

CFS MYPOY 19 June

EU Delegation comments

CFS MYPOW – Revised Chair Proposal

General

In general, we agree that the CFS workload should be reduced for the next biennium, as also indicated by other members and stakeholders. **This necessarily implies to reduce the number of OEOWs and the number of meetings.** In this connection, either the number of topics could be reduced or we could explore a different way of working out each of them.

If agreement is reached on further prioritisation and reducing the number of themes, we would consider **the follow-up to the evaluation and the workstream on nutrition to be the ones to be retained in any case by the Committee for the next biennium,** together with the topics already selected for the HLPE reports.

Concerning the budget, there is need to keep the cost level at the long-term average support level for a biennium.

Specific

List of potential activities for the MYPOW 2018-19:

a. Preparation of Action Plan of the CFS Evaluation

From our point of view, **this topic is of paramount importance and should be top priority for the CFS during the next biennium.** It also refers to the funding of this activity, which should be secured as soon as possible, either through including it into the core CFS budget or by securing it as soon as further funding arrives.

c. CFS MYPOW for 2020-21

The process of developing the next CFS MYPOW should be deeply linked to the evaluation process. From our perspective, the way CFS currently prioritises needs to be further improved. In this regard, we think that the CFS Programme of Work should be more aligned to the RBAs' respective programmes and objectives as well as to those of other FSN actors. Furthermore, in developing the MYPOW, more attention should be given to the SOFI and other FSN related reports that raise issues of relevance to the CFS.

d. Sharing experiences and good practices on the use and application of CFS recommendations

Activities on monitoring CFS products need to be undertaken, as agreed by the CFS in previous years, through the organisation of thematic events. It is important to follow up on previous decisions taken by the Committee, CFS 42, and limit the scope of this monitoring work to the major policy products.

In that connection, it is difficult to see the need of keeping an OEWG to work out the preparation of such events. The Bureau, in proper consultation with the Advisory Group, should be able to provide guidance to the CFS Secretariat on this matter.

e. CFS engagement in advancing nutrition.

We agree that this should be the main workstream the CFS should focus on during the next biennium. This workstream should build, as proposed, on the work undertaken by the Committee during the current biennium as well as on the HLPE on Nutrition and Food Systems. Nonetheless, this workstream needs as well to be fully aligned with the work that is currently being conducted by others, especially FAO and WHO but also WFP and UNICEF, among others, in the framework of the Decade of Nutrition and its Framework of Action.

With regards possible outcome resulting from this workstream, **there is no need to rush into negotiating policy guidance and develop a policy product.** In order to have a good policy product, much more evidence based scientific background is needed so to have good policy guidance on nutrition that could help advance the FSN agenda. The CFS work on nutrition has to be complementary to the work done by others. Furthermore, we need to clearly understand the added value the CFS could provide to the Nutrition agenda. This implies to have a clear focus on nutrition from the perspective of food security and poverty reduction.

Thus, further thinking is needed so as to narrow the focus of this workstream and have proper and sufficient technical background to build on. Moreover, **an eventual policy product should be demand driven.**

We consider that *Stunting and child nutrition* could possibly be a useful theme to develop into a policy product.

Concerning the proposal of organising regional conferences, the CFS should only plan them once its work on nutrition is sufficiently mature.

f. Urbanization, rural transformation and implications for food security and nutrition

We consider that **it is premature to embark on negotiating policy recommendations on this topic,** as proposed in documents presented for discussion at the OEWG meeting. Before engaging in a process as such, further discussion is needed so as to clearly understand what the added value of the CFS could be on this topic and how the CFS can help advance the FSN agenda in relation to the changing rural/urban dynamics. We also think that more technical work by specialised agencies is needed before the CFS embarks on developing a negotiated product on this issue.

In case further prioritising is needed, we could agree to keep this workstream on hold until having enough resources.

g. Engaging, recruiting and retaining youth in agriculture.

We consider that youth in relation to FSN and agriculture is a very interesting topic to be taken by the CFS. Nevertheless, we would like to see the current proposal differently formulated. **We think that it is far too soon to engage in a policy negotiation process on this theme.** We would rather favour to look at how youth issues can be fully integrated in other workstreams.

Taking into account previous experiences at the CFS, as the *CFS 42 Youth for food security and nutrition Idea Incubator*, this event could be somewhat replicated with a different focus. In this connection, a special event during Plenary can be organised, either CFS 45 or 46, in which young farmers associations and academia, civil society, private sector, UN agencies, governments, and other interested stakeholders, could gather and share experiences in order to identify challenges, gaps, and lessons learned in order to advance the Youth agenda in relation to FSN and agriculture.

Furthermore, we consider that youth should be mainstreamed throughout all the work to be conducted by the Committee.