



## Swiss Inputs – Draft Outline of the Action Plan on increasing awareness, ownership, use and usefulness of CFS Policy Outcomes

### General remarks

1. The development of an action plan requires an analysis of the initial status, weaknesses, strengths and lessons learnt, especially for actions related to the CFS. We doubt that a meaningful action plan can be drawn up and implemented without such an analysis. This analysis can be done, for instance, through a mapping exercise by sending a questionnaire to all CFS stakeholders. The 2017 evaluation contains some interesting statements that are still relevant today (e.g., Conclusion 11 or Para. 82, 83, 87 and 106 – 113).
2. The action plan currently is a list of actions by stakeholders. However, it might be worth to link these actions with proper objectives, indicators, deadlines and – at least for the CFS section – with a budget estimate. The action plan should also include a monitoring and reporting mechanism. Although activity 1.B.4 mentions “the development of an updated strategy for monitoring and evaluation of the uptake of CFS policy agreements” this might be too unspecific/weak. We suggest to add a proper monitoring and reporting section, including a budget.
3. The action plan focuses too firmly only on CFS policy products. We strongly recommend to include objectives, activities and responsibilities on how other roles of the CFS in addition to policy convergence role can be utilized better and more strategically (e.g., how to better make use of the HLPE reports?).
4. All CFS Stakeholders are equally important to increase awareness, ownership and use of CFS policy products according to their roles and responsibilities. It would be important to add sections for all categories of CFS participants according to the structure of the advisory group.
5. Why are “CFS Policy products” replaced by «CFS policy agreements»? Same applies for policy “convergence process” and “policy agreement process”.

### Comments by section:

#### SECTION 1 – COMMITTEE ON WORLD FOOD SECURITY (CFS)

##### SECTION 1 A):

- 1.A.1 + 1.A.2: address also the how. Negotiated outcomes are rarely concrete, understandable and actionable. What are the criteria for effective prioritization?
- Allow considerations to be made as to whether future CFS products can be structured differently to facilitate and improve uptake.

##### SECTION 1 B)

- Additional action about improving GTE and stocktaking event during CFS Plenary.
- 1.B.2 - If such a mapping is done, one should be ensured that these platforms are not only purchasers of the products at national level, but that the countries are invited to ensure that these multi-stakeholder platforms are also involved in the development of the negotiating position (à la Swiss National FAO-Committee). Countries having a national FAO-Committee (Cabo Verde, Sweden, Switzerland, Brazil) can share lessons learnt (see also Section 2.B.3).
- 1. B.3 – identification of pilot countries can be done by screening national pathways. Link to UNFSS follow-up process should be ensured.

##### Section 2 – CFS MEMBERS IN THEIR NATIONAL CAPACITY:

- 2.B.1 – why regional and local levels but not national level?
- 2.B.3 – If such national multi-stakeholder and cross-sectoral structures are established, one should be ensured that these structures are not only purchasers of the products at national



level, but that the countries are invited to ensure that these multi-stakeholder structures are also involved in the development of the negotiating position (see also Section 1.B.2).

- Would it be worth to formulate a recommendation that CFS delegations are composed of different ministries (policy coherence)?

### Section 3 – UN AGENCIES AND OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS:

- Additional action in mainstreaming CFS Policy Products in Rio Conventions and their actions plans (NBSAP, etc.). Link to UNFSS follow-up process (a) the preparation of the Voluntary National Reviews; b) preparation for the UNFSS+4 (+6) Stocktaking moments)? (e.g., in 3.B.2 [...] of the governing Bodies of the Rome-based Agencies, the COPs of the three Rio Conventions and the follow-up process of the UNFSS)? This could also be added as activity for CFS members in their national capacity.
- CFS products to be leveraged in other global governance streams, e.g., the follow up to the UN Food Systems Summit and its Coalitions, and the work of other UN agencies.
- In former times for CFS major products an FAO umbrella programme was installed to support uptake, use and implementation of CFS products. This could be included.
- The new FAO Evidence Platform for Agrifood Systems and Nutrition provides countries with an “evidence toolbox” to monitor uptake of the recommendations of the Voluntary Guidelines on Food systems and Nutrition. Similar platforms could be put in place to document experiences and initiatives across countries in implementing the CFS Voluntary Guidelines and other products and monitoring their uptake.
- 3.B.3 – interaction with UN technical committees is too narrow, rather as the title of sections says “strengthening interaction and collaboration between CFS and UN Agencies and other international organizations”.
- 3.B.5 – include reference to UNFSS National Pathways.
- 3.B.7 – and global level.
- 3.B.8 – what is meant by “guidance on expectations”?