

**First Draft of the CFS Multi-Year Programme of Work 2024-2027**  
**Written Comments by the CSIPM**  
**26 June 2023**

## **General Comments**

The CSIPM wants to thank the Chair and the Secretariat for all their efforts in advancing the process for the next MYPoW for the period 2024-2027. Our written inputs to Draft 1 are based on the interventions made during the Bureau and Advisory Group meeting on June 19, 2023.

The CSIPM is pleased to see that the organizing principle of this document follows the different strategic objectives of the CFS. The focus areas that are presented on page 4 of the draft are useful to understand the aspects that the next MYPoW will tackle. The focus areas should, nevertheless, avoid ‘fragmenting’ the next MYPoW, since many of the proposals that are situated within one or another of the different areas are actually cross-cutting. A common thread should connect the different proposals across the MYPoW calendar. This is why we suggest that the calendar be moved upwards in the Draft, as an introductory table.

We agree with the Bureau Member States who express the view that the next MYPoW should not be overcharged. This is why the prioritization exercise must continue, taking into consideration the support that the different proposals have received, it would be useful for the next steps to make the different levels of support visible. As CSIPM, we see space for merging certain proposals in order to advance with the “lightening” of the next MYPoW proposal. This merging needs to be guided by the CFS mandate, anchored in the Right to Food, its policy coordination potential and the opportunity offered by its unique inclusive space.

We see that several of the activities that are being proposed would take place in other platforms rather than within the CFS itself. We appreciate the effort to make the CFS visible “outside its walls” and we would suggest that the visibility and strengthening of the CFS would be more effective if the other spaces came to Rome rather than vice-versa. Inviting other UN fora or platforms to the CFS would be a more illustrative way to demonstrate how the different voices and levels and the strong convening power make the CFS a unique example within the UN system.

Finally, we urge the CFS Chair and Secretariat to consider having an additional “open” moment to allow a broader engagement of Member States, as in the last OEWG meeting on May 17 which proved to be rich in discussions. This could be done by planning a dedicated space for discussion of the draft MYPoW before the 27 July meeting takes place, although we realize that the schedule for July is quite charged, or at the least opening up the 27 July meeting to all interested CFS MSs and participants. This would be more representative of the Plenary participation and would build broader ownership for the next MYPoW.

## **Section 1.1 Right to Food Action: Action towards 2030**

As pointed out by the [HLPE Report on “Building a Global Narrative towards 2030”](#) there is an urgent need to prioritize the Right to Food as a guiding principle for a food systems framework that strengthens, widens and consolidates the understanding of food security and nutrition. In fact, the adoption of the Voluntary Guidelines to Support the Progressive Realization of the Right to Adequate Food has been an encouragement to put more into practice the realization of this right, and progress has been made in many cases. However, this report also clearly indicates that much work remains to be done to achieve the full realization of the right.

The Right to Food (RtF) should be therefore the guiding principle for the next MYPoW. It should be recognized and uplifted through the Uptake function and the 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary commemoration of the Voluntary Guidelines on the RtF adopted in 2024 and should then be integrally incorporated in the different

workstreams, including the ones for the platform function on coordinating policy responses to food crises and for the policy convergence function on biodiversity and climate change. We see therefore useful the merger of this workstream (1.1) with the 3.2.1 one as an important kick-starter of the next MYPoW. Having a High-Level Event within the CFS in Rome would effectively draw attention to the legitimate body to ensure coordination and accountability for the Right to Food.

#### **Section 1.4 Strengthening responsible investment and financing for food security and nutrition**

As CSIPM, we do not support this proposal as it is misleading and narrow in scope. Firstly, this proposal might undermine the rest of the proposals that are now included under the platform function which highlight the real impacts of a “policies first” framework rather than “finance first”, which this proposal points to. The policies first approach makes it possible to start the discussion from the needs and concerns of small-scale producers and other constituencies as negotiated with governments, rather from than the interests of investors. Moreover, this workstream as proposed would avoid discussing about important issues related to financial governance such as market regulation, taxation, alleviation, or cancellation of debt for adequate national fiscal space, etc.

#### **Section 1.5 on Coordinating policy responses to emerging food crises**

We are very pleased to see that the proposal which we and others have been championing for some time has definitely been incorporated in the MYPoW. This is one of the proposals for the coming MYPoW which has garnered considerable support.

However, we have some concerns with the way in which this proposal has ‘transited’ into the First Draft. In synthesis, the scope has been restricted to detecting and addressing ‘crises’, whereas a fundamental dimension of this proposal is to help prevent future crises and to promote food system transformation. There is no reference to the kind of structural issues we have proposed to debate. The proposed role of the HLPE has also dropped out. The merger we had suggested with ‘Localizing SDG2’ is not mentioned, nor is the link that we posited with the ‘increased use of CFS policy outcomes’ proposal. We appreciate the Secretariat’s concern to synthesize the text presented in Draft 1. However, as we move to the final Draft we suggest reintegrating elements of the proposal that have been deleted or altered.

##### **1. Reintegration of missing elements:**

**Title:** add ‘for a coherent, sustainable and inclusive food system transformation’ as per the ‘merged proposal’ that we presented to the 20 April dedicated MYPoW session.

**Rationale:** re-integrate into the text some dimensions from our ‘merged proposal’ that have been deleted:

- The fact that international initiatives are fragmented, often neglect voices of the most affected people and most affected countries, propose solutions that are often incoherent with long-term transformation;
- The need to reduce dependency on food imports, to address the sovereign debt problem exacerbated by inflation, inadequate trade regimes, and conflicts. Need to support domestic food production by small-scale producers and territorial markets, promoting neglected crops and consumption of domestic foods. The key role of local/regional governments and reterritorialization of food systems.
- The importance of a multi-level governance approach.
- The need for policy coordination to take place within a human right, people-centered framework, as in the CFS.

**Objectives and expected outcome:** re-integrate key elements from our proposal:

- Enhance policy coordination at the different levels and in the different forms described in our ‘merged proposal’.
- Improve implementation of existing CFS policy outcomes and coherent packages of short and long-term policy proposals by:
  - ✓ working towards the development of a general policy framework.
  - ✓ developing implementation toolboxes and communication instruments.
  - ✓ highlighting global issues that restrict the policy and fiscal space of national governments.
- Function as an on-going platform in which to keep track of the evolving food security situation and react accordingly.

**Potential activities:**

- **Meetings.** Return to quarterly meetings (not biannual). This is needed to keep continuous track of the evolving situation and progressively discuss major issues that emerge. The whole idea is to identify and address emerging potential problems before they become full-fledged global food crises (in contrast with the last paragraph of the Draft 1 proposal). The CFS needs to function as an on-going platform throughout the four years of the MYPoW, not a series of discontinuous events.
- **HLPE.** Our proposal foresees an important role for the HLPE. Reference to the HLPE has disappeared in Draft 1. We suggest a possible ‘softer’ way of involving the HLPE by linking our proposal to an HLPE report on ‘Building resilient food systems’ to be proposed for 2028 (see Overview table on pg. 28). The HLPE would accompany the activities of our proposal as a preparation for this report, which would build on the consolidated outcome of four years of work in the Platform mode. It could, for example, prepare background notes on issues to be discussed in the meetings.
- **Toolbox and communications instruments.** This has also disappeared in the Draft 1 but was present in the Zero Draft. It is important to reincorporate it in order to enhance the capacity of MSs and other actors at all levels to access, make use, apply, implement the proposals emerging from the platform’s work and existing CFS policy outcomes. A dedicated page of the CFS website would be an excellent tool to provide visibility to the Committee and to support the uptake of CFS policy outcomes.

**2. Addressing the ‘question in the box’**

- The proposed rhythm of quarterly meetings would, in itself, constitute a procedure to address major shocks, but also to identify emerging problems before they become major shocks.
- We suggest that a Technical Task Team be established to work with the secretariat in carrying forward the activities of this programme. The presence of focal points from the RBAs and the mechanisms would help to ensure that information is received in a timely fashion and fed into the quarterly meetings.

**3. Relation to ‘Collaborative governance for more effective, resilient and inclusive food systems’ and overall coherence of the Platform function.**

The ‘collaborative governance’ proposal also refers to multi-sector, multi-actor and multi-level policy coordination, but contains less detailed objectives, activities and outcome. The ‘coordinating policy responses’ proposal already encompasses the elements suggested by the ‘collaborative governance’ one. It is preferable to avoid fragmentation of the MYPoW and to have a single platform programme running throughout the four years, with the multiple objectives outlined above, feeding in to an HLPE report in 2018 on ‘Building resilient food systems’ which would provide the basis for a policy outcome to be negotiated in the following MYPoW. Strong support by the RBAs for the platform and uptake functions of the CFS is key and would be greatly appreciated.

**Section on the Role and Rights of agrifood systems workers**

Taking into consideration the discussions held at the last Bureau and Advisory Group meeting on June 19, we agree with the proposal to have this workstream under the platform function and not to expect a policy convergence process. We agree with the fact that the CFS has a crucial role to play in protecting the role and rights of food systems workers, and it should follow the lead of the work done by ILO. In fact, the recently adopted ILO guidelines strongly recognize workers' rights as trade unions have voiced them for 100 years.

In this sense, we agree that the CFS could provide a platform for dissemination and awareness raising on the ILO Guidelines and reflecting on how to strengthen already adopted CFS outcomes with the ILO Guidelines. Therefore, among the potential activities, we would only support the last two bullet points:

- High-level meeting co-convened with ILO on the ILO Policy Guidelines (preferably within the CFS in Rome)
- Conclusions of CFS Plenary on the issue, enhancing the uptake and implementation of ILO Policy Guidelines

We would refrain from putting a focus on best practices in workplaces, since there is still substantial space for improvement. Instead, we would urge to listen to the experiences of agriculture and food systems workers and their demands to recognize the role and guarantee the rights of workers in food systems.

### **Section on the impact of unilateral coercive measures and other financial and trade restrictions on global food security, with special emphasis on SDGs 1, 2, 3, 10 and 17**

As CSIPM, we reaffirm our support for this proposal. The MYPoW will likely recognize as a priority the need on advancing the uptake of the CFS Framework for Action for Food Security and Nutrition in Protracted Crisis (MYPoW First Draft, p. 23). The FFA recognizes the need to address the impact of unilateral measures on food security and nutrition for most marginalized populations and recommends not to use food as an instrument for political or economic pressure. Within this framework, it would be good to leverage the convening power of the CFS as the foremost inclusive international and intergovernmental platform to discuss FSN issues, to have a discussion on the impact of unilateral coercive measures on access to food, water, electricity, shelter, cooking and heating fuel etc. in particular for the most marginalized populations.

The 2023 FAO and WFP report on Hunger Hotspots in the world, warns that acute food insecurity is likely to deteriorate further in 18 hunger hotspots – comprising a total 22 countries (Afghanistan, Nigeria, Somalia, South Sudan, Yemen, Haiti, Burkina Faso, Mali, Sudan, Pakistan, the Central African Republic, Ethiopia, Kenya, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the Syrian Arab Republic, Myanmar, Lebanon, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Malawi, Guatemala, Honduras. Of these countries, 14 are grappling with forms of unilateral coercive measures - mainly sanctions - with approximately 150 million people in them living in acute food insecurity. The peoples of other countries that have faced or are currently subjected to unilateral coercive measures, mainly sanctions, not listed as hunger hotspots, have also confronted food insecurity since decades with terrible rates of inflation, devastated economies, and the sharp devaluation of their national currencies continuously impacting the livelihoods of many people and hitting the hardest on the most vulnerable populations. Some of these countries are Cuba, Palestine, Venezuela, Iran, Libya, Belarus, and Iraq (Iraq faced a severe famine during the 1990s as a result of sanctions). The UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food has also voiced strong support for this proposal. He recognized the devastating impact that unilateral coercive measures and other financial and trade restrictions have on food security and thus the urgent need to lift them.

Evidence shows the severe impacts on people's food security and for this reason this proposal should be included in the MYPoW, as a discussion with this very specific focus is relevant for the CFS and could contribute to the uptake work on the FFA.

### **Section on Addressing climate change and biodiversity loss to achieve SDG2**

Food producers are the ones who are most directly affected by climate change. They are the ones who see their crop yields decline, their livestock die, and their water supplies become polluted. On the other hand, the diversified production of small-scale food producers is crucial for ensuring biodiversity. Women's knowledge, including Indigenous Women's knowledge, are at the heart of biodiversity protection. These knowledges need to be recognized, preserved and protected for sustainable food systems.

The insights of small-scale food producers are essential for understanding the true impact of climate change and biodiversity loss and for supporting or developing participatory solutions which ensure the small scale food producers' agency in deciding how, when and to produce for preserving biodiversity and traditional varieties, which are the foundation of dietary diversity. Any response to addressing climate change and biodiversity loss should be anchored in the Right to Food, taken into particular consideration what is expressed through the [General Comment 12](#):

*"The right to food shall therefore not be interpreted in a narrow or restrictive sense which equates it with a minimum package of calories, proteins and other specific nutrients."*

*"The notion of sustainability is intrinsically linked to the notion of adequate food or food security, implying food being accessible for both present and future generations. The precise meaning of "adequacy" is to a large extent determined by prevailing social, economic, cultural, climatic, ecological and other conditions, while "sustainability" incorporates the notion of long-term availability and accessibility."*

The agroecological pathway is proven to be the differential one in addressing climate change and biodiversity loss, as recognized by the [FAO's 10 Elements of Agroecology](#) and given its ability to deliver contextualized solutions to local problems anchored in the human rights framework, with particular attention to rights of women, youth and Indigenous Peoples.

The CSIPM therefore strongly supports for a policy convergence process to be included as part of the next MYPoW for biodiversity protection under the Right to Food framework, which is CFS' mandate. The CFS is a unique space for this policy convergence process, as small scale food producers (essential actors for the implementation of any policy on biodiversity protection) will be fully involved in the decision-making process from the outset so as to provide their input and ensure that the policies are workable. The HLPE report for the policy convergence process on biodiversity and climate change should build from the evidence that the food producers can provide in the context of worsening climatic conditions and weather events. The HLPE report on this topic could be finalized in 2027, so as to start the process by the end of the next MYPoW.

## **Section on Building resilient food systems**

See comments for section 1.5 on Coordinating policy responses to emerging food crises. The HLPE would accompany the activities of the platform function on coordinating policy response to the food crises as a preparation for a report on Building resilient food systems to be finalized in 2028, which would build on the consolidated outcome of four years of work in the Platform mode. The HLPE report 2028 on Building resilient food systems would then inform a policy convergence process.

## **Section on preserving, strengthening and promoting Indigenous Peoples' food and knowledge systems**

The CSIPM expresses its support for this workstream and welcomes the revisions made to the proposal incorporating the inputs shared by the CSIPM. However, it is important not only to recognize, preserve and strengthen Indigenous Peoples' food and knowledge systems but also to recognize, protect and strengthen the already existing international legal framework that protects the rights of Indigenous Peoples regarding

land issues, territories, and the collection and use of data. Specifically, the principles of self-determination and Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) should be emphasized throughout all CFS workstreams. Regrettably, attempts to undermine the FPIC principle have been observed in various workstreams. Therefore, one of the objectives of this workstream should be to establish coherence on this matter across all the work of the CFS, ensuring consistency between the intended outcomes of this specific workstream and previous and future CFS products.