

CSIPM COMMENTS ON THE ZERO DRAFT OF THE 2024-2027 MYPoW

Interventions for the 17 May 2023 OEWG

1. General remarks

The CSIPM appreciates the efforts that the Chair is devoting to the task of developing the CFS MYPoW 2024-2027. However, we feel it is necessary to reiterate some of the remarks regarding the methodology and the proposed structuring that we and others made during the 20 April AG/B and Bureau meetings and which we stated in the written comments we submitted on 24 April.

While we appreciate the originality of the thematic areas presented by the Chair, we believe that in order to be able to adopt a broadly owned MYPoW at CFS 51, it is essential to apply a clear and simple methodology with which CFS Members and participants are familiar. The approach to structuring the MYPoW around three Strategic Objectives was adopted by CFS 45 in 2018 following considerable, deep discussion. It is possible that this approach could be updated and improved, but to do so would require inclusive debate and would profit from approval by the Plenary.

The thematic areas introduced in the current Zero Draft have not been subject to such deliberation. In this sense, they are not so helpful for prioritization and merging. Categorizing proposals under these four themes tends to fragment the mission of the CFS rather than reinforcing its holistic nature and its ability to intervene in a forceful and transformative way with priority attention to the rights of those most affected. Although we appreciate some of the merging proposals in the Zero Draft, others tend to group together, in a kind of 'box', proposals that are not necessarily in harmony with one another. Additionally, the broad scope of some proposals could be limited by identifying them with just one theme. Supporting family farming, for example, is not just about enhancing equity and inclusiveness; it equally concerns fostering resilience and nurturing the planet. Generally speaking, the thematic areas do not adequately reflect the amount of support each proposal has received, or whether or not the topic is appropriate for policy convergence. According to our calculations 11 of the 19 'sub-themes' target Strategic Objective 2 (often in addition to another SO). Yet there is space in the 2024-2027 MYPoW for not more than 3 policy convergence processes in addition to those already foreseen on inequalities and urban and peri-urban food systems. How are we going to get there?

We would like to propose, as suggested in the 20 April Outcomes, that the thematic areas be adopted as a basis for building the MYPoW narrative, while the Strategic Objectives be retained as the principle for its structuring. In the end, the 2024-2027 MYPoW will need to look like the 'Overview Table' that appears at the very end of the daunting 35 pages of the Zero Draft. In order to stimulate a move in that direction we are presenting our proposals for the MYPoW in tabular form in the following section 2, incorporating Zero Draft merging suggestions that we have found useful. In section 3 we present comments on some of the other Zero Draft proposals that we have not included in 'our' MYPoW. In section 4 we offer a few suggestions regarding next steps forward.

2. CSIPM Proposal for the 2024-2027 MYPoW

Thematic areas				Strategic objectives	2024	2025	2026	2027
Advance the progressive realization of the right to adequate food and the achievement of SDG 2, through food systems policies and programmes that:				1 – PLATFORM: Leverage the convening power as the foremost inclusive international and intergovernmental platform to discuss the FSN situation and coordinate collective action at all levels	Merged proposal 2B) + 4B) on “Coordinated policy response to food crises and multilevel governance for a coherent, sustainable and inclusive food system transformation.”, including discussions on 1B) on “Investing in Family Farming to strengthen Sustainable Food Systems and to achieve Food Security and Nutrition” and other pertinent topics.			
Enhance equity and inclusiveness	Foster resilience to shocks and stresses	Nurture and protect the planet	Strengthen collaborative action and financing for food security and nutrition		4G) “Impact of unilateral coercive measures and other financial and trade restrictions on global food security, with special emphasis on SDGs 1,2,3 and 17 of Agenda 2030”			
					2 – POLICY: Develop voluntary global policy guidance for policy convergence and coherence to achieve food security and improve nutrition and promote the progressive realization of the right to adequate food	Policy workstream on Reducing Inequalities for FSN	Policy workstream on Strengthening urban and peri-urban food systems	1C) The role and rights of [agri] food systems workers
				HLPE report on Strengthening urban and peri-urban food systems	HLPE report on merged proposal 1C) The role and rights of [agri] food systems workers	HLPE report on 1D on “Preserving, strengthening and promoting Indigenous Peoples’ food and knowledge systems”	HLPE report on merged proposal 3B + 3C on biodiversity, climate policies and the importance of food sovereignty (work in progress)	2028 HLPE Report topic
				3 – UPTAKE: Foster the uptake, follow-up and review, and sharing of experience and best practices on the use and application of CFS products at all levels	4A) In-depth debate on enhanced efforts to increase global awareness and use of CFS Policy Products			
				Proposal #7 Right to Food – Action towards 2030	Follow-up and uptake on proposal #3 on “Food Security Crisis – Conflicts and the fragility of food systems (High Level Expert Forum and Global Thematic Event)			
							HLPE Note on CEEI	MYPoW 2028-2031 Preparation

Strategic Objective 1: Platform

We suggest that the proposal '*Coordinated policy response to food crises and multilevel governance for a coherent, sustainable and inclusive food system transformation*' be implemented across the entire MYPoW period. This proposal includes two of the sub-themes presented in the Zero Draft: 2B and 4B, thus incorporating the important dimension of multi-level territorial governance. It would also provide space for discussions on 1B (Investing in family farming to strengthen sustainable food systems to achieve FSN) and other pertinent topics that are not selected for policy convergence. It would permit the CFS to effectively exercise its Strategic Objective 1 and perform its coordination and support roles at all levels as set out in the Reform Document. It would provide the CFS with the on-going capacity --sorely lacking in these past few years as noted in the 20 April Outcome document-- to react in a flexible and transformative way to emerging food crises and their structural causes. It would help the CFS to move beyond discussion to supporting implementation of coherent packages of short and long-term policies. The collation by the HLPE of existing relevant CFS policy outcomes within a reasoned human rights-based framework would provide an excellent basis for strengthening synergies between SO1 and SO3.

Under the Platform function, as CSIPM we also support 4G on Impact of unilateral coercive measures and other financial, trade and other restrictions on global food security, with special emphasis on SDGs 1,2,3,10 and 17 of the 2030 agenda. We suggest that this discussion is also part of the process on the follow-up and uptake of the CFS outcomes, particularly the Framework for action for protracted crises which already refers to the need to address unilateral coercive measures. These are urgent matters to be addressed in order to respond and prevent food crises.

Strategic Objective 2: Policy

The CSIPM suggests prioritizing the following three topics under SO 2:

The role and rights of food systems workers

The CSIPM feels that the rights of workers in agriculture and food systems should be a top priority for the CFS. We agree with the proposal 1C in the Zero Draft, as it has been drafted, but the title should adopt the broader term 'food system workers' and the intent to protect and fulfill workers' rights should remain at the heart of the merge. The HLPE report for this policy workstream should focus on the impact of COVID-19 on food system workers, inequalities and discrimination they face, and the ways CFS should build upon existing frameworks and policy action for workers' rights and social protection, such as ILO Conventions, UNDRIP, and UNDROP. These human rights instruments should be the basis for any policy recommendations coming from the CFS. The CFS should engage in the development of a document on workers' rights only if we start from a common agreement that no step backwards is taken and commit to not undermining the existing labour standards and labour rights which trade unions have gained during over 100 years of struggle.

Biodiversity, climate policies and the importance of food sovereignty

The CSIPM proposal #18 on Protecting and restoring biodiversity to mitigate and reverse climate change and for the progressive realization of food sovereignty has been recognized as a priority for the next MYPoW among our constituencies.

This proposal from the CSIPM has some commonalities with proposals #22 and #32, and can also dialogue with proposal #5 on family farming for sustainable food systems. Indeed, biodiversity loss in crops and animal species is leading to soil fertility loss, desertification, climate disasters, pandemics, and food insecurity. There is an urgent need for a policy workstream in the CFS agenda to address the interconnection between agriculture and climate and shift to local and diversified food systems to realize food sovereignty. The expected results are policy recommendations and guidelines that promote the restoration of biodiversity through sustainable production and raise awareness among policymakers and the public.

The workstream that we are proposing would focus on increasing biodiversity in food systems and supporting small-scale agroecological food producers who work to restore and respect ecosystems, prevent biodiversity loss, and promote **food sovereignty**.

Preserving, strengthening and promoting Indigenous Peoples' food and knowledge systems and traditional practices for sustainable food systems.

We agree with the importance of having a CFS process on the importance and critical role of Indigenous Peoples. As CSIPM, counting with the direct participation of the Indigenous Peoples' constituency, we are interested in the Zero Draft's proposal on this matter and we will discuss with the proponents so that this proposal will benefit from the support from the CSIPM and will include the participation of the Indigenous Peoples constituency in the CFS. Moreover, we would highlight the importance of this proposal being supported by the evidence of the Indigenous Peoples themselves, from both the CSIPM and the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, and from the HLPE. Any process on Indigenous Peoples' knowledge and practices should be guided by the essential principles on Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC), as well as the right of Indigenous Peoples to fully participate in decision-making, both recognized by UNDRIP and the CFS itself. Chair, we would very much welcome facilitation by you and the Secretariat in arriving at a common proposal by Indigenous Peoples' themselves, both from the CSIPM and the UNPFII.

Strategic Objective 3: Uptake

The CSIPM stresses the intimate interaction among all three strategic objectives of the CFS, in particular between SO 1 and SO 3 which have both received less attention in past years than SO 2. The CSIPM proposes prioritizing the following activities under SO 3 of the coming MYPoW:

Enhanced efforts to increase global awareness and use of CFS policy products (4A)

The CSIPM has supported this proposal from the outset, along with many MSs, and we feel that it should be given space as an extremely important stand-alone activity under SO 3.

Right to Food – Action toward 2030. (1A)

This is another very important and broadly supported proposal, which merits space under SO 3.

Conflicts and the fragility of food systems. (2C)

We support the merging of proposals # 3 and 12, as suggested in the Zero Draft, but only if they are placed under the “Uptake” function and do not lead to a new negotiated outcome. The CFS has already an important document on protracted crises, and now is the time to understand how to

strengthen its implementation. The CSIPM has an extensive monitoring report on this policy outcome, which could be an essential resource for the proposed uptake activities under proposal # 3. In particular, we support the proposed activities and timeline put forward in proposal # 3, including a global thematic event focusing on the implementation of the Framework for Action for food security and nutrition in protracted crises.

3. Additional Comments on proposals in the Zero Draft

4C) Principles for Responsible Investment in Sustainable Agriculture and Food Systems 2.0, updating the CFS-RAI to align with the 2030 agenda.

The CSIPM was not happy with the outcome of the original RAI negotiations, and this proposal goes even further in the direction of giving priority to external investors and financiers over the concerns of the small-scale producers who are the principle investors in food production.

4D) Collaborative governance for more efficient, resilient and inclusive agri-food systems

Regarding this proposal, the CSIPM emphasizes the vital role of the CFS and its unique position in global food governance, as reflected in its vision and strategic objectives centered around inclusive policy "coordination." We would put the emphasis on reinforcing the engagement of the RBAs in the CFS we have, rather than re-imagining it by introducing terminology of "collaborative governance". We invite the RBAs to support the merged proposal on "Coordinated policy response to food crises and multilevel governance for a coherent, sustainable, and inclusive food system transformation," as it is crucial for the progress that we seek in the CFS, and to strengthen their support for the implementation of CFS policy outcomes.

4E) Agriculture, Food Systems and Food Security Financing Information System - AFSIS

The concern for monitoring the evolving situation that the proposal 4E expresses would be more appropriate – in the CFS context – if it were focused not on financial resources but rather on the range of structural issues and the voices of those most affected, as in our proposal for SO 1 on strengthening the coordination function of the CFS.

4G) Regarding merger proposal on the Impact of unilateral coercive measures and other financial and trade restrictions on global food security, we want to raise the importance of this as a voice from the ground. We at CSIPM strongly support this proposal in the light of the rapid expansion of the use of these measures all around the world and their proven grave effects of food security. These measures in all their forms can and have caused famine. They have also driven self-sufficient countries to experience unprecedented levels of poverty and hunger. The world is full of current examples and examples in recent history. We also all saw what this issue caused during the CFS50 last October, thus, we at CSIPM see that this discussion needs to be open seriously, it should be given adequate time in terms of years, and needs to start taking place soon, because millions of people around the world are currently suffering greatly and are food-insecure because of this.

4. Next steps

The CSIPM strongly proposes that Draft One of the MYPoW be structured according to the Strategic Objectives. Under each SO it should indicate the options among which prioritization is necessary and the degree of support that the different options have received. Consideration could be given to dropping, from Draft One, proposals that have received extremely limited support thus far.

We believe that it is indispensable to plan additional occasions for collective deliberation on the draft in order to build broad ownership. To this end, and to avoid scheduling additional meetings, we propose that the AG/B meetings planned for 19 June and 27 July be opened to all CFS MSs and participants.