

## **UK statement on Item 5 (Strengthening the Impact of CFS Policy Products)**

Thank you, Chair.

For the UK, Items 5 and 6 are closely connected and so with your permission, we make this statement to cover both items.

We have seen throughout the UN80 and FAO Reform processes, consistent calls – including from the UK – for a modernised and prioritised UN. One that champions collaboration and localisation to deliver clear impact and value for money.

We must bring this reform mindset to CFS.

We must be bold in rethinking our collective vision for CFS' role in the international architecture, and what we want CFS to achieve. The UK wants to work actively with Members to consider what this means as we look ahead, including to 2030 and beyond.

CFS has an important and distinctive role to play as an inclusive forum that brings together evidence, experience and diverse perspectives.

We agree with others who have referred to policy product uptake as a collective responsibility. We also echo calls for greater emphasis on innovative monitoring and evaluation.

Equally, we also agree with those who have praised the convening potential of the CFS – notably with regards to the Global Alliance Against Hunger and Poverty and the Global Network Against Food Crises.

However, we must be even more ambitious and think honestly about how we work.

In that regard, we do not believe current prioritization of CFS resources is right. Considerable time is spent negotiating new policy products, rather than considering where CFS can add most value and how existing products can achieve greater impact.

This would likely mean spending less energy on annual policy convergence processes.

As we said yesterday, too often, the negotiations become overly politicised, extend far beyond CFS's mandate and move away from issues where CFS is best placed to offer practical guidance. This risks diluting established norms. Negotiations also place disproportionate demands on stakeholders' time and resources, contributing to policy convergence fatigue. We do not believe that they help safeguard the core principle of multistakeholderism – in fact, they weaken it. And similarly, we do not believe that the

current way of working strengthens the science-policy interface – the HLPE and its reports should be protected, but the convergence processes currently fail to do this.

Before launching further policy convergence processes, CFS should map the proposed work plan against existing frameworks, policy products, reports and evidence within the broader international food and agriculture architecture.

This will help to identify genuine gaps, avoid duplication and ensure that any new products have a clear purpose and practical value.

The UK wants CFS to become a stronger forum for the RBAs to work with the wider food security architecture, coordinating around key, strategic policy questions to strengthen the impact and visibility of CFS products and disseminate them systematically through dialogue at national and sub-national levels. This would help to build a more coherent, coordinated multilateral food security architecture in which institutions work according to their respective mandates and comparative advantages.

Looking beyond 2030, CFS could provide a useful forum for shaping how food security, agriculture and nutrition are reflected in the framework that succeeds the SDGs. But it should do that through focusing on multistakeholder dialogue at sub-national, national and regional levels, rather than focusing on protracted, circular discussions in Rome.

If this era of reform for impact has taught us anything, it is that change is no longer optional. With 2030 approaching, we have a unique opportunity to embrace new ideas and ensure that CFS is more focused and effective, ensuring that it continues to be the foremost inclusive platform for dialogue on food security and nutrition.