

CFS MYPOW process – Additional comments on future activities and CFS 44 Draft Decision

France

Dear MYPOW Chair, dear Dr Rahman,

We thank you very much for the draft MYPOW decision and for your proposal. Here you are some comments from our side.

1) **On the draft decision box**, we are not really comfortable with the provisions in paragraphs c and d referring to a possible reprioritization of the MYPOW in case of insufficient resources available, for several reasons :

- From a legal point of view, it seems a bit strange to envisage that an extremely important decision of the supreme CFS organ related to the priorities for the upcoming two years could be completely modified by the MYPOW working group (which is a subsidiary body), or renegotiate every year,
 - From a practical angle, we see the risk of endless discussions in the MYPOW working group, endless discussions that would also contribute to substantially increase the workload of the MYPOW working group. Furthermore, the time needed to achieve a workstream inclusively is generally longer than two years. A solid and transparent process to produce evidence or “well-incubated” inputs needs more than few months.
 - From a financial perspective, we are not sure that envisaging a budget gap from the beginning of the process of MYPOW would be the best way to incentivize voluntary contributions ; on the opposite, it could provide an incentive for donors to wait until the reprioritization before making financial commitments.
- ⇒ for these reasons, we believe that it would be highly commendable to avoid such reprioritization work to be conducted by the MYPOW working group and to do our utmost to build from the beginning a more selective, relevant and therefore attractive MYPOW, avoiding to multiply the number of OEWGs on subjects that are not yet sufficiently mature.

2) **On the Chair’s proposal** :

- About the number of OEWGs: we support the idea to have a more selective/strategic and relevant/attractive MYPOW when adopted in plenary, avoiding the openness of new thematic OEWGs on subject that are not sufficiently mature and not to multiply them in parallel from the beginning. The workload for members, participants and Secretariat during the intersessional period and its correlative budgetary needs have a strong link with the number of OEWGs.
It may be possible to have for instance more or less two thematic OEWGs, to look at the necessity to keep OEWGs for SDGs and GSF (if their processes are under “routine”), and keep the organic OEWGs MYPOW and “monitoring”.
In addition, there is the workstream of the plan of action of evaluation.
Then it is not appropriate to add now another thematic workstream on youth, before the ones of the two on nutrition or on rural transformation has achieved its task.
Furthermore, HLPE notes and reports should systematically be planned to feed the Committee considering its role in the CFS constitution (para B 37): assess the state of FSN, provide analyze and advice on specific relevant issues and identifying emerging

issue.

There are useful before the creation (or not) of a OEWGs. HLPE reports represent very high quality inputs and they are *quasi* “ for free”, as the experts of the steering committee and specific project teams are not paid. Its role is to accelerate the maturation of substantive inputs in an independent and multidisciplinary way before launching a workstream. Its methodology is both solid and inclusive, and the selection of its members follows rules under the supervision of the Bureau (which is not the case for a technical task teams for instance).

So one report a year (two reports per biennium) is a minimum. They are seeds for the relevance of future CFS works.

- About the costs of one HLPE report: the presentation of the cost p.15 is a little bit misleading. All the fixed cost for HLPE for the two reports (beyond the project team) shouldn't appear under one HLPE. It should be split for each HLPE report and includes direct costs only (project team for instance).
Our own analyze few months ago shows that the cost of one HLPE report is around 700 KUSD, including fixed costs and translation. It is around 300 KUSD with translation and without fixed cost. It is around 200 KUSD for the pure scientific part. This is much lower than what appears here. I let the specialists confirm these costs.

3) **For the future reflection on evaluation :**

The evaluation (para 81) notes that the policy products has been strongly reduced since 2011 (from four to one), and while we observed collectively that the vacuum has be immediately fulfilled in the meantime by other workstreams and OEWGs. The question to consider for the future raised in the retreat may be : *how we redesign the process before creating a new thematic OEWG, and how to give its correct place to the evidence produced thanks to an HLPE report in this process in the spirit of the reform, to facilitate mutual understanding especially in this innovative platform with non-states actors.*