead*. The GSF is going to be periodically updated, through an inclusive process involving all the CFS participants, and whose outcome is discussed and endorsed by the CFS Plenary. For this reason, the GSF update process can provide the framework within which to define the CFS contribution to the HLPF global review on food security and nutrition.

**Para 11 and Item 2.1.5 in Activity Box: 4-Year MYPOW**

The CSM is not able at this stage to provide its definitive position on the matter as internal consultations are undergoing. Given the importance of the matter, it may be expected that this matter – as others – will have to be concluded at CFS 43. However, there is a discussion within the CSM that would suggest that, rather than transitioning from a 2Y to a 4Y-cycle, the proposal should provide for a 4-Year plan that is to be reviewed every 2 years. This would mean that the MYPOW would include a 4-year time horizon, with greater details for the first 2 years and initial rough orientation for the following 2 years (including workstreams that could run beyond the initial 2 year period). This is reviewed every 2 years, by crystallizing plans for year 3-4 (now becoming year 1-2) and adding two additional years. It becomes a rolling process, which will provide flexibility to respond to new issues and maintain the governance cycle unaltered.

**Para 12-14 and Lessons Sharing Activity Box**

The CSM remains concerned that this entire segment could remain non-impactful while involving a significant share of the limited CFS resources. As earlier proposed and discussed during the OEWG Sessions, the CSM proposes to scale down these activities, connect them more closely with the reviewing progress function and focus them on building experiential knowledge by all CFS constituencies on key obstacles encountered in the use and implementation of CFS products, therefore connecting it closely with the CFS monitoring workstream. In particular, references to side events should be removed, as these are autonomous spaces organized by CFS constituencies.

Furthermore, the CSM would like to add the notation “...and challenges” in the title. This way the title would better reflect the actual content of the paragraph, as it proposes to “understand concrete challenges or bottlenecks faced in the implementation of the national food security and nutrition goals and shifts needed in the policy environment”.

**Para 15 and Item 2.3.1 in Progress Review Activity Box**

The use of the term “discussing” the review of global FSN situation seems extremely weak. The CSM reiterates its call for strengthening the role and activities of CFS and proposes to change the text into “Review progress and challenges in the realization of the Right to Adequate Food and Nutrition”.

**Para 19-20-21: CFS Contribution to the HLPF**

On all options proposed for the CFS Plenary calendar (extraordinary sessions, possible shifting of the Plenary schedule from October to March), the CSM believes that these should be discussed in the June session of the OEWG, where proper involvement of as many participants as possible is granted. Comments and views on such a substantive set of issues cannot be requested with a four working days deadline. The CSM needs proper time to translate all these proposals and consult with its wide constituencies.

The CSM also reiterates that a standing OEWG should be established to advance work intersessionally on the CFS continued contribution to the follow-up and review of the 2030 Agenda, prepare for Bureau and Plenary’s decisions related to the HLPF, and ensure inclusive preparation of CFS submissions. A possible option could be that of reframing this as the continuation of the GSF process, consistently with CSM’s comment above.

**Para 27 and item 4.2.3 in Activity Box**

The interaction with other bodies and functional commissions requires further clarification, as there is lack of clarity on how and by when relevant bodies be identified and how the CFS would interact with them.

## FRANCE

Our preference would be to have a discussion on CFS contribution to HLPF 2017 rather in the regular session of CFS 43, as there are major budgetary and organizational implications of an extraordinary session.

## Germany

For an extraordinary plenary of CFS next year, Germany sees serious budget issues that would have to be solved beforehand. Therefore, we prefer to look for a solution in CFS 43.

Concerning para 10 und the proposal for 3.1 and 3.2., we can agree.

## IFAD

Dear CFS colleagues,

Thank you for sharing a strong revised proposal and for the opportunity to provide some initial thoughts concerning the questions flagged in the email below, preparatory to a more thorough discussion on 22 June.

Concerning the proposals related to the work of the HLPE, they appear generally sound. One way to strengthen what is now in the text may be to spell out in paragraph 9 that not only will a selection criterion on Agenda 2030 relevance be added to the guidance note for the MYPOW, including as concerns HLPE reports, but an effort will also be made to distil gaps and challenges requiring HLPE attention in the sharing of country experiences in plenary or in dedicated inter-sessional events.

More broadly, and related to this point, IFAD would reiterate its earlier recommendation to be explicit in the section on policy convergence and policy coherence, as to the fact that issues to be addressed under this heading will emerge through sharing of experiences and multi-stakeholder debate around this sharing of experience, and not only through the work of the HLPE. This should be true both of the work that the CFS will do in the future to design policy convergence tools and products like the CFS-RAI or the VGGT, AND of what it will do to promote coordination of efforts and greater policy coherence towards food security and nutrition, whether in terms of coherence and coordination across countries and across sectors. This link to the work on experience sharing and multi-stakeholder debate is implicit in the section on sharing of lessons and good practices, but not made explicit in the section on policy convergence and coherence, where it needs to appear as well.

Concerning the timeline for organizing the preparation of CFS submissions to the HLPF during years of particular attention to SDG2 or when the Forum gathers under the UNGA, a decision on this matter rests with the CFS member states. It is our view, however, that it would be important to have a dedicated discussion in March/April, rather than allowing for several months of gaps between the October Plenary and the preparation of this submission.

Finally, also related to the contribution by the CFS to the HLPF, the proposed distinction among years of specific focus on SDG2 and other years seems appropriate.

## ITALY

Thank you very much for your coordination efforts and for the excellent revised proposal on “CFS engagement in advancing the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development”; the text captures well the thorough reflection and discussion on the issues at stake, as debated at our April meeting. In general, we appreciate the document and the main innovations introduced.

A few comments on our part:

- **HLPE work (Paragraph 10).** We fully support the idea of having the MYPoW OEWG propose a technical note elaborating on FSN “nexus” between SDG 2 and other goals and targets in the Agenda. This activity would reflect the concrete added-value of CFS as a multi-stakeholder (and multi-disciplinary) platform. Placing CFS work at the intersection of several SDGs is not only fully in line with its mandate and its “raison d’être”, but would enhance its visibility and contribution to global processes;
- **Arrangements for the 2017 HLPF (Paragraphs 19 and 21).** We strongly appreciate the efforts to make the timing of CFS work more suitable to the HLPF review and follow-up process. However, convening a Special Plenary in March or April 2017 would overload the already cumbersome agenda of the RBAs next year (FAO biannual Conference and IFAD Governing Council + Replenishment process, in particular). It would also have considerable cost implications (as pointed out in Appendix 2). A mandate to the Bureau to finalize the contribution for 2017 would be preferable. (Par. 21; alternative 21 bis)
- On the other hand, after 2017 and only in the years when food security and nutrition and/or SDG 2 are a direct focus of the HLPF global thematic review, we would suggest to reconsider the calendar of the CFS Plenary Session to enable alignment with the global review process and discussions, for instance through Plenary sessions in March/April instead of October, starting in 2018 (Par. 19; alternative 19 ter)
- **Proposal for a 4-year MYPoW.** We fully support this innovation, as stated also at the April OEWG meeting, as it allows for a more flexible adaptation of CFS to emerging issues.

## NORWAY

We wish to thank you and the Secretariat for an excellent revision of the proposal for CFS’ engagement in the 2030 Agenda. We appreciate that several of our comments have been integrated and are in general very pleased with the structure and focus of the document. We would like to suggest the following concrete additions and changes:

- Para. 4: After the first sentence, we would like to add a footnote with the following text: “[The term agriculture includes crops, livestock, forestry, fisheries and aquaculture.]”

- Para. 8: We would like to make a small addition after “agricultural investments, and biofuels, **[and the role of sustainable fisheries and aquaculture for food security and nutrition.]**. According to the CFS HLPE report "Sustainable fisheries and aquaculture for food security and nutrition" (2014), the qualities of fish are not fully recognized in global food security and nutrition, hence the CFS Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition (GSF) forth version (2015) includes advice to give to fish the position it deserves in food security and nutrition strategies and programmes and make fish a visible, integral element in food security and nutrition strategies, policies and programmes.
- Para. 8: We would also suggest a small addition at the end of the paragraph, in order to make sure that also already produced HLPE reports are made active use of: “They are informed by evidence-based report from the HLPE, **[both formerly produced reports and new ones]**.”
- Para. 14: We would like to limit the number of activities suggested under sharing of lessons, in order not to overstretch the CFS Secretariat. Workshops for groups of countries and global CFS events would imply an expansion of CFS’ activities.
- Para. 19: Based on the limited financial resources, we would opt for 19bis. We would like to suggest the following addition:

**“[The discussions will result in plenary endorsed guidance together with a mandate to the Bureau to finalize the contribution. At CFS 44 (2017), the outcomes of the HLPF meeting will be discussed. Based on the experience, CFS may decide to reconsider the calendar of its Plenary sessions to enable alignment with the global review process and discussions, for instance through Plenary sessions in March/April instead of October.]”**

- Para 21.; We prefer 21bis.

Thanks again for your commitments and hard work for the Open Ended Working Group.

## SWITZERLAND

**General comment:** at some occasions, the proposal refers to food security, nutrition *and sustainable agriculture*. However, most of the times it only refers to FSN. We would propose to add the “sustainable agriculture” dimension throughout the document.

### **Specific comments:**

Para 4 We agree and also fully support this paragraph, in general. However, we would add the word “sustainable” add the very beginning of the paragraph.

Para 8: There are also guidelines on the progressive realization on the right to food, VGRtF. They are part of the Strategic Framework. Are they not considered a CFS policy instrument?

Para 9: These selection criteria look interesting. However, even though they have been mentioned, latest in the message by the two Chairs (OEWGs SDG and MYPoW), they never seen spelled out. It would be interesting if this criterion had a time factor, something like "... in relation with the aspect(s) of the Agenda 2030 that the HLPF focuses on in the year after the adoption of the HLPE report."

Para 10: We also support the technical note proposed therein, however our understanding is that this should not be in lieu of the HLPE reports highlighting interlinkages between FSN&SA and other themes treated at the HLPF.

Para 11: We fully agree!

Para 13: "...experiences on country-led efforts to achieve national goals and the SDG targets related to food security and nutrition .. can be .. conveyed to the HLPF.." – we support this.

Para 14: "- stock-taking sessions on the use of CFS products, documenting catalysts, constraints and results achieved around a CFS product at local, country or regional level (such as the VGGT event planned for CFS 43) and contributing to CFS monitoring"

The final words "...contributing..." are important to us. Such an activity is very welcome, but can never replace monitoring. In addition, under "thematic sessions", the focus should not be "on a specific SDG relevant issue", but rather an issue relevant to a specific theme of the 2030 Agenda.

Para 15: We fully support such reviews as CFS contribution to the HLPF, based on UN system reports (in particular SOFI), complementing quantitative findings with qualitative discussion.

Para 18: Again, very well formulated, and important to have also the second kind of contribution. However, there should not be a hierarchy between the two kinds of contributions (see also remarks on para 20).

Para 19: At this stage our preference will go to a compromise between 19 and 19bis : « *A contribution to reviews directly related to food security, nutrition and sustainable agriculture, CFS' core mandate, should be **finalized and agreed by CFS Plenary**. CFS will dedicate a segment of its Plenary session in October to this discussion. In order to ensure timely inputs and feed in/make use of the global political momentum leading to the HLPF held under ECOSOC in July, or the HLPF held under UNGA in September, **CFS may decide to convene a Special Plenary in March or April in those years** »*

Para 20: We do not support this proposal. Again, CFS and FSN&SA is not only about SDG2. We should remain more flexible. Why should a contribution on SDG2 be agreed by plenary, but a contribution on water (and agriculture) not? This is completely against the spirit of an integrated agenda.

Para 21: We prefer the original version in particular if food security is confirmed as the theme for 2017.

Para 22 : We fully support, especially on the "cross-cutting issues between the annual theme and food security and nutrition".

Box: ATTENTION: Para 19 and para 19ter speak about "*related to food security, nutrition and sustainable agriculture,*", and not SDG2, as in the table! Please remove inconsistency. The same applies to the heading of para 19 ("SDG2 under global thematic review.."). We are of the opinion that in general the focus should be on FSN&SA, rather than on SDG2.

## WHO

We appreciate the opportunity to provide additional comments on this very much advanced latest version of the proposal.

1. We support that the CFS OEWG on MYPoW proposes a technical note elaborating the food security and nutrition “nexus” between SDG 2 and the other goals and targets in the 2030 Agenda, to be commissioned from the HLPE. In light of the interconnectedness of the SDGs, we suggest broadening this further and to include also health, so it would be the nexus food security, nutrition and health’.

2. Furthermore, as previously expressed, we are in support of a longer term MYPoW. This could facilitate future CFS planning by better anticipating and allowing policy work to be finalized and delivered in synergy with relevant processes outside CFS. Such processes include the HLPF thematic reviews. They include also the review process of major milestones of the UN Decade of Action on Nutrition. This should be mentioned as well in the paper. The UN Decade of Action on Nutrition is another important international process in New York that is highly relevant for the achievement of the Agenda 2030 and in particular SDG2.

3. Overall, we welcome and support the inclusion of the UN Decade of Action on Nutrition 2016-2025 especially as in para 3. With this regard, the language on the Decade could be further strengthened in the document such as under the first proposed function of CFS on ‘policy convergence’. We propose to add in activity 2.1.5 the wording: ....’such as the major milestone reviews of the UN Decade of Action on Nutrition’.

Activity 2.1.5: revised text would read: Four-year MYPoW, with flexibility to adjust, takes into account major international events and processes related to food security and nutrition in the global agenda such as the major milestone reviews of the UN Decade of Action on Nutrition, or HLPF theme when relevant

4. In the context of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development that gives a strong message to break down silos and engage in partnerships across sectors, we like to underline the important link of agriculture and food security with health and nutrition. To achieve the SDG goals and targets, the technical expertise jointly provided by the three Rome Based Agencies is further complemented with the expertise of the main UN agencies with a mandate in nutrition notably by UNICEF, WHO and others. With this regard, the language in the proposal could be strengthened in several parts of the document, such as in para 2 and para 13

5. The language on nutrition could be further strengthened in the document. The following is suggested:

Para 2 with regard to second sentence : The 2030 Agenda goes beyond hunger elimination. We would like to suggest to add also the aspect of .... ensuring food security and nutrition for all human beings, which is part of the CFS vision expressed in the reform document.

According to the reform document (para 4), The reformed CFS..... provides a platform for support of country-led processes towards the elimination of hunger and ensuring food security and nutrition for all human beings. Leaving out this aspect, would not pay full attention to the vision and mandate of the CFS as spelled out in the reform document.

Para 6, para 7, para 15 (box with activity 2.3.1 and its outcome), para 19 and others

We like to suggest adding the word ‘improved’ before nutrition, so that it reads .... achieving



food security and improved nutrition and sustainable agriculture ..... in line with the wording of the SDG2.

Footnote 4

We suggest adding 'nutrition', as the CFS-FFA works on the nexus between food security, nutrition, resilience of livelihoods, and ....

Footnote 8

The five regional overviews of food insecurity should also include regional overviews on nutrition, similar to the new model that is being developed for the SOFI, and in collaboration with nutrition mandated UN agencies that are managing global data basis. This is important, also with regard to the SDG2 and its targets.

Footnote 10

We like to suggest to add ... the UN Decade of Action on Nutrition implementation reports. The new foot note would read:

10) These could include: the State of Food and Agriculture (SOFA) report, the annual report of the Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food, the UN Decade of Action on Nutrition implementation reports and ICN2 progress report and the new Secretary General's SDG global progress report on SDGs.

6. Finally, on the proposed options for the arrangements for the 2017 HLPF we suggest to have a substantive discussion in CFS43 leading to the mandate to the Bureau and the OEWG on SDGs to finalize CFS' contribution to 2017 HLPF in the next intersessional period.

