

OEWG MYPOW
Chair's Proposal – Budget - Decision Box - Prioritization
Comments from the PSM

Chair's Proposal

General comments on chair's proposal:

- The PSM feels that the entire MYPOW is too broad and has too many workstreams.
- There seems to be an increased number of reports, meetings and inter-sessional activities despite a context of difficulties in raising funds for CFS activities.
- We feel the secretariat is under-resourced and time has been undervalued to deal with very complex workstreams and negotiations (cf: urbanization, agro-ecology)
- We feel that the document does not take in consideration the evaluation process and we recommend that all the language on the future MYPOW be deleted or edited so as to reflect that the learnings from evaluation will be incorporated.
- We find it confusing that the evaluation and MYPOW processes seem so disconnected.

Specific comments on each section:

- Evaluation
 - a. Time is undervalued in light of the tremendous amount of work that has been spent on this activity this year. The budget should be increased for next biennium.
- SDGs
 - a. We would not be in favor of the inter-sessional activity and would recommend using the time in plenary.
 - b. We feel it is very important for CFS to keep strong synergies with the SDG process in New York through the HLPF, the recent participation of the Chair and of Willem Olthof at the Expert Meeting showed the value of having CFS representatives raise awareness of the Committee in this other venue.
- MYPOW
 - a. We do not think that there is a need for the multistakeholder dialogue. This seems like a complex endeavour.
 - b. We recommend deleting sections 19 to 23 as they are all dependent on the results of the evaluation process.
 - c. The review of decision on future workstreams can only take place after the evaluation results.
 - d. The question of review and prioritization against actual funding should be mentioned in this section.

- Sharing experiences
 - a. The question of the OEWG should be postponed until after evaluation.
- Nutrition
 - a. #32 says “using as a basis the HLPE report”, we would request to use language from CFS42 Final Report which said in section 10 instead “as well as the CFS policy recommendations informed by the High-Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition (HLPE) reports”
 - b. We do not understand the reference to the regional conferences: is it a reference to the FAO regional conferences, or are these new conferences to be organized specifically by the CFS? In addition, the budget for these conferences is too high. Finally, if CFS sessions take place during the FAO regional conferences, they should be on several workstreams and not just on nutrition.
- Urbanization
 - a. In the previous version of the proposal, the budget was at 150K. It seems to us that it was quite low. Maybe a good point of reference would be the livestock negotiations to compare.
 - b. No further comments until OEWG on Urbanization on June 23.
- Youth
 - a. The PSM has a passion for this topic and we are delighted to see it mentioned in the Chair’s proposal. We find it is a great subject for the CFS to make its contribution as no other group is working on this subject.
 - b. We understand that there is strong support for the subject but that there are already too many workstreams and prioritization needs to happen.
 - c. In light of this, the PSM would be interested in seeing this topic being integrated into the urbanization workstream.
 - d. Our preference would be on this integration rather than on having an event in plenary.
- Partnerships
 - a. No comments as text already agreed upon.
- Agroecology
 - a. Section 66, we have issues with several of the bullet points. In the meeting, Switzerland and France indicated that the bullet points were copy-pasted from the HLPE Critical and Emerging Issues note. We reviewed this document and found these three bullet points¹:
- *“To what extent can agroecological innovations improve resource efficiency, strengthen resilience, secure social equity/responsibility and*

¹ http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/hlpe/hlpe_documents/Critical-Emerging-Issues-2016/HLPE_Note-to-CFS_Critical-and-Emerging-Issues-2nd-Edition_27-April-2017_.pdf

*create decent jobs, in particular for youth, in agriculture and food systems, at different scales, in a range of agroclimatic zones and contexts? **What are the controversies and uncertainties in the science and practice of agroecology?***

- *What kinds of markets and regulations are required to support agroecological farming, remunerate farmers and strengthen local, regional, and national economies? How do trade rules, intellectual property rights on seeds and livestock, as well as food and safety regulations impact on agroecological pathways to food and nutrition security?*
- *How to better integrate different knowledge systems in participatory processes to tailor agroecological innovations to unique and highly diverse local situations? What challenges does this participatory research create for national and international research and extension systems? What are the enabling policies, organizational changes, institutional arrangements and new professional practices required to scale up and promote agroecological solutions for sustainable agriculture and food systems?"*
 - a. You will note that these bullet points are very different from the ones that are in the Agro-ecology section of MYPOW.
 - b. In this context, we would to reiterate our request to delete the reference to "price levels and fluctuations", as this point is encompassed in the bullet point on markets.
 - c. On "controversies", we are fine with the agreed upon new language proposed by the USA that would read "Possible barriers to the adoption of certain practices and ways to address them; including controversies and uncertainties in the science and practices and risks and challenges associated to the development of these approaches;"
 - d. We support the change of language proposed by Argentina from "ecological footprint" to "environmental impacts" or "negative environmental impacts"
 - e. The budget for this workstream would need to take in consideration a potential lengthy and complex negotiation process so secretariat and meeting times should be budgeted accordingly.
 - f. As you know, we are concerned with this workstream as we deem that the CFS should not provide recommendations on a single farming system.

Budget

- In general, we feel that the budget did not take in due consideration the likely long negotiation process for several workstreams (including agro-ecology).
- We request that the language on page 1 be modified: “ HLPE, CSM and PSM components which need to be supported financially as a deficit in any component threatens the effective functioning of CFS.” **We request the deletion of the mention of the PSM. The PSM is fully self-funded and should not be considered a “deficit” for the CFS.** In fact, this characteristic is duly noted on the last page of the budget.
- The Secretariat time has been undervalued.
- We wonder what will be the consequences of the possible postponement of the forestry negotiations on the budget for next biennium.

Decision Box

- In general, we feel that the decision box should be making a reference to the evaluation process. The absence of this reference seems to imply a disconnect.
- We do not support point G) on the organization of multistakeholder dialogues (as mentioned above) under MYPOW.

Workstream prioritization

We believe that workstreams, meetings and events should be reduced in general. We believe the following workstreams are of most importance. They are organized by order of importance:

- 1. Nutrition**
- 2. SDGs**
- 3. Evaluation**
- 4. Youth**
- 5. Urbanization**