

Outcomes of the global discussions on the follow-up to the Evaluation Meetings of 1 & 5 June 2017

The objective of the meetings was to discuss the preparation of the response to the CFS independent evaluation (Plan of Action), specifically to discuss potential deliverables for CFS 44 (including the roadmap) and the evaluation recommendations.

The following definitions will apply in the context of the follow-up to the Evaluation:

Roadmap: Strategy to prepare the Plan of Action; will not contain any element of decision in response to the evaluation

Plan of Action: A document with the decisions made in response to the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations (whether they are accepted, activities, responsibilities, timeframe, implications for additional funding and whether they require plenary decisions)

1. Consultation process up to CFS 44

Participants stressed the need for sufficient time to consult with their capitals, and within their agencies and constituencies, but also the importance of not losing momentum on discussing the follow-up to the evaluation and of producing strong and strategic deliverables at CFS 44. They looked for a process which is as inclusive as possible. The process will include an extended Bureau/AG meeting on 7 June, an extended Bureau retreat on 8 June (“extended” refers to the participation of member countries that are not members of the Bureau) and global discussions on 11 and 14 July.

It was noted that the translated versions of the final report would be available on 30 June 2017, before the global discussions in July 2017.

2. Roadmap

The draft roadmap was introduced at the first global discussion on 1 June and a refined version was presented at the second global discussion on 5 June. The roadmap includes sections on **timeframe**, **process** and **format and content of the Plan of Action**.

The Plan of Action will be developed during the 2018 intersessional period and presented at CFS 45 for endorsement. Some guiding questions were included in the roadmap to encourage feedback. There were suggestions for the CFS Chair or Vice Chair to lead the inclusive process for the preparation of the Plan of Action during the 2018 intersessional period.

The Plan of Action will present the overall response to the evaluation and the decisions made in response to the evaluation recommendations and major findings (as participants highlighted the importance of addressing some findings even if they were not part of the recommendations), providing the proposed following information:

- Whether the recommendation is accepted, partially accepted or rejected
- Actions to be taken and/or actions already taken and /or comments about partial acceptance or rejection
- Whether there is a need for certain action before the implementation stage

- Responsible group/body for implementation
- Timeframe for the implementation of the proposed actions
- Whether further funding is needed to implement the proposed actions
- Need for Plenary endorsement (yes/no)

There was general agreement on the following categorization for responses to recommendations:

- Recommendations to be endorsed at CFS 44
- Recommendations to be endorsed by the Bureau during the intersessional period between CFS 44 and CFS 45
- Recommendations to be endorsed at CFS 45

3. Evaluation recommendations

Different opinions were expressed on where to start, whether with recommendations addressing strategic issues or with recommendations that seemed to be easy to agree on (low-hanging fruits). Some participants drew attention to the need to address recommendations 2, 4 and 8 as the new Chair and Bureau will be elected soon and these recommendations were directly relevant to their work.

Participants agreed on the need for more strategic planning and focus but insisted on not reopening the reform document. The strategy should be aligned with Agenda 2030 and linked to the MYPoW and budget. There were divided views on whether this strategy should be embedded in a separate strategic framework or included in the current MYPoW. Participants pointed out that CFS was not an organization and therefore did not require a strategic framework and that missing strategic elements could be incorporated into MYPoW. MYPoW was found to be too supply-driven and concerns were expressed about the use of red lines in the preparation of MYPoW.

It was underlined that sustainable funding was essential to implement MYPoW activities. CFS core budget should not be donor-driven and should be covered by unearmarked and predictable funds. More commitment was needed from RBAs and countries for funding all three CFS components. Participants emphasized the importance of having a good collaborative working relationship with the RBAs to increase efficiency and effectiveness. There were suggestions to reach out to the private organizations and philanthropic foundations for funding with a caveat to ensure that there would be no conflicts in interest.

There were discussions on revitalizing and maximizing the potential convening power of CFS plenary. Attendance by ministers and top-level participants was deemed to be important to affect impact on the ground and to attract funding for CFS. The need for flexibility in the plenary agenda was raised to accommodate discussion on emerging and important issues.

There was a general agreement on the need to streamline the number of Open Ended Working Groups to make CFS more effective and efficient. The monitoring function of CFS was emphasized in relation to assessing the impact of CFS policies on the ground. This would rely on commitment by all stakeholders, in particular the RBAs, to use, disseminate and incorporate CFS products in their policies and programmes.

4. Conclusions and Follow up

The following deliverables were agreed for CFS 44:

- (i) **Consultation report:** presents the results of the consultation process for the preparation of the response to the evaluation leading up to CFS 44, including status updates on on-going or completed work. The report may include decisions made in response to specific evaluation recommendations provided consensus is reached before CFS 44.
- (ii) **Roadmap:** It will present the strategy to prepare the Plan of Action, building on the results of the consultation process. It will include issues on which there is no agreement or which require more discussion.

The updated roadmap, incorporating inputs from the discussions on 1 and 5 June, was circulated to participants of the global discussions (**Annex 2**) and will be updated progressively following subsequent meetings.

It was eventually agreed that the extended Bureau and Advisory Group meeting on 7 June and the extended Bureau retreat on 8 June will focus on discussing responses to recommendations 1 (Strategic Plan), 2 (MYPoW), 3 (Resource mobilization), 5 (Plenary) and 6 (OEWGs) due to their strategic nature. The Advisory Group and Bureau retreat participants were encouraged to prepare action-oriented suggestions for improvements to CFS that respond to these recommendations.

Annex 1: Roadmap for the preparation of the Plan of Action

Draft roadmap for the preparation of the Plan of Action of the CFS Evaluation

The roadmap will detail the strategy for developing the Plan of Action in 2018. It focuses on the process for preparing the Plan of Action and not on the Plan of Action itself.

Definitions:

Roadmap: strategy to prepare the Plan of Action (who, how, when); does not contain any element of decision on the evaluation recommendations.

Plan of Action: presents the decisions made in response to the evaluation recommendations and major findings (whether it is accepted, activities, responsibilities, timeframe and implications for additional funding and need for Plenary endorsement).

The roadmap for the preparation of the Plan of Action provides information on the timeframe, the process, specific roles for specified recommendations, and the format and content of the Plan of Action.

Guiding questions for Members and stakeholders:

Do you envisage additional/different information in the roadmap?

Are there more effective ways to develop it?

1. Timeframe:

The Plan of Action will be developed during 2018 intersessional period and presented at CFS 45 for endorsement.

The timeframe includes all the important events/deadlines for the successful preparation of the Plan of Action during the 2018 intersessional period (e.g. consultation workshop, delivery of first draft, etc.), allowing all CFS stakeholders to plan their contribution and participation accordingly.

Guiding question for Members and stakeholders:

What level of detail is required? Any specific milestones?

2. Process

The roadmap builds on the results of the consultative process in June-September 2017 for the preparation of CFS 44.

Guiding question for Members and stakeholders:

What do you think is the most effective and efficient way to proceed for the preparation of the Plan of Action?

- All discussions will take place under an inclusive process, with the possibility to have focus groups / Friends of the Chair to work on specific issues, the results of which will be reported and discussed in an inclusive setting.
- Specific consultative processes might be envisaged for some recommendations (e.g. questionnaires to governments, consultative meetings, interviews with RBAs, and request for inputs from different groups of stakeholders).
- Depending on the nature of the recommendations, there may be a need to engage with different stakeholders, organisations and bodies to request their input and guidance regarding relevant recommendations.

Guiding questions for Members and stakeholders:

What format is envisaged for the inclusive process of discussion?

Is there a need to engage with different stakeholders for some recommendations? If yes, please explain.

3. Format and content of the Plan of Action

The Plan of Action will provide an overall response to the evaluation and a response by recommendation with the following information:

- Whether the recommendation is accepted, partially accepted or rejected.
- Actions to be taken and/or actions already taken and /or comments about partial acceptance or rejection.
- Whether there is a need for certain action before the implementation stage.
- Responsible group/body for implementation.
- Timeframe for the implementation of the proposed actions.
- Whether further funding is needed to implement the proposed actions.
- Need for Plenary endorsement (yes/no)

Guiding questions for Members and stakeholders:

Should the Plan of Action include additional information? Are all listed information required?.

Suggested deliverables for CFS 44:

1. Agreed roadmap for the preparation of the Plan of Action.
2. Report on the results of the consultation process for the preparation of the response to the evaluation (June-September 2017)

Plan of Action in response to the CFS evaluation report

1. Overall opinion about the evaluation and its report, findings, conclusions and usefulness
2. Response matrix

			Date		Plenary decision	
Response I: Endorsed at CFS 44 II: Endorsed by the Bureau during the intersessional period between CFS 44 and CFS 45 III: Endorsed at CFS 45	Accepted, partially accepted or rejected	Plan of Action				Requires Plenary decision (Y or N)
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Responsible body	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)	
Recommendation 1	Insert brief explanatory comment on the decision to accept, partially accept or reject the recommendation; mention progress already made in implementing the recommendation if any				Mention whether implementation of a recommendation is dependent upon additional funding	
Recommendation 2						
Recommendation 3						
...						