



CFS OEWG-SDGs Meeting # 2

Date: 24 February 2016

Time: 14:30-17:30

Location: Auditorium, WFP (Ground Floor)

## Summary compilation of contributions received

*The following document provides a compilation of written contributions received from CFS stakeholders and OEWG participants (23 contributions received) between 22 January and 12 February 2016, based on indicative questions prepared by the CFS Secretariat, and following a first exchange of views in the first OEWG-SDG meeting, on 21 January 2016.*

*The document summarizes points where there is broad agreement among stakeholders pertaining to CFS' relevance to support the implementation of the 2030 Agenda, the means by which it can do so with greatest value add, and the focus and activities which can support this engagement.*

*It also lists additional suggestions (which may sometimes be mutually exclusive) made by various stakeholders, for consideration by all.*

*The individual contributions can be found annexed to this compilation.*

### ***I- Is CFS, considering its mandate and functions, relevant to supporting the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development?***

There was general agreement that CFS, with its current mandate, vision and roles (intergovernmental, multi-stakeholder, evidence based), has the potential to convey and amplify the vision and ambition of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, and drive results. CFS is “fit for purpose”, particularly with regards to CFS’ inclusive and universal nature, the centrality of human rights in its work and approach, its ability to foster a sense of collective ownership and joint accountability, to consider interlinkages, and the broad recognition it has in NY.

### ***II- Which aspects of the 2030 Agenda implementation process can CFS best support?***

#### **1- Support to country implementation**

##### **- In the design of national policies**

There was broad recognition that CFS “normative instruments” (policy recommendations, voluntary guidelines, etc.) can be a powerful tool to support integrated national policy design to implement the 2030 Agenda, as they foster collective ownership, and their broad legitimacy facilitates their joint implementation by multi-stakeholders.

*A suggestion was made that that in the near future, CFS could agree on principles or guidelines to*

*serve as a framework to guide actions of all stakeholders in the implementation of SDG 2, and targets within other goals linked to food security, nutrition and sustainable agriculture.*

- **Supporting the definition of strategies for inclusive national reviews in the area of the CFS mandate**

Many contributions suggested that CFS can assist countries in defining participatory strategies to review national progress, given its expertise in multi-stakeholder processes, and the experience it is building since its reform to review its effectiveness and take stock of the uptake of CFS products.

*Additional suggestions mentioned:*

- *CFS as a model-to-replicate by interested countries*
- *CFS as an appropriate body to set guiding principles for national SDG review processes for the relevant targets.*
- *CFS could support multi-stakeholder platforms at various levels on implementing CFS products.*
- *CFS can prepare a policy review document that includes pros and cons about the multi-stakeholder multi-disciplinary experience since the reform of 2009.*

- **Strengthening RBA cooperation and programming coherence at national level**

It was suggested that CFS's role in providing space for improved RBA collaboration at global level, could be enhanced at country level, as some contributions stressed that coherence in the programming and activities of various UN agencies and initiatives on the field could still be a challenge.

*Further suggestions: some CFS activities could be dedicated to the strengthening of RBA cooperation at country level to support Member States implement the SDGs, for instance by encouraging country level activities to be based on a joint strategic situation analysis.*

## 2- Support of thematic global review

Thematic reviews of progress on the SDGs including cross-cutting issues will take place in the High-Level Political Forum (HLPF)<sup>1</sup>, and *“will be supported by reviews by the functional commissions of ECOSOC and other intergovernmental bodies and forums which should reflect the integrated nature of the Goals as well as the interlinkages between them”*.

Stressing that contributing to the HLPF thematic reviews does not imply or create a formal reporting link to the HLPF or modify CFS' mandate or governance, and that no single body or organization has a thematic “monopoly”, there was broad convergence that CFS, as the most inclusive intergovernmental platform on FSN, could play a constructive role in supporting the thematic review of issues related to its scope.

*Contributions further suggested that this could be done by:*

- *Continuing to promote a structured knowledge and experience sharing effort aiming to overcome common challenges and identify new and emerging issues. This could be done during CFS Plenary or during the intersessional period, and designed in a manner to feed into the thematic reviews to be presented to the HLPF.*
- *Analysing and communicating to NY how CFS's past and future normative and coordination roles impact SDGs and relevant targets. A specific report could be produced on the correlation between relevant SDGs and CFS's normative productions, such as the GSF, the VG RtF and the VGGT.*

<sup>1</sup> The HLPF's role, as underscored by Member States, is to *“draw high-level political attention to gaps or areas where we are lagging behind and ‘political leadership, guidance and recommendations for follow-up’ to accelerate progress on the most important issues.”*

- *Creating a web-platform mapping all FSN national programmes and policies.*

### 3- Collaboration and partnerships

As per its reform, CFS' role is to provide coordination at global, and regional and national levels; there was convergence on the fact that these activities can support the implementation of the 2030 Agenda.

*Further suggestions:*

- *The outcomes of the thematic reviews may result in opportunities for dialogue and cross-dissemination, to be explored with other platforms that will be tackling issues with strong relevance to the efforts of countries in achieving FSN (employment, environment, etc)*
- *It is primarily the role of CFS Advisory Group Members to ensure that CFS policy deliberations are brought to the attention of respective governing bodies, fostering coordination and integration among different platform and bodies.*
- *The CFS Plenary, through its sessions, side-events and special events, can be key to increase the number food security and nutrition partnerships. Outcomes of these sessions could be shared at the ECOSOC partnerships forums that will be linked to HLPF annual meetings.*

### 4- Accountability

Some contributions stressed the fact that the participatory nature of CFS processes fosters voluntary, transparent and inclusive policy decisions for which stakeholders are collectively and individually accountable. Several respondents highlighted that CFS ongoing work on the uptake of its products will contribute to further strengthening this capacity.

### 5- Keeping the momentum

Several contributions recalled that, to successfully reach all the 17 goals by 2030, it is crucial that the momentum be maintained over the next 15 years. There was some agreement that CFS can play a strong role in maintaining attention and accountability to the SDGs, and could further enhance its role as an active advocate of the importance of Ag & FSN, as cross-cutting issues conditioning success on the rest of the development agenda.

## III- How (activities, focus) will CFS add value ?

Contributions received generally found that CFS should direct its work and activities to the following:

### 1- Focus on SDG 2 and interlinkages

There was broad convergence on the fact that while a big part of CFS' value add lies in the fact that it is able to address interlinkages and cross-cutting issues in the integrated 2030 Agenda and its 17 indivisible goals, CFS work should keep a clear focus. A majority of comments suggested that SDG2 should be a primary focus and immediate entry point, but that working to achieve FSN will require touching upon and addressing other areas across the SDGs, under a "food security and nutrition lens", examining that other sectorial policies do not endanger FSN, or that promoting FSN objectives does not foster major trade-offs in other areas.

Contributions diverge on the areas (SDGs, targets) and number of areas where interlinkages are stronger.

*Further suggestions:*

- *Focusing on a central policy area such as food systems for food security and nutrition would for example require CFS to broadly cut across SDGs in the pursuit of SDG2.*

- *The mapping of the SDG targets in relation to the CFS scope and work is important for determining the role which CFS can play for the implementation of the SDGs. A mapping of the areas covered by existing CFS products will be helpful in understanding the extent to which CFS inter-relates with other goals and targets, and how these linkages can be effectively leveraged.*
- *Multi-stakeholders can be important to identify and understand to which extent CFS work should be integrated; it is crucial that CFS continues reaching out to relevant stakeholders in this global process.*

## 2- Follow-up and review of CFS products vs. follow-up and review of country progress on SDGs?

The formal monitoring reports which will feed in the Global Progress Report on SDGs, will be compiled by specialized agencies (RBAs, WHO, UNICEF, WB, etc) in collaboration with countries. While some inputs suggested that CFS should concentrate on the review of the uptake of CFS products, a number of contributions suggested that based on (and in complementarity with) these reports, the CFS platform can provide a space to exchange experiences and understand the challenges and enabling factors on country implementation of SDGs, with a view to formulate policy guidance to accelerate progress.

*Additional suggestions:*

- *Targeting progress of CFS policy product implementation is not an alternative to targeting country follow up and review of the SDGs. Rather, the former is an important object of monitoring and review by the CFS in its own right, as this work is essential to improve the effectiveness of the Committee and to generate lessons that can guide future activities, including those related to support to the 2030 Agenda.*
- *CFS should focus its efforts on building monitoring capacity for the implementation of its products, independently of the Agenda 2030. In this view, CFS could develop guidelines for the dissemination of its products. This could include a clarification of the steps after a CFS product has been launched.*
- *The work of the OEWG monitoring on the design of review processes for CFS product implementation should consider creating a clear relation and synergies to enhance SDG implementation. In particular, it could consider how CFS products/reports, including thematic HLPE reports, can be used in the most efficient manner to support the SDG agenda.*
- *CFS could develop an integrated approach across its products and workstreams: several CFS products may be relevant to a particular goal, while one product may be relevant to several goals.*
- *Country progress on SDG targets can be discussed in the Coordination and linkages session.*
- *CFS could provide a space and a methodology for inclusive dialogue on progress assessment which would benefit the follow-up and review of both CFS products, and progress on SDG targets.*
- *It would be highly relevant for WHO and the RBAs to collaborate on a jointly produced monitoring report addressing SDG2 in an integrated manner.*
- *CFS should coordinate with various bodies to collect relevant reports, compile them and submit them to the HLPF*

## 3- Intensify impact at regional and country levels

In order to support the implementation of the 2030 Agenda more effectively, including by providing support to country-driven implementation and follow-up and review, multiple contributions suggested that CFS could do more at country (and regional) level.

*Further suggestions:*

- *CFS has to be more focused on the country-level. This is in line with the roles mentioned in the Reform Document of 2009, which foresees enhanced focus in “phase 2” to the coordination and alignment of actions at national and regional levels, and the evaluation of outcomes on the ground.*
- *CFS may consider promoting participation of its constituencies to the monitoring and review at*

*regional and country level, with the support of the joint RBA CFS Secretariat and the technical support of UN agencies and bodies which form part of the CFS Advisory Group. These exercises will be most effective if they fully involve those most affected by development challenges.*

*- This may include establishing local “CFS Chapters” in voluntary countries, coordinated by the local RBA representatives.*

*- CFS should work further to promote coherence with the Right to Adequate Food and Nutrition and the GSF among global/regional initiatives and programmes.*

#### **4- Identify opportunities and challenges to progress on the SDGs :**

Contributions found that reviewing country-level experiences, broader trends, and emerging issues that may hinder progress over time, is a key role of CFS by which it can make a difference in advancing the 2030 Agenda.

*It was further suggested that this could be done through:*

*- the High Level Panel of Experts suggesting emerging challenges, areas for further policy discussion needs, including on SDGs, and appropriate policy actions.*

*- Knowledge and experience sharing on challenges faced in implementing CFS products or SDG FSN targets. This can be done in dedicated spaces during its plenary sessions, or inter-sessionally, through the organizations of seminars, workshops and ad hoc subject-matter meetings. The outcomes could be integrated into the CFS MYPoW to suggest new workstreams, and may also be suggested as areas of work to other stakeholders (particularly the RBAs).*

*- monitoring the use and impact of CFS policy products with specific sensitivity to the question of challenges and gaps in SDG implementation*

*- focusing particularly on developing countries and LDCs which face specific difficulties in the implementation of the 2030 Agenda*

*- drawing upon the results of the national, regional, and global reports produced annually to feed into the Agenda 2030 monitoring progress, including thematic reviews, the Global Sustainable Development Report, the SDG report, the report on progress in the implementation of the Addis Ababa Action Agenda and the means of implementation for the 2030 Agenda.*

*- starting now, by making an inventory of challenges and best practices with an immediate focus of CFS on relevant targets and indicators, in order to be able to submit substantial inputs at the first HLPF thematic review on FSN.*

#### **5- Look at country experiences**

It was suggested that CFS could better leverage the many existing country experiences which demonstrate the power and challenges of developing multisectorial approaches, combining diverse policy instruments, and ensuring policy coherence across the three dimensions of sustainable development with special emphasis on food security and nutrition, to learn and foster mutual learning at the global level.

*It was further suggested that:*

*- CFS could consider whether it is useful to gather countries with similar successes, natural conditions or implementation challenges into groups where it seems appropriate.*

*- The experiences made at a national level could be shared internationally, through voluntary exchange – for example as a side-event of the CFS Plenary week.*

#### **6- Within its workings, focus on role of different actors, tailor its work to various stakeholders**



Some suggestions mentioned that CFS processes could better acknowledge the differentiated roles of stakeholders. Policy recommendations could be further tailored, taking into account the variety of roles and responsibilities of multistakeholders, with direct engagement of both primary contributors to food security and those primarily affected by it.

### **7- Coordination of other initiatives-work-bodies, better linking with the rest of the UN system**

In the context of the 2030 Agenda, it was stressed by many that strengthening the interaction of the Committee with other major FSN actors (UN system and beyond) is important in order to avoid duplication, overlaps, gaps, and maximize synergies, as there is no single ownership of a goal or area.

- *It was recalled that it is up to the Member States to ensure coherence of messaging in all relevant governing bodies, as CFS has no mandate over governing bodies of UN Funds, Programmes and Specialized Agencies.*
- *Some inputs recalled that it is important for CFS to stay afloat and link up with developments beyond Rome (and NY) to stay relevant and produce substance by the time that FSN is reviewed by the HLPF.*
- *Several contributions found that the CFS evaluation will assess CFS' effectiveness in promoting coordination at global level between all relevant stakeholders; in particular, in bridging UN specialized agencies with a mandate touching on FSN, and linking with the rest of the UN system. The findings of the monitoring of the uptake of CFS products will further demonstrate whether the products effectively foster RBA collaboration at country level.*
- *It was suggested by some, for example, that CFS should coordinate with the United Nations Climate Change Convention (UNFCCC)'s adaptation and mitigation policies that are relevant to CFS's mandate. CFS work on climate change (goal # 7) should be coordinated with UNEP and UNFCCC; gender related issues should be coordinated with UN Women and CEDAW secretariat.*
- *Some contributions mentioned that CFS may cooperate with other institutions to collect relevant reports/information, compile, and analyse under a multi-stakeholder FSN perspective before sharing with then HLPF. For instance, various reports of the Human Rights Council (such as Universal Period Reports, as well as reports and recommendations from the human rights treaty bodies and Special Procedures) about the monitoring efforts of national implementation of the right to food, and other relevant thematic reports.*

### **8- Better communication and outreach**

*Some inputs suggested there was a need for more communication and outreach on CFS' relevance to advance the implementation of the 2030 Agenda, both to the wider public, and to the users of CFS products.*

### **9- Bridging Rome-NY: increasing two-way interaction, and engaging with the HLPF**

Some contributions suggested that CFS should not seek any formal reporting link with HLPF, nor any given institutional role in the follow-up and review architecture. Several contributions found that CFS work would have more impact if the work done in Rome was better known in NY.

*In particular, it was suggested that:*

- *CFS policy deliberations on cross-cutting issues (Food Security and Nutrition in Protracted Crises; VGGTs, RAI Principles, FS and Climate Change, Food Loss and Waste in the Context of Sustainable Food Systems) could be brought to the attention of the SDG global architecture. The results of these discussions could be reported to the HLPF.*
- *The CFS could strengthen fruitful interaction by increasing its visibility in New York, and stepping up its engagement and connection with the HLPF, UNGA and ECOSOC, keeping in mind that efforts undertaken by these mechanisms or their functional commissions are not duplicated.*

- CFS should submit a regular report to the High Level Political Forum in New York on the outcomes of each plenary session.
- Through an endorsement by CFS of the “SOFI” report of the three Rome-based agencies, the SOFI report could be incorporated as the main instrument in the thematic follow-up and review framework of the HLPF regarding goals and targets related to food security, nutrition and sustainable agriculture.
- The modalities for CFS interaction with the HLPF can only be discussed once the global thematic review architecture is agreed by Member States in New York.
- When supporting thematic reviews in conjunction with the HLPF process, the principle of subsidiarity between CFS and HLPF/UNGA must be enforced.

### 10- Keep a flexible and dynamic approach

It was suggested CFS should consider whether it is able to have two-way interactions with the HLPF<sup>2</sup>: to convey findings of its plenary debates, but to also respond to requests for inputs, high-level reviews or policy guidance. Flexibility on the particular ways the CFS platform could be used is critical.

*A few contributions suggested that CFS could benefit from the voluntary country reports provided to the HLPF (CFS’s role could be to highlight findings related to agriculture/food security/nutrition from the voluntary national reviews) and other resources available from the global SDG architecture. Some contributions stressed that the importance for the SDG, nutrition and MYPoW workstreams should be fully consistent with one another.*

### 11- An evolution of CFS calendar and agenda?

Contributions broadly recalled that all activities carried out by CFS should support the implementation of the 2030 Agenda, as they aim to eradicate hunger and malnutrition through a multi-stakeholder cross-cutting approach.

Some suggestions were made concerning the CFS calendar and agenda, for CFS’ contribution to the 2030 Agenda process to have more impact:

- **MYPoW:**

- *Relevance with the 2030 Agenda should to be taken into account by the Committee when prioritizing future workstreams, and the MYPoW could be better aligned/the 2030 Agenda process should take precedence over other considerations.*
- *CFS could decide to align its future work relating to the SDGs (major workstreams, themes of the HLPE reports, and the Coordination & Linkages sessions) to fit the HLPF thematic review cycles. Close coordination with ECOSOC and the UN General Assembly would be critical in this respect.*
- *Early decision should be reached on the role which the HLPE can play, since it needs time to produce its outputs.*

- **CFS Vision and roles:**

- *Some contributions suggested that CFS could be mandated with a new function: “maintaining alignment with relevant SDGs”*

---

<sup>2</sup> In order to support the HLPF thematic reviews, functional commissions and other intergovernmental forums should “examine their agendas and methods of work and ensure that they are able to respond to requests for voluntary inputs by the HLPF as needed and within the scope of their regular meetings”( Report of the Secretary General on critical milestones towards coherent, efficient and inclusive follow-up and review at the global level, paragraph 48).

- ***CFS Plenary and intersessional calendar***

*Several contributions found that the annual activities of CFS may be reformulated in terms of calendar to fit into the thematic reviews conducted by the HLPF.*

*- This could be done by considering a regular inter-sessional activity dedicated to providing inputs to the HLPF following CFS Plenary(ies)*

*-Such activities could include intersessional seminars and workshops, particularly at global and regional levels*

*- They could be dedicated sessions during CFS plenary, or special events.*

*- They could include thematic reviews consistent with the work of the High Level Political Forum or provide stakeholders with the possibility to share experiences and lessons learned on 2030 Agenda implementation*

-----

*A suggestion was made for the HLPF to be tasked with the preparation of a report on “how CFS can effectively contribute to the implementation of the SDGs”.*