

## **CFS MYPoW 2024 - 2027**

### **Summary of IFAD's comments**

**Overall comment:** there are many different issues included in the proposed areas of focus for the 2024-2027 MYPoW. It may be worth for the AG/B members to find a way to prioritize the issues and narrow down the scope of work.

#### **Area 1: Enhance equity and inclusiveness**

- Equity should also highlight the plight of - the rural poor, women, PWDs and other vulnerable groups
- No reference to Youth in this section either
- As custodians of nature, it is important to also consider the role that agrifood producers and IPs also play in biodiversity conservation, not just food production system. This can be reflected in this area of work. For instance:
- As part of enhancing inclusiveness and equity, the global biodiversity framework includes a goal that the benefits from using genetic resources is shared equitably, including among IPs and local communities. This aspect could feature under this area of work as genetic diversity plays a key role in FSN.
- There is also a key emphasis on ensuring that IPs and local communities can reap the benefits from the food systems transition, not just playing a role in it/sharing knowledge. For instance, as transitioning to more sustainable practices may temporarily reduce yields, it is important to ensure producers can still receive compensation for the positive externalities on biodiversity.
- On proposed topic c): need to ensure that existing ILO expertise is included here

#### **Area 2: Foster resilience to shocks and stresses**

- Overall comment:
  - o Overall, there are way too many workstreams, there is scope for further mainstreaming and reducing. Areas 2 and 3 could be merged so as to have Area 1 with a social entry point, Area 2 with environment and resilience entry point, and Area 3 on Partnership, finance, measurement, policy dialogue.
  - o The original proposals, if they need to be maintained, can be better shared across areas (i.e. Area 1 could integrate original proposal #11; Area 4 could integrate proposals#2, # 31...; etc)
- On proposed topic b): This could be merged with a) with respect to responding to food security crisis caused by conflict and fragility. Some elements would then be covered by c) when it comes to building resilience ex ante, to enable food systems to continue functioning in a sustainable manner when conflict arises or if fragility sets in down the line.
- On proposed topic c):
  - o better to use the term "food systems" and not "supply chains"
  - o Suggests that this also directly includes the issue of biodiversity restoration/conservation, as building food systems' resilience to shocks rely on the health and genetic biodiversity of ecosystems/species, and maintaining this health and biodiversity requires changes along the whole system (production, transformation, distribution, etc )
  - o CFS previous recommendations on agroecology would be relevant here, so perhaps the topic should focus on how to enable them/scale them up

### **Area 3: Nurture and protect the planet**

- On proposed topic f):
  - o this should likely go beyond protecting and also include restoring and enhancing BD.
  - o Climate would not be "protected". Need to clarify whether this is about FSN only and climate resilience to achieve FSN through BD/ecosystems protection; or if this is about protecting BD to achieve climate mitigation, or both.
  - o There is also a risk that the solutions proposed only focus on nature based solutions for climate mitigation or adaptation, even-though restoring/protecting ecosystems and biodiversity can yield other benefits than climate-related benefits. Scope would need to be carefully specified to ensure proposals are not focused on climate benefits but encompass all biodiversity/ecosystems benefits on FSN
- On proposed topic g): Albeit focusing on fisheries, it will be very important to adopt a landscape approach in answering this question. Recommend this is made explicit - for instance "landscape solutions for sustainable fisheries and aquaculture..."

### **Area 4: Strengthen collaborative action and financing for food security and nutrition**

- Overall comment on title of the area: Suggest to rename "collaborative action, measurements and financing etc..."
- On proposed topic b):
  - o The SDG agenda is cross-cutting and should apply to all work areas
  - o We need to be more explicit on what we mean by engagement in the context of the SDGs- Does this include country level action level or CFS being part of a global team on SDGs? Anything specific that the CFS should contribute to the SDG agenda based on its comparative advantage?
  - o This is related to Area 2 on resilient food systems. Consider moving it under area 2. Also, it focuses on governance and does not address the issue of financing and action to achieve resilient and inclusive agrifood systems. Therefore, best to move it out of Area 4.
- On proposed topic d): Even though "protecting biodiversity" is considered a separate area; innovative finance for nature can play a key role in restoring BD and, as a result, improving food security and nutrition. There is also a large area of work to remove harmful agricultural subsidies, revise seed policies etc, benefiting both biodiversity and FSN. Hence, recommend that BD is integrated in the scope of these questions too, not only Area 3
- On proposed topic e): Apart from just an in-depth debate, it would be useful to develop a strategy and/or action plan that can move stakeholders toward action and not just deliberation.
- On proposed topic f):
  - o It is not clear what this would entail. In general, there are various analyses and studies that show the impacts of unilateral measures and other financial and trade restrictions. Perhaps what should be proposed is a set of policy recommendations/guidelines which could be linked to g) below if an effort is to be made to come up with binding global regulatory framework for food systems.
  - o Also note, some of this would be work being done by the WTO and there would be several contentious issues, which already exist.

- This also raises the question on whether CFS is best placed to address both f) and g)?

**Responses to guiding questions:**

**Guiding question 2:** What are the topics where CFS is better positioned to work on, based on its comparative advantages?

- Value in bringing issues on social inclusion to ag ministries as often disconnect with labour issues

**Guiding question 5:** Which measures can be undertaken to strengthen linkages between CFS and global initiatives related to food security and nutrition?

- Link with ILO on rights of workers topics. ILO are forming guidelines on decent work for Agri Food Systems Workers in May 2023. To avoid any overlap/confusion
- It is not clear how the CFS interfaces with the Coalitions stemmed from the FSS. Many of them work across similar areas. Coordination with respect to roles and activities could be sought