

## **CFS Workstream on "Increasing awareness, ownership, use and usefulness of CFS policy outcomes" – Zero Draft of the Action Plan**

### **IFAD's Feedback**

#### **General comments**

IFAD is pleased to review the zero draft of the Action Plan of the CFS Workstream on "Strengthening the uptake of CFS Policy Agreements" and provide some initial feedback also in writing, following the comments made at the second meeting of the OEWG.

In general, IFAD appreciates the work of the Secretariat in developing the zero draft, however we have noted that some sections and paragraphs could benefit from clearer language, explanatory footnotes and overall explanation on how certain sections have been introduced.

Overall, we would also like to stress the importance of **not increasing the workload** of all CFS Stakeholders, during an already heavy period with demanding priorities and an already quite full year to be dedicated to the implementation of the first workstreams as part of the current MYPOW. This point was also mentioned several times, by different stakeholders, during workplan negotiations last year.

The **success of this action plan** will depend on the degree to which we will be able to identify specific responsible stakeholders that will be held accountable.

**IFAD will continue to support** the CFS Secretariat with financial and human resources as we have done in the past, in particular supporting the development of policy recommendations and guidelines, by providing technical advice and expertise. IFAD will also continue **to sensitize its staff** – also through ad hoc awareness raising sessions – around the use and uptake of CFS Policy products at the country level in discussing and designing new programmes and projects. IFAD is also promoting the use of its internal database collecting all CFS policy products, as a reference platform for its country staff and for the development of programmes and projects in collaboration with countries.

More detailed feedback will be provided, by section and paragraph.

#### **Specific comments by section/paragraph**

- **Use of the terminology "Policy Agreements"**. We understand that the word "agreement" is used to stress the consensus achieved by CFS stakeholders behind the document. However, we suggest the use of the words "Policy Recommendations, Voluntary Guidelines" etc, rather than "Policy Agreements",

which subsume legally binding documents, which is not the case. If the wording “Policy Agreements” is agreed to be used by most, a foot note should be included to explain the reasoning behind the use and what these agreements refer to, i.e. policy recommendations, voluntary guidelines, etc.

- **When CFS is mentioned**, does it refer to the entirety of the constituencies of the Committee (i.e. all stakeholders, including Member States, RBAs, CSIPM and PSM) or only refers to the CFS Secretariat? Should the latter be the case, this should be specified throughout the document.
- **Additional workload**. We should be mindful of adding additional tasks within the action plan that would require additional workload, during an already busy year for the implementation of other workstreams. To the best extent possible, the actions outlined in the plan should be embedded in those actions already ongoing as part of the regular work of the various stakeholders and constituencies. The point mentioned in paragraph **1.A.2** is extremely relevant and will be very important to ensure prioritization of topics in the future MYPOWs.

### **Section 1**

- **Paragraph 1.A.3. and 1.B.3**. What type of expertise is required? Should academia, for example, be added?

### **Section 2**

- **Paragraph 2.A.1**. IFAD would like to understand where the idea of the **toolkit** came about, and how does the CFS think this tool will be then promoted and utilized at the local, national and regional level. Additionally, IFAD believes that if, going forward, the development of a toolkit should include all CFS Stakeholders, not only the RBAs and the Secretariat, as it may be more insightful to hear from all on how they think this tool could support the use and uptake of policy products at the local, national and regional level. Additionally, who will develop the analysis on the experiences from the uptake of CFS main policy products?
- **Paragraph 2.A.4**. IFAD believes that technical and institutional support can be provided to countries upon request. Actions can be taken on a demand driven basis.
- **Paragraph 2.A.5**. IFAD already promotes internally the alignment with, use and uptake of CFS policy products as a reference for the preparation of projects and programmes. The responsibility should lie with all stakeholders engaged in project design, including government, who are key counterparts in these processes.

- **Paragraph 2.A.6.** As per paragraph 2.A.4, IFAD actions at the country level are demand driven. IFAD has been promoting and will continue to promote the use of CFS policy products while discussing new programme and projects with country governments.
- **Paragraph 2.A.10.** What are the cost implications of translating all CFS policy products in national and local languages, and who will bear these costs?
- **Paragraph 2.B.1.** A definition of national and regional multistakeholder platforms should be provided. Additionally, such a mapping exercise should involve all other CFS stakeholders, not only CFS and the RBAs. Once again, we caution on adding additional tasks and items on an already heavy workplan, especially for this year.
- **Paragraph 2.C.3.** It should be noted that the RBAs already share updates on their CFS activities to their respective governing bodies on a regular basis.

### **Section 3**

- **Paragraph 3.3.** IFAD asks if the envisioned new OEWG will be replacing the annual reporting exercise provided to the Bureau and Advisory Group. How often will the OEWG be meeting?
- **Paragraph 3.4.** IFAD already promotes, as part of its work on the ground, the use of CFS policy products through its programme of loans and grants. What is intended with “resource mobilization to support implementation”? To the extent possible, the actions of this workplan should be undertaken with the available budget.

### **Annex A**

- **On Budget.** Many of the actions included in the plan are already embedded in what IFAD does as we discuss with government new programmes and projects. It should be clarified what are the specific **additional** actions envisioned that would require additional budget. Any action under the plan should be delivered, to the extent possible, in the context of the current CFS budget. It is important to embed the various activities listed in within the operations we all already take out.
- **Clear identification of roles and responsibilities, as well as timeline** is necessary to ensure the success of the plan. Actions should be undertaken only if there is willingness and bandwidth to do so, to avoid burdening further any of the stakeholders.

- **Annex A.** While the table is a useful summary of the actions to be undertaken, it should be transformed in a more actionable, monitorable document, with clearer timelines. Possibly transforming it in a Results Measurement Framework (with outcome and outputs) could help stakeholders be more accountable and ensure easier tracking and monitoring of the specific actions.