

Dear Co-Facilitators and CFS Secretariat,

First let me repeat my congratulations of today's meeting on progress to date on this thorny issue. You asked for written comments following our discussions of yesterday.

First on the core implementation document, and the 'key elements to improve CFS':

Paragraph 7 sub paragraph 3) reads in the draft of yesterday:

- 1) PLANNING – Ensuring the effective prioritization and selection processes of CFS activities that can most directly contribute to a positive impact on food insecure and malnourished people in line with CFS vision, bearing in mind budget implications.

I strongly recommended that the subtitle PLANNING should revert to its previous 'key element' as 'prioritization', or as some suggested at least 'planning and prioritization'.

Secondly that the weak phrase 'bearing in mind budget implications', should be replaced by 'and focusing on defined outputs arising from defined inputs and cost /budget implications'. That same weak phrase also appears in the first sentence under the 'planning' heading on page 4 (between paragraphs 13 and 14), and should be modified accordingly.

The first two sentences of paragraph 14 currently read:

'The new MYPoW preparation process will lead to a more effective prioritization of CFS thematic activities. The selection of activities will be carried out bearing in mind that activities will not start until resources are provided or a clear indication that the resources are in the pipeline'.

better would be:

The new MYPoW preparation process will lead to a more effective prioritization of CFS thematic activities. The selection of new activities to be included is subject to concrete indications of resource availability, and that the corresponding volume of planned activities would be appropriate to CFS staff resources.

Turning to the annex document, I strongly recommend (and I hope; that the Bureau agreed this afternoon) that we need both the core document and this annex. I agree with most points made yesterday on the annex, but focus especially on section D **Proposal for making plenary more vibrant, attractive and substantive (A5.1)**. This was a concern repeatedly emphasised by Member States at CFS 44, also in the perceived trade off in terms of participants' attention to side events vs the plenary sessions. We heard again today at the Bureau/AG discussion about the importance of side -events to emphasise key CFS topics (eg UN GA declaration of a decade of family farming). For this reason I spoke yesterday on D paragraph 3 vi) which currently reads:

i. Side Event “Elevator Pitches”

Space could be allocated in the timetable for the organizers of Side Events to pitch the outcomes of their Side Events to Plenary. This could be scheduled on the last day of the session when the Side Events have been completed with each Side Event being allocated a maximum five minute slot. Themes such as climate

change or sustainable agriculture could be used to cluster the contributions. No extra funding would be required.

As was pointed out, with around 50 very diverse side events last year, we would have to be selective - Maybe 6-8 maximum of the most CFS 45 relevant side events, likely to have heavy participation. Decisions on side events are taken at end July, which gives CFS Secretariat time to sound the likely short list of side event organisers about undertaking such a brief executive summary of their events. This would also have the advantage of dissolving the impression that side events are a parallel or diversionary distractions from the CFS plenary.

I hope that these comments are useful.

regards,

Dr. Rod Cooke

CFS Advisory Group member, representing the CGIAR System Organisation