

## CFS Uptake workstream – GER comments to Action Plan Outline

Thank you for this very comprehensive and detailed outline which provides a solid basis for the further drafting of the Action Plan.

In our view, the outline follows a clear and logical structure which enhances the readability and future applicability of the envisioned document. Its structure which clearly distinguishes between the potential actions of the different stakeholders as well as the goals themselves – usefulness on one hand and awareness and use on the other hand – is very valuable, since it allows a targeted categorization of the measures needed. To include the respective stakeholders is an essential aspect as it shows that every stakeholder – which is literally to be understood as from farm to fork – is in the position and responsibility to bring CFS and its policy products forward. The distinction between the usefulness and awareness/use component demonstrates that both areas – the rather conceptual as well as the outreaching one – has to be addressed in parallel. However, we would suggest to include the ownership component as well, as from our experience, the CFS policy products might not always be regarded as CFS ones. Therefore, it might be recommendable to include measures on how to raise ownership awareness as well, e.g. outreach beyond Rome activities by CFS Chair. From our perspective, those measures could also be incorporated in the existing structure, e.g. under 1.B.

Suggestions to the respective chapters:

- 1.A.2.: a prerequisite for this goal is to identify common aspects which make CFS policy products more concrete, understandable and actionable. This should be included.
- 1.A.3.: the broader the topic, the longer the timeframe needed for the whole process in order to produce valuable and balanced outcomes. This should be taken into account.
- 1.B.1.i.: dissemination tools and activities could be based on former successful examples, e.g. handbooks. However, an assessment on how to design such tools and activities to match the needs of the different targeted groups could also be helpful.
- 1.B.1.iii.: It should be defined what is understood by national needs. Additionally, depending on the rationale behind this proposal, another option could be to identify common realities (e.g. regional, climatic, economic ones) instead of national needs. This would allow an easier classification.
- 1.B.1.iv.: suggestion to identify a common approach of progress assessment of CFS policy products in order to continuously produce lessons learned in a comparable way (1.B.1.v.). There are examples of successful assessment mechanisms, e.g. WHO.
- 1.B.1.v.: concrete best practices for CFS policy products could also be developed.

- 1.B.3.: pilot countries should come from different regions to produce transferable outcomes.
- 1.B.6.: this is an essential point. From our view, also parliamentarians could be a targeted audience. All media platforms should be strategically used. The communication should come from an abstract level to a more concrete level, so the products find more common ground and audience. Also dissemination of information on public livestreaming of certain events could be useful.
- 1.B.7.: In our view, to create added value, a compilation like it is foreseen should entail a kind of assessment/explanation. E.g. a sort of commented version of agreements, which indicates for the respective (key) obligations inter alia the rationale behind, examples of transposition in national context. Relevant questions in that context are: What aspects should such a compilation include? Which criteria should inform the decision on key CFS agreements? What concrete added value should be created?
- 1.B.8.: also applicable for the tools (1.B.1.i.)
- 2.A.: national assessment on lessons learned regarding implemented CFS policy products which outcomes could feed into future CFS policy convergence processes.
- 2.B.1. "Provision of financial resources": should be better rephrased and replaced by "mobilization of voluntary financial and non-financial contributions, private and public, from all stakeholders"
- 2.B.3.: inclusion of concrete examples, e.g. German working group on global food security (AKWE), connect it with bottom-up approaches which have a wide range of partners from farming to consumers.
- 2.B.4: outreach actions to legislators could be included.
- 2.B.5: inclusion of concrete examples, e.g. Global Forum for Food and Agriculture (GFFA) and Policy against Hunger Conference. Regarding the inclusion of references to multilateral policy agreements: it would be helpful to identify examples of agreements, which might provide a basis for inclusion of references. Include high level political representation at CFS Plenaries.
- 3.A.1.: include also future initiatives and processes as well as relevant UN policy agreements.