



Date: 19 March 2018

Time: All Day

Overview of morning session

The morning session of the retreat focused on seeking guidance on the implementation process and how to arrive at the Plenary Implementation Report (PIR) in an efficient and timely manner, to make the best use of the remaining evaluation meetings that are scheduled.

The participants discussed options for the implementation process, ways to synthesize the implementation of the response to the evaluation to form the core narrative of the PIR, and general outline for the PIR. Several background documents were provided to help guide this discussion including an indicative table connecting strategic elements to actions in the response to the evaluation and a draft annotated outline for PIR.

Much of the discussion focused on ways to synthesize the various elements into a holistic approach, which better connects each to the overall vision/objectives that will improve CFS. Several options were discussed that all had a similar objective – to highlight how the implementation of the evaluation recommendations will produce major changes or improvements to the work of CFS.

Other points arising from the discussion included:

- ... the volume of documents is overwhelming, not possible to process all of this – let's move past this and get back to addressing FSN issues and really align the potential of CFS ...

- ... prefer the PIR is short, based on consensus/agreed language, with few if any Annexes ...

- ... this PIR is meant to build on and complement the Reform process ...

- ... important to communicate clearly what changes we are proposing to improve CFS ...

- ... need to link the objectives/core narrative to the main actions that we have already discussed/agreed...

- ... welcome initiatives that will streamline this process, while retaining the inclusivity ...

- ... don't forget items that need Plenary endorsement.

The general consensus from the discussion was to focus on a short concise document that synthesizes the responses to the evaluation, and move away from the detailed reaction to each Recommendation. However, we will still need to take stock action-by-action to ensure that all previous Plenary decisions are addressed and that any action that needs Plenary endorsement is clearly evident, and indicate those items that may need to be done post-Plenary (such as the CFS Reform implementation plan).



Outcomes of the Working Group discussions:

Comments on the response to Recommendation 1

The working group only discussed Table 1 of the background document (Retreat/2018/03/19/03) regarding the Contribution of CFS roles to CFS vision and modalities of implementation. There was insufficient time to discuss the strategic objectives for the next MYPoW and expected results/ outcomes.

With a view to sharpening the document for presentation on 29-March meeting, the suggestion was to focus on those changes that will lead to improving CFS, namely:

- Role 1: adding “advocacy” in the third column (how the role is or should be performed);
- Role 2: cancelling reference to horizontal and vertical promotion of policy convergence in the second column (clarification to CFS vision) as this was found confusing;
- Role 3: adding a reference to FSN multi-stakeholder platforms in the third column and a reference to RBAs and their country offices in the last column (by whom the role is or should be performed);
- Role 5: Cancelling the reference to the response to recommendation 7 in the third column and adding new text, indicating that the role should be performed through annual contributions to HLPF, participation in Voluntary National Reviews on progress in implementing the 2030 Agenda and review of alignment of national policies with CFS policy products and recommendations.

Comments on the response to Recommendation 2

The need to ensure a more prominent role for the CFS plenary in this process was stressed. In this regard, the proposal was well received as a positive attempt in that direction. It was suggested to foresee the possibility for the plenary to identify a limited number of issues that may require further attention for the MYPoW preparation. This would give the possibility to all CFS stakeholders, not only those more involved in the intersessional period, to contribute to the process from the outset. It was reiterated that this would not preclude the possibility for CFS stakeholders to present preliminary proposals in the subsequent steps of the MYPoW preparation on issues that were not discussed in plenary.

The importance of better integrating the HLPE contribution in the work of CFS was reiterated. It was also mentioned that it is important to consider the implications that this would have on the HLPE Secretariat.

It was suggested that each step of the process is carried out under the responsibility of the CFS Chair who will consult with the involved stakeholders and make sure that an inclusive process is implemented.



Comments on the response to Recommendation 10

A brief overview was provided of the proposed approach to the implementation of the response to Recommendation 10. The proposal is to progress from the objective of a CFS framework for “monitoring” to a framework for “promoting accountability and best practices” which includes monitoring-related activities, in the context of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (see Retreat/2018/03/19/05). There was general consensus in the working group that the framework depicted in Table 1 was useful to help clarify the roles of CFS at all levels with respect to role (v) in the CFS Reform document, which includes monitoring.

Several participants provided inputs to help clarify some of the entries in Table 1, including:

- How to better emphasis/promote FSN issues in the national VNR reports, and the linkages with the HLPF contributions from CFS;
- Have stronger discussions during the follow-up and review of global FSN situation and trends;
- Regarding TORs to share experiences and good practices, it should be emphasize more that these TORs are not only for the Global Thematic Events held in CFS Plenary, but also help guide national and regional consultative processes to share their experiences and good practices;
- How can these TORs and other CFS efforts promote more “CFS-like” platforms at country (and regional) levels to better streamline CFS products/policy recommendations into national policy dialogues;
- In addition to the TORs, there is a need for guidelines to help countries in this regard;
- Clarify/strengthen the role of the CFS Secretariat and the Chair to promote CFS more (linked to the communication and outreach discussions);
- It was noted that the need for and role of the OEWG on monitoring may be reconsidered in light of the decisions of the Committee related to the follow-up to the independent evaluation of CFS (as stated in CFS 2017/44/Report), especially regarding the outcome of the response to Rec1 and Rec2 (and others).