

Notes from CFS Bureau / Advisory Group meeting, 18th & 19th March

1. Updates

L'Aquila financial commitments

General

- World Bank said that there is a lack of clarity about how much money some govts will be providing, how much will be additional and how they intend to channel the funds
- Canada and US are providing significant additional funds through bilateral and multilateral channels

World Bank Trust Fund

- Updates on the WBTF can be found at www.worldbank.org/ruralag
- <US\$ 1bn committed so far to WB Trust Fund over 2 years, US\$380 in Yr 1
- Spain : €160m over 2 years, €70m in Yr 1 already in Fund
- Canada : Canadian \$230m over 2 years to be rcvd by end March
- USA: US\$ 470 over 2 yrs, US\$67m in Yr 1.
- Discussions underway on selection of government and non-government participants in the Steering Cttee and in the Technical Advisory Group
- There are no clear linkages between the CFS and the governing bodies of the WBTF

MDGs

- David Nabarro made clear that the UNSG does not support an extension to the MDG deadline and believes that everything possible should be done to achieve the current MDG targets

HLTF Comprehensive Framework for Action

- Revised CFA will be submitted to CFS for consideration in late May
- Consultation meeting to be held in Dublin mid May

Civil Society Mechanism for CFS

- Member States made it clear that they hope to hear a diverse range of views coming from civil society

2. General CFS issues and updates

Commitment / views of AG members

- WFP said that the whole organisation is available to support the CFS and the CFS is contributing to a rejuvenated partnership between the Rome Based Agencies
- David Nabarro said that the High Level Task Force and its members are at the disposal of the CFS and will provide all necessary support. He said that if the CFS is to become the “supreme governance mechanism for food security & nutrition” then it will need benchmarks against which its success can be evaluated
- DN emphasised the role of CFS in promoting effective policies and actions

Role and functioning of the advisory group

- The CFS Chair supported the suggestion of Bioversity that it would be useful to map the activities and capacities of organisations and networks represented in the AG

High Level Panel of Experts

- The Selection Committee meets on 8th April

Nutrition

- The need for the CFS to address nutrition was emphasised by David Nabarro, Oxfam and was widely supported by other Bureau and AG participants
- The lack of a seat on the AG specifically dedicated to nutrition was discussed.
- Participants emphasised that there are a number of ways in which stakeholders which focus on nutrition can participate in the CFS, e.g. through the HLPE, through SCN participation in the plenary, through AG participants, through the CFS online working space
- The need for advice and clarity on the specific roles and responsibilities of the CFS in relation to nutrition was emphasised

3. Planning for 36th Session of CFS in October

General

- See background documents for the meeting
- Agenda for the Oct meeting needs to be agreed by end March
- It had been agreed by Bureau prior to meeting with the AG that Oct meeting would be structured around 3 pillars: (1) lessons learnt/country & regional support; (2) policy convergence; (3) update and way forward on CFS reform
- Need to draw on discussions and conclusions of FAO Regional Conferences which will take place prior to 36th Session (Latin America, Africa, Asia)
- The CFS Chair suggested that the head of the 3 Rome Based Agencies might jointly open the 36th Session
- A number of criteria were suggested to aid the selection of issues which should be discussed by the CFS, including:
 - ✓ global issues which cannot adequately be addressed at regional/national levels;

- ✓ issues which require increased policy convergence/synergy and inter-governmental agreements;
- ✓ issues which require high level political decision making;
- ✓ issues most urgently need to be addressed in order to promote food and nutrition security for all;
- ✓ issues/actions that will deliver large scale impacts
- ✓ highly topical issues;
- ✓ a mix of issues, i.e. one which is controversial but also one on which agreement can be reached in order to demonstrate effectiveness of reformed CFS;
- ✓ taking forward issues discussed at MDG Summit

Process for 36th Session

- All agreed importance of avoiding long pre-prepared statements, need for debate and decision making
- Many participants suggested that discussions in plenary should be limited and there should be greater use of smaller break out groups

Lesson learning and regional/country support

- All agreed that best to have a small number of in depth case studies in order to identify lessons which can be generalised to other contexts.
- It was suggested that case studies should lead to recommendations on effective policies, implementation capacity, investment and participatory national governance mechanisms
- Europe, the HLTF, and Oxfam all emphasised that this session should not only consider lessons learnt and lead to improved policy guidance but should also consider how to link global technical and financial support with national investment and action plans
- FIAN, IFAD and others all emphasised to make a link between discussions on case studies and discussions on policies. Recommendations should be derived from the case studies which inform the policy discussions
- There will be a need to prepare guidelines for preparation of case studies
- There was agreement that case studies should be by multiple stakeholders from the national level, not only governments – they could be prepared by national multi-stakeholder platforms on food security and nutrition
- The need for independent reporting by civil society actors was emphasised by the civil society participants and others
- The adviser to the Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food suggested that there should be a report on the progress being made in implementing the Voluntary Guidelines on the Realisation of the Right to Food
- Oxfam emphasised that the tool for “mapping food security actions at country level” which has been proposed by an ad-hoc task team, facilitated by the CFS Secretariat, has direct relevance to the Phase 1 lesson learning and country/regional support roles of the CFS and this pillar of the 36th Session. If applied, the mapping tool should help to identify lessons learnt, produce good quality case studies and help to link global support to national plans. It was also suggested that donor governments, international organisations and other stakeholders should also report back on the support that they are providing to national plans.
- Conclusions: The Bureau will meet and decide on case studies. A working group of Bureau and AG members may be established to develop guidance for preparation of case studies and planning the session.

- The CFS Chair suggested there should be a maximum of 4 case studies, 2 of which might be Bangladesh and CAADP.

Policy convergence

- *CFA as basis for inter-governmental policy & strategic framework* : Supported by Europe, Japan, HLTF, Bioversity, IFAD,
 - *Food security and climate change*: Supported by Australia, HLTF, World Bank, Oxfam, Opposed by IFAD
 - *Responsible land investment*: Supported by Japan, Brasil, FAO, World Bank, IFAD, AFN
 - *Responsible investment in sustainable agriculture*: Supported by USA, HLTF, IFAD, FIAN, IPC, Oxfam, Special Rapporteur
 - *Tools to address food price volatility*: Supported by HLTF, FAO, IFAD, FIAN, AFN, Special Rapporteur
 - *Gender* : Supported by FAO
 - *Protracted crises and conflict*: Supported by Brasil, FAO, World Bank
 - *Transition from emergencies to development*; Supported by Brasil
 - *Nutrition* : Supported by Oxfam, AFN
 - *CGIAR reform*: Supported by World Bank
 - *Accountability*: supported by Europe, FIAN, Oxfam, Special Rapporteur
 - *Sustainable development of pastoral economies*: HLTF
 - *Migration from rural areas*: Supported by Equatorial Guinea
- David Nabarro proposed the following as cross-cutting issues : gender, conflict, participation of civil society
 - Civil society representatives suggested that the CFA should be one input that informs a global policy and strategic framework, together with others including the IAASTD reports, the Voluntary Guidelines on the Right to Food. It was also argued that there should not be a rush to endorse a global policy and strategic framework based on the CFA – there needs to be national & regional level discussion and input into a global framework
 - The World Bank questioned why the CFS needs its own strategic framework(!)
 - In his summary, the CFS Chair identified the following as the emerging priority issues: price volatility; responsible land investment; conflict/post-conflict; a global policy framework based on the CFA; gender & nutrition

CFS reform

- Some argued that the CFS should not stick rigidly to the 2 phases as there is a lot of overlap and linkage between the roles in different phases
- IPC and other civil society participants emphasised the need for funding to enable civil society participation, particularly from the South

Way forward in finalising agenda and preparing for 36th Session

- It was proposed by a number of participants that small working groups consisting of Bureau and AG members, should be established to take forward the planning on the 3 pillars
- The Bureau will probably be meeting on 8th April to reach some decisions on the agenda and consider the establishment of working groups
- Suggestion of next Bureau/AG meeting on 20th April

- Emphasis given to need to communicate electronically

4. On-going (inter-sessional) activities of CFS

- A number of participants including the CFS Chair, David Nabarro, Oxfam, IFAD, FIAN emphasised the need for the CFS to have a costed work programme and to be taking actions on an on-going basis
- The establishment of working groups based around the role of the CFS / the pillars of the 36th Session was proposed as a means of developing and implementing work programme activities
- It was also suggested that the Bureau should empower the AG to establish working groups in order to take work forward, ensuring coordinated support and advice from its member constituencies
- The CFS Chair emphasised that the CFS reform empowered the Bureau to take decisions and actions on an on-going basis
- It was suggested that the annual Sessions do not need to address all on-going CFS activities