

## **WFO written comments to the Co-Facilitators' proposal and recommendations 1, 2 and 10**

The World Farmers' Organisation would like to thank the Co-facilitators for the excellent work dispensed so far in preparing this document.

In general, WFO reiterates its support for this zero-draft as it is a good basis to further discuss and it includes several points that WFO has been supporting during all the meetings on the evaluation process. We refer in particular to the following elements:

- The strategic objectives and expected outcomes that will set the 4 years MYPoW. We are in favour of having a 4 years MYPoW in order to guarantee continuity in the implementation of the planned activities, as well as their feasibility in the long-term;
- CFS to be better focus on the reality on the ground. This should be reflected in the CFS agenda as well as in the content, format and length of its products (sometimes the documents could be shortened for the sake of readability). Furthermore, it is fundamental that the planning phase of the CFS priorities is made according to the budget and resource availability and that activities begin only once resources are available;
- WFO agrees on the fact that the plenary should be more vibrant and provide a more inclusive and effective platform for multi-stakeholder dialogue on FSN. We support the idea of organizing round tables and interactive panels with more participation from stakeholders like farmers of all kind and size (as food producers) who could bring their own concrete experiences from the ground and also give their opinion on how they use the CFS products, what they know about them. This could help the plenary to be more practical, evidence-based and could be of great help to the Country Members being the CFS an intergovernmental platform to understand how to work;
- WFO agrees on the need to enhance awareness and dissemination of CFS and its products at all levels. As underlined in the Evaluation Report last year, the CFS is quite unknown outside Rome both at international and at country level.

Please find below WFO specific comments on the proposal as well as on the recommendations:

- Co-facilitators' proposal, introduction 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph: we suggest to add a specific mention to UN decade of Action on Nutrition as well as on the UN decade on Family Farming 2019-2028 recently adopted by the UN GA;
- Direction, par 9: the first part of the paragraph should be clearer, maybe the first sentence is too long and should be reformulated;
- Demand-driven, par 16: we agree on using the term "beneficiaries" as written in the document. In fact, we think that the composition of the Advisory Group should be set according to the needs, nature and work of the CFS, using an open and inclusive approach that could allow the participation of other stakeholders whose expertise might be relevant for the topics under discussion. To a certain extent, the Advisory Group should reflect the reality on the ground and beyond the Member States, thus reflecting the needs of the other stakeholders and beneficiaries of the CFS policy products and recommendations that should guide the CFS activities;
- Ownership, par 28: as already stated, WFO believes that the Advisory Group should work independently from the Bureau, although in consideration of the priorities set by the Bureau

itself. Furthermore, the Advisory Group should be able to establish internal consultations aimed at providing a strategic response to the Bureau. Therefore, taking into account the Bureau needs, the AG should have its own agenda of meetings and discussion items;

- Uptake par 34: as already said during the meeting, we think that this the main missing part of this document (role of the Advisory Group and its relationship with the Bureau), it should include a response to recommendation 4;

Regarding the recommendations, we have some specific comments on recommendations n. 10:

- WFO has always stressed the importance of monitoring and the need to mainstream it in all the CFS workstreams. Therefore, we support the idea of shifting from a CFS framework for monitoring to a framework for “promoting accountability and best practices” that includes monitoring -related activities in the context of the 2030 Agenda. However, when it comes to the CFS activities as described in the table, we think there are some missing elements. The activities should be undertaken within a specific timeframe, in the occasion of or to follow-up on specific events (i.e. HLPFs) and this should be reflected in the document. Furthermore, we certainly agree on the need to be more practical and cost-effective. In general, we would suggest a stronger link with the reality on the ground that could be reflected in the organisation of regional events with the engagement of all relevant stakeholders in order to foster multi-stakeholder and inclusive dialogue that could be then reported to a Global Thematic Event maybe every 4 years (or even 2 according to the budget). In any case, Global thematic Events are supposed to raise awareness on the work of the Committee and experts as well as the beneficiaries of CFS products from the ground should be invited to participate and share their experience together with the Country Representatives.