

PSM comments on Annexes F, G and H of CFS Evaluation Implementation Report

1. Terms of reference of the Chairperson

While the outreach 'political function' of the Chair has been clarified (in some areas, the resource mobilisation perspective is vague) we do not believe that the reporting lines between the Chair and the CFS Secretary have been made as explicit as was recommended by the Evaluation so that 'grey' areas are addressed. Phrases (item g of the ToR) that the Chair will "work in collaboration with the CFS Secretariat" remains unclear, does not address reporting lines or the protocol for reporting from the CFS Secretariat. This lack of clarity is reflected in the ToR of the Secretary as well.

2. Terms of reference of the Secretary

We do not believe the necessary clarity in terms of reporting lines between the Secretary and Chair has been made by only indicating that the Secretary will work "under the overall guidance of the CFS Chair.....and under the administrative supervision of the responsible FAO manager". In terms of the day to day administrative and technical work of the CFS Secretary we would expect further clarity.

We would seek clarity on the task that the CFS Secretary will 'engage in global policy dialogues beyond CFS meetings' as to both whether this was in the previous ToR and secondly, whether this has not already been included as the role of the Chair. In a similar vein, we would seek clarification that the Secretary would keep the Heads of RBAs informed duplicates a task already assigned to the Chair (item h of Chair's ToR).

Finally, we note the performance assessment of the Secretary will not involve the Chair but will be "assessed jointly by the RBAs". We would have expected the Chair to have had a role and would seek clarification of which of the RBAs annual performance review systems and typologies would be used and how an envisioned joint review, including the annual personal review meeting, would be chaired and conducted.

3. Composition and processes of the Advisory Group

With regard to the proposals by the evaluation co-facilitators of the evaluation on both the Advisory Group processes and composition.

As regards composition, we believe the co-facilitators proposals (paras 14-15) well addresses the concerns of the evaluation process and would allow PSM and its membership to have a timely and substantive input into the advice being offered to the Bureau of the CFS.

With regard to composition, para 16, we support the call for better coordination by existing members within their constituencies of other parties and stakeholders and that this should include a revised AG reporting exercise. We also strongly endorse the establishment of a new, formal procedure for new candidates to request a seat and, through a Technical Task Team, to develop criteria to assess such requests. We would therefore support the proposed new paragraph 26.