

CFS OEWG on Uptake

Written Comments on the Zero Draft of the Action Plan

By Martin Wolpold-Bosien, German Institute for Human Rights (Observer)

Remarks and suggestions on introduction section:

On first paragraph:

In the beginning of introduction section, there should be an **explicit objective** of the Action Plan that **anchors the Uptake process in the CFS mandate** and **explicitly refers to the CFS vision statement and the CFS roles** according to the reform document, underlining especially the CFS functions on providing support and advice to countries and fostering policy coordination. All CFS Policy outcomes have the explicit objective that they **aim at contributing to the progressive realization of the right to adequate food**. Hence, it is important to include this in the Action Plan for the Uptake of these policy outcome as well.

On second paragraph:

The term coordination is mentioned in the last sentence of this paragraph. It points to the need of coordinating efforts on uptake. This is important. However, is there is also the need and potential to **using the intergovernmentally agreed policy instruments of the CFS for global policy coordination on food security and nutrition**.

Remarks and suggestions on Part 1:

On 1.A.1: The established role of **HLPE** in developing the **Note on Critical, Emerging and Enduring Issues** should be included. If the HLPE is requested to elaborate an additional note in this context, it should not only be to identify gaps, but rather to **collect and assess experiences and methodologies that have effectively connected content of CFS policy agreements** with national and international processes to advance the progressive realization of the right to food.

Remarks and suggestions on Part 2. A

Merge 2.A.3 with 2.A.6: CFS Members should use and apply CFS policy agreements in national strategies (.....) and wherever appropriate, request support from RBA and other UN bodies.....

The reason for that is that the identification process of countries for the application of policy agreements, and which kind of support they need from RBA and other UN agencies should be defined by themselves.

On Translation: (2.A.10):

- **Language Translation into non-UN languages** is not an equal responsibility of all stakeholders, is a responsibility of Member States and UN agencies.
- **The other meaning of „translation“** should be included: **Translation of CFS policy agreements into the different contexts and realities** of different constituencies. This dimension is essential and should be explicitly acknowledged in the Action Plan: the task is to connecting contents of CFS policy agreements with different processes, realities and struggles. There is a need of translation of institutional language into the language of different realities.

Remarks and suggestions on Part 2. B

2.B.1/2.B.2 : A differentiated and qualified understanding of multistakeholder structures and platform should be an analytical part of the mapping exercise:

- CFS itself is a foremost inclusive intergovernmental and international platform. Not all stakeholders have the same **roles and responsibilities**, but there are the distinct categories of members, participants and observers.
- Being anchored in the **progressive realization of the right to adequate food** is another distinctive normative basis that the CFS as well as other platforms on national, regional and global level have. However, many multistakeholder platforms are not based on such human rights based approach. It is important to make this transparent in the mapping exercise.
- The concept of **inclusiveness** which is fundamental for the CFS is primarily about the inclusion of the excluded in political processes on food security and nutrition, therefore the emphasis of the CFS reform on providing **special attention to the participation of the most affected** social groups and constituencies. This aspect is treated differently in many other multistakeholder settings. The question if and how the most affected social groups and constituencies are included in a particular multistakeholder forum should be particularly asked.

Remarks and suggestions on Part 2, C.

2.C.1. Add a sentence, in line with the comment made on paragraph two of the introduction section: ... Additionally, CFS members should support that the CFS global policy coordination function be acknowledged and included in global and regional initiatives for food security and nutrition.

Remarks and suggestions on Part 3:

3.2. Monitoring: an **explicit reference should be made to the existing CFS innovative monitoring mechanism**; including to the **TOR for national events on monitoring the use and application of CFS policy outcomes**, as approved by CFS PLenary and included in the CFS approved Response to Evaluation from 2018.

3.5 Include **bilateral and triangular cooperation into resource mobilization**; include a notion that specific safeguards against potential conflicts of interest need to be in place.