

ARGENTINE MISSION TO FAO, IFAD AND WFP

COMMENTS ON THE CFS FRAMEWORK TO ENHANCE EFFORTS TO INCREASE AWARENESS, OWNERSHIP, AND USE OF CFS POLICY OUTCOMES

We would like to thank you for sharing the Rapporteur's summary of the first open meeting allocated to this critical framework. From our perspective, the document presents a balanced view of the different aspects and priorities emphasized by Members. Naturally, this exercise of objectiveness is essential to design a comprehensive and realistic Action Plan.

In this connection, Argentina would like to put forward a series of preliminary comments related to the broader horizon of this line of work to contribute to identifying concrete areas to further develop CFS's potential.

Essentially, we would like to signal the following points:

a.- Action Plans depend on available financial resources to succeed. That is to say, prior articulation between paramount objectives and means of implementation is fundamental to establishing an achievable framework in a given schedule. Indeed, in the context of the RBA's work plans elaboration, we have examples of this type of exercise (e.g. FAO's Strategies or WFP country programmes). In this sense, perhaps it could be beneficial to assess beforehand what kind of recourses are or will be available to CFS, including voluntary contributions, in order to determine plausible ambitions for this Action Plan.

b.- There is consensus on the need to explore alternatives towards incrementing the impact of CFS products on the terrain. In this frame, since CFS is not an implementation Agency, we could assess how valuable synergies with FAO, IFAD, and WFP can be promoted to channel and materialize Voluntary Guidelines and Policy Recommendations into concrete programmes. For instance, in 2023, the WFP Executive Board approved the institutionalization of a development fund to finance long-term efforts in developing countries to prevent recurrent food crises. In this context, CFS products could be introduced within WFP's toolbox to improve resilience and

sustainable agrifood systems. Additionally, similar examples could be identified in FAO's Regional Offices and IFAD's financial packages.

c.- The idea of promoting CFS national focal points is interesting. Indeed, FAO's technical committees, depending on their specificities, have dedicated interlocutors at national levels (e.g. COFI) to facilitate official interaction. However, this option might partially resolve the lack of awareness of CFS since, for instance, local governments and municipalities would still ignore the existence of the Committee and its policy documents. In this vein, in addition to the proposal concerning focal points, it could be explored the possibility of organizing diffusion seminars with the UN Resident Coordinators to reach diverse and multiple stakeholders. Equally, FAO Regional Conferences could be utilized as platforms for CFS's advocacy, for instance, by presenting successful policy recommendations and uptake examples.

e.- In parallel, it could be valuable to reflect on the nature and utility of CFS's policy products. Are we accurately targeting the challenges of countries, in particular those of developing ones? Do the supposed users feel represented by the content of the documents? Are we just proliferating the elaboration of policy recommendations while ignoring what practitioners need? This exercise could be extremely significant to understand, for instance, if the language, themes, and technical propositions of documents are capturing the concerns and priorities of governments. Essentially, if we are not able to intertwine the objectives and content of policy products with national or regional top urgencies, we will run the risk of de-attaching CFS goals from countries' realities.

Finally, we would like to express our gratitude for the opportunity to share our comments and, of course, we remain available to provide further clarification if needed.

Rome, 2024/01/09