



COMMITTEE ON WORLD FOOD SECURITY

Forty-Fifth Session

"Making a Difference in Food Security and Nutrition"

Rome, Italy, 15-19 October 2018

CFS EVALUATION: PLAN OF ACTION - WITH DRAFT DECISION

MATTERS TO BE BROUGHT TO THE ATTENTION OF THE COMMITTEE

CFS 2018/45/2 "CFS Evaluation: Plan of Action – with Draft Decision", presented by Ms. Tian Jiani (China) and Mr. Oliver Mellenthin (Germany), co-facilitators of the process.

The Committee:

- a) Expresses its appreciation to Mr. Oliver Mellenthin (Germany) and Ms. Tian Jiani (China) for facilitating the finalization of the Plan of Action, specifically the response to the evaluation recommendations 7, 10, 11, 12 and 13 and 14 that were not presented to CFS 44.
- b) Endorses the "CFS Evaluation: Plan of Action – with Draft Decision" (CFS 2018/45/2).

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This Plan of Action presents the response to all fourteen evaluation recommendations, including the response to recommendations 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8 and 9, that were endorsed by CFS at its 44th Session in 2017. The responses to the remaining recommendations 7, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14 was prepared through a consultation process conducted from November 2017 to January 2018 and the results are included in the Plan of Action. The process was co-facilitated by Mr. Oliver Mellenthin (Germany) and Ms. Tian Jiani (China) who were nominated by the CFS Bureau. The process included a series of inclusive meetings on 23 and 27 November 2017, and 19 January 2018.

2. The Final Report of the Evaluation of CFS (CFS 2017/44/Inf 23) was circulated to all CFS stakeholders in April 2017. The report underlined that CFS was the only platform within the United Nations system that brings together a broad range of diverse stakeholders at the global level to develop policy guidelines and recommendations on food security and nutrition with the participation of civil society and the private sector in all its major processes, drawing on the evidence base provided by the

*This document can be accessed using the Quick Response Code on this page;
an FAO initiative to minimize its environmental impact and promote greener communications.
Other documents can be consulted at www.fao.org*



CFS 45

reports of the High-Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition (HLPE). It recognized the CFS contribution to enhancing global coordination on food security and nutrition issues. The report presented fourteen recommendations to improve the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the Committee in order of priority and advised that all of them are necessary.

3. There was a general agreement among CFS stakeholders that the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations provided a solid and comprehensive basis to strengthen CFS. CFS stakeholders also proposed improvements to address the evaluation findings that go beyond the evaluation recommendations. These improvements are incorporated into the related recommendations.

II. CFS EVALUATION - PLAN OF ACTION

Recommendation 1

4. The Committee should direct the Bureau to lead the development of a strategic plan/framework to guide the work of CFS over the medium-to-long term, using the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development as its frame of reference, and informed by amongst other things, the Critical and Emerging Issues Note of the HLPE. While the Bureau leads the process, it should be an inclusive process that draws on the insights of all CFS Members and Participants, and other relevant stakeholders. An Open Ended Working Group (OEWG) structure supported by a Technical Task Team should be tasked to develop the plan/framework.

5. The evaluation team does not wish to prescribe the particular planning regime that the Committee should adopt, as each organization needs to find what approach is best suited for its mandate. The United Nations system has adopted a results-based approach to planning, and the Committee is advised to incorporate the principles of a results-based approach into its framework. It would be useful to consider the approaches adopted by the Rome-based Agencies (RBAs). FAO has a 10-year strategic framework, and within this, a four-year medium-term plan and a two-year programme of work and budget. IFAD has a 10-year strategic framework, with three-year medium-term plans, while WFP has five-year strategic plan.

6. The planning horizon for CFS should be at least six years, covering three biennia, and should be reviewed and updated as necessary. The strategic plan/framework does not replace the Multi-Year Programme of Work (MYPoW) – it sets the direction within which the MYPoW should be formulated. The MYPoW represents the programme of activities that CFS intends to implement for the duration of the MYPoW.

7. The strategic plan or framework should set out the vision of CFS and its overarching goal(s), as well as a small number of strategic objectives to direct it towards achieving or contributing to the goal(s). While there is no prescription on the number of strategic objectives, it is advisable to have no more than five clearly articulated objectives, and the results or outcomes to be achieved. It is important that the Committee considers the pathways for achieving the intended outcomes or results, and here the indicative programme logic, developed in the course of the evaluation, can be used as a guide. The development of the strategic plan/framework also provides an opportunity for the Committee to clarify the six roles set out in the Reform Document, and the modalities for carrying out these roles. Figure 1 shows schematically the indicative elements of a strategic plan/framework.

8. As part of the process of developing the strategic plan/framework, CFS should draw on the forthcoming Critical and Emerging Issues Note of the HLPE, and information on what other global actors are doing in food security and nutrition (FSN), to enable CFS to clarify its niche and where it can add value. The strategic plan/framework should be informed by the realities ‘on the ground’: the CFS should obtain information on the national FSN priorities, as well as information on existing and

planned national platforms. The Advisory Group, the RBAs and WHO are well-placed to provide information on national priorities and national platforms.

Recommendation is partially accepted

9. CFS is the only multistakeholder platform within the UN system for global coordination on FSN. CFS agrees that there is a need for more strategic direction to guide CFS work but as a platform does not require a standalone strategic framework. CFS will strengthen the strategic content of the MYPoW and expand it to cover at least two biennia with regular updating of activities. CFS will develop strategic objectives and expected results/outcomes to be included in the longer-term MYPoW to provide direction towards achieving the CFS vision, clarifying the contribution of the 6 roles of CFS set out in the Reform Document to achieving the vision and the modalities for carrying out these roles (including how and by whom they should be implemented), based on experience since the CFS reform. The strategic content of the MYPoW will cross-reference global priorities (2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development), issues raised in HLPE Critical and Emerging Issues Note and the RBA strategic objectives.

10. Recommendations 1 and 2 are interlinked and will be implemented together.

Actions to be taken	Implementing body	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)
A1.1. Develop the strategic content of a medium to long term MYPoW; and clarify the contribution of the six roles set out in the Reform Document to achieving CFS vision, and how and by whom they should be implemented, based on experience gained since the CFS reform	Bureau, after consultation with the Advisory Group	By March 2018, to be endorsed by CFS 45	N

Recommendation 2

11. The MYPoW structure and process should be revised. The MYPoW should be informed by, and aligned to the strategic framework, and there should be a clear link between the activities in the MYPoW and the results or outcomes in the strategic framework. CFS is investigating the option of a four-year MYPoW. Given the difficulty that CFS has in securing a firm budget for a two-year period, extending the MYPoW to four years will simply mean having a plan with many unfunded activities. The need for a medium-term perspective is catered for by the introduction of a strategic plan/framework that covers three biennia.

12. The MYPoW should be linked to the budgeting process to reduce the chronic funding deficits faced by the MYPoW. While CFS seeks to ensure sustainable funding, it should also prioritize its work, streamlining workstreams and potentially de-emphasizing other workstreams where appropriate. CFS needs to determine the delicate balance between quality and quantity of workstreams and avoid spreading itself too thinly. Any MYPoW presented at the CFS Plenary should include a committed budget with specific allocation to prioritized workstreams. There should be an understanding that other workstreams should not start until extra budgetary funding is available.

Recommendation is partially accepted

13. CFS will revise the MYPoW structure and process. The new MYPoW, starting in 2020 and covering at least 2 biennia, will include a “standing” section with the medium-to-long term strategic content, referring to global priorities (Agenda 2030), and informed by the HLPE Critical and Emerging Issues Note and the RBA strategic objectives, and a rolling section with activities that will be updated on a regular basis, taking into account resource availability. Priority will be given to critical, emerging and urgent FSN issues, considering their impact on people most affected by food insecurity and malnutrition. Plenary will be invited to propose, discuss and give guidance on issues to be considered, taking into account:

- Information provided by the HLPE and global developments, considering their relevance to the work at country level of stakeholders including the RBAs;
- Potential duplication with other bodies;
- Expected added value taking into account the CFS roles and vision; and
- Potential synergy across issues.

14. The preparation of the MYPoW will include a comprehensive planning phase led by stakeholders to identify priority areas of work and will comprise, for each activity, a strong rationale for CFS engagement, objectives and outcomes, explicit CFS added value, roles and responsibilities post endorsement, monitoring activities and budget. The process will lead to a decision on whether to adopt the activity or not. The decision to include new activities in the MYPoW will be conditional on resource availability, taking into account other factors, such as workload.

Actions to be taken	Implementing body	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)
A2.1. Develop a proposal for a new MYPoW structure and process which is linked to Agenda 2030, with a standing section with the strategic content (see A1.1) and a rolling section with activities linked to resource availability.	Bureau, after consultation with the Advisory Group	By June 2018, to be endorsed at CFS 45	N
A2.2. Develop and apply clearer criteria for selecting CFS activities.	Bureau, after consultation with the Advisory Group	By June 2018	N
A.2.3. Give Plenary the opportunity to propose, discuss and give guidance on critical, emerging and urgent FSN issues to inform the preparation of the MYPoW.	Bureau, after consultation with the Advisory Group	By February each year for plenary in October	N
A2.4. Define a comprehensive planning phase for the MYPoW to identify activities, taking into account resource availability.	Bureau, after consultation with the Advisory Group	By June 2018	N

Recommendation 3

15. The ability to carry out activities in the MYPoW is dependent on a sustainable CFS budget. The Bureau should take the following actions to secure sustainable funding for CFS:

- i) It should develop a resource mobilization strategy as a matter of urgency. The resource mobilization strategy should be underpinned by a clear, simple message about CFS that will appeal to potential funding partners.
- ii) The resource mobilisation strategy should be for CFS Plenary and workstreams, the HLPE and the Civil Society Mechanism (CSM). The sources of funding should be diversified. Private foundations and the private sector should be considered, provided there are no conflicts of interest. The donor base from public sources should be expanded, with an appeal to those CFS Member States that have not funded CFS since the reform.
- iii) The RBAs should formalize their contribution through a Memorandum of Understanding and could be approached for an increase in their annual contribution. It is not possible to predict the size of the increase as this would depend on the number of workstreams in a given MYPoW.
- iv) There should be greater transparency in the budgeting process, showing how budget allocation decisions have been arrived at. Equally important is transparency in the expenditure. There should be accounting of actual expenditure where this is currently not the case, except for the HLPE and CSM.
- v) Consideration should be given to having a position in the Secretariat that is dedicated to resource mobilization, budget analysis and expenditure reporting.

Recommendation is partially accepted

16. CFS relies on the contributions of the three RBAs, who together provide US\$ 4.05 million each biennium in cash and in-kind, towards the CFS core budget that covers the cost of CFS Plenary and Secretariat. The in-kind contribution comprises three senior staff seconded from the RBAs. This contribution, established since the CFS reform, formerly covered the full CFS core budget but now only covers part of it due to increases in running costs, changes in the composition of the Secretariat which presently includes a full time secretary, and additions to what is considered 'core' (funds for some intersessional interpretation and an assistant to the CFS Chairperson). The full amount contributed by the RBAs has to be agreed by all three based on their respective governing body decisions. The discussion of this recommendation is interlinked with the structure of the Secretariat that the Evaluation has recommended to revise in Recommendation 9. HLPE and CSM are entirely funded by voluntary contributions.

17. All three components of the CFS budget (Plenary and workstreams, HLPE and CSM), are facing a chronic budget gap which depends on voluntary contributions from Members and Participants. There is an urgent need for making sure that this is balanced by better prioritization of CFS activities and appropriate resource mobilization. This was a priority in discussions of the CFS Bureau and Advisory Group and an open meeting on CFS sustainable funding on 9 March 2017.

18. Response to the recommendation is the following:

- i) CFS agrees to develop and implement, with advice from RBAs, a resource mobilization strategy for CFS Plenary and workstreams, the HLPE and the CSM to implement agreed MYPoWs, once the new strategic content of the MYPoW is defined, with specific activities aligned with the budget. The strategy will include robust safeguards in line with FAO guidelines to prevent potential conflicts of interest.

ii) Continued efforts will be made to expand the CFS donor base, including reaching out to CFS Member States as well as private foundations and the private sector, and financial institutions.

iii) CFS will request the RBAs to contribute the full amount of their stated contributions, with guiding principles for monetary and in-kind contributions, and to formalize their contribution for predictability.

iv) CFS Members will request the RBAs to adjust their contributions in a sustainable way to cover the core budget for CFS Plenary and workstreams starting from the 2020-21 biennium.

v) Accounting of actual expenditure for CFS Plenary and workstreams, HLPE, CSM and the Private Sector Mechanism (PSM) is now being incorporated into the CFS Annual Progress Report, which is an annual information session document, starting from 2017. Budget allocation decisions are stated under the assumptions section of the budget table in the MYPoW. Need for additional information on actual expenditure and budget allocation decisions will be clarified and additional information provided as agreed to enhance transparency.

Actions to be taken	Implementing body	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)
A3.1. (i) Develop and implement a resource mobilization strategy for CFS Plenary and workstreams, the HLPE and the CSM to support CFS priorities, with clear and robust safeguards in line with FAO guidelines to prevent potential conflicts of interest regarding funding.	Secretariat, with advice from RBAs and after consultation with the Bureau & Advisory Group	By June 2018	Y
A3.2. (ii) Diversify the financing base from Members, private foundations and the private sector, and financial institutions.	Secretariat with political support/outreach from CFS Chairperson, the Bureau, and dependent on willingness of contributors	Continuous	Y
A3.3. (iii) (a) Request RBAs to contribute the full amount of their stated contribution with guiding principles for cash and in-kind contributions and to formalize their contributions for sustainability.	CFS Chairperson	By June 2018	N
A3.4. (iii) (b) Request RBAs to adjust their contribution to cover the core budget for CFS Plenary and workstreams starting from 2020-21 biennium.	CFS Members, as appropriate, during RBA Governing Body meetings	Aligned with governing bodies calendar in 2018	N

Actions to be taken	Implementing body	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)
A3.5. (iv) Clarify stakeholders' need for, and provide, additional information on actual expenditure and budget allocation decisions and consider how to improve the accessibility and transparency of information.	The Bureau, after consultation with the Advisory Group	By June 2018	N

Recommendation 4

19. The Bureau should review the composition and processes of the Advisory Group to ensure that it is able to perform its functions effectively. Members of the Advisory Group who have not attended three consecutive meetings in the current biennium should be requested to provide reasons for their non-attendance, and an indication of their interest in going forward. These members can be given the option of an ad hoc seat and attend only when there are specific items that are relevant or are of interest to them. Another option would be to make phone-in facilities available for those members not stationed in Rome.

20. The Bureau should assess requests for seats on the Advisory Group, using a due diligence approach. Requests should only be considered if accompanied by a detailed proposal setting out, but not limited to the following:

- Demonstrate how the participant will contribute to CFS objectives, and the value added by the participant.
- Demonstrate the contribution made to date in CFS processes and other structures.
- Resolution from the member organizations to be represented, and audited or reliable figures on the membership.
- Governance arrangements – composition of decision-making or steering structures.
- How participation in the Advisory Group will be funded.
- Declaration of conflict of interest.
- Participation in other intergovernmental bodies.

21. With regard to current requests for new mechanisms or additional seats, the decision rests with the Bureau. The evaluation team has been requested to provide a view on these requests and on the current allocation of seats. The views of the team are as follows:

- i) The PSM has requested parity in seats with the CSM, that is, whatever the number of seats that the CSM has, PSM should have the same number. In the opinion of the evaluation team, an equal voice does not mean that there must be parity in the number of seats. The CSM was allocated four seats to give priority to those voices that historically have been marginalized. To give parity in the allocation of seats will only serve to reinforce the asymmetry of power between civil society and the private sector within the context of a multistakeholder platform, and so undermine the principles of the reform. However, there are small businesses involved in food production and they should be

brought on board, and accordingly, consideration should be given to an additional seat for the PSM.

ii) The World Farmers Organisation (WFO) has requested the creation of a farmers' mechanism, on the basis that farmers are not adequately represented by the CSM, asserting that they represent social movements and not farmers, and the PSM, as they represent agri-business and not farmers. The evaluation is not persuaded by the argument, as there are farmers in both mechanisms. The team noted that the WFO and its member organizations feel strongly about the issue, and they should be invited to submit a detailed proposal to the Bureau addressing the items set out in Para 11.

iii) Consideration should be given to allocating an Advisory Group seat to WHO, as they have demonstrated their commitment and contribution to CFS.

iv) The CSM should be requested to provide a comprehensive proposal to motivate the need for additional space. The allocation of an additional seat should be contingent on demonstrating that the CSM has addressed its internal organization, in particular, how the communication to, and the involvement of sub-regions can be improved.

Recommendation is partially accepted

22. The importance of the Advisory Group in providing substantive input to the Bureau on FSN for the range of tasks which the CFS Plenary has instructed the Bureau to perform, and in outreach to constituencies was reiterated.

23. The Bureau does not currently take full advantage of the Advisory Group and the expertise and knowledge of the broad spectrum of voices of the constituencies it represents. CFS will review the composition and processes of the Advisory Group to ensure that it is able to perform its functions effectively.

24. The meetings in September 2017 highlighted the following elements for the Bureau's consideration in its review:

Process related:

- The Advisory Group should primarily contribute substantive work and provide advice to the Bureau on FSN, in line with the Reform Document and the Rules of Procedures.
- The Bureau should clarify the support required from the Advisory Group before appointing it and, during its two-year term, requesting specific advice on substantial issues and agenda items.
- Active engagement and participation in CFS work, either through physical attendance or other means, and yearly periodic reports of Advisory Group members on their contributions towards CFS are important.

Composition related:

- The quality and relevance of advice provided is an important factor to consider, which is reflected in the criteria listed in the recommendation for assessing the requests for seats on the Advisory Group.
- The five categories of constituencies remain relevant and the principle of inclusiveness should drive composition.
- The Advisory Group should reflect the broad spectrum of voices of its constituencies and the Bureau should remain open to receiving advice from more stakeholders, considering the need for reviewing the number of categories and seats.
- The appointment of ad hoc participants with a mandate limited to a particular topic, a specific activity and a limited period of time, as per the Rules of Procedure, allows flexibility and inclusiveness to better respond to CFS priorities in the agreed MYPoW.

Action to be taken	Implementing body	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)
A4.1. Review the composition and processes of the Advisory Group, so that it can perform its functions effectively.	CFS Bureau, seeking additional inputs as needed	By March 2018	N

Recommendation 5

25. The CFS Plenary Session is the high point and culmination of the work done during the year, and the Bureau should ensure that the Plenary is a vibrant platform where there is dialogue on the key FSN issues of the day. The many side events should not be seen as threat to the main Plenary, but as an opportunity to raise the profile of CFS to an audience wider than the audience in the main Plenary. The side events should also be used to have a dialogue on difficult or contentious issues that have not found their way onto the main agenda of the CFS Plenary.

26. The Bureau should revisit the recent practice of having negotiations well in advance of the plenary week. The negotiation process is as important as the policy recommendations that are finally endorsed, and it is essential that the process be as inclusive as possible. While these processes do take time, being inclusive is likely to be more efficient in the long-run, than short-term efficiency approaches that inadvertently exclude those who cannot travel to Rome several times a year. The Committee could consider a different approach, taking reference from other intergovernmental meetings, where, for example, side events and negotiations at the level of officials precede the plenary attendance and discussions that involve ministerial level delegates.

Recommendation is partially accepted

27. Plenary needs to be vibrant and the agenda needs to attract Ministers who have the ability to bring about changes at national level and high-level representatives. Instead of having long plenary statements, Plenary should have an attractive agenda reflecting an interesting MYPoW with high-level, innovative roundtables or forums that comprise stakeholders from the mechanisms, think tanks and research mechanisms to encourage more interactive and substantive dialogues on FSN, ensuring a balance with the decision-making function of Plenary. This would reinforce the CFS function as a platform and CFS would be seen as a place for generating ideas.

28. Suggestions for making plenary vibrant and attractive included a possible joint declaration by Ministers or heads of delegations, high level roundtables and debate sessions to catalyze partnerships, a communication strategy to increase the visibility of CFS, which would include a media plan for plenary and the presentation of important reports and global developments related to FSN.

29. It should be noted that the Committee commended the practice of having negotiations in advance of the plenary week at CFS 43 [Final report of 2016, para. 15].

Actions to be taken	Implementing body	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)
A5.1. Prepare a proposal for making the plenary more vibrant, attractive and substantive, taking into account ideas generated through the consultation process.	CFS Bureau, after consultation with the Advisory Group	By February 2018	Depending on the proposal, might require more funding

Recommendation 6

A6.4. Clarify the respective roles and responsibilities of the Bureau/Advisory Group and OEWGs, allowing OEWGs to focus on substantive thematic issues	Bureau, after consultation with the Advisory Group	By June 2018	N
--	--	--------------	---

30. The Bureau should streamline the number of OEWGs by consolidating OEWGs with related functions, as well as take stock of OEWGs which have completed their tasks given by the Plenary and need not continue. It should consider creating an OEWG for the MYPoW and budgeting. The status of the Global Strategic Framework (GSF) OEWG should be revisited once it has completed its review of the GSF, as updating the GSF following each Plenary does not require a fully-fledged OEWG.

31. All OEWGs should develop terms of reference to govern their functioning. The terms of reference should outline the objectives of the OEWG, the results the OEWG must achieve over the biennium, and if the OEWG is policy-related, there should be a date for its term of expiry. Terms of reference should include roles and responsibilities of the OEWG Chair, Participants and the Technical Task Teams that support the OEWG. Where the work of two or more OEWGs or other policy workstreams are interrelated, provision should be made for joint meetings of OEWG Chairs.

Recommendation is accepted

32. CFS will streamline its OEWGs. The Bureau, after consultation with the Advisory Group, will clarify the respective roles and responsibilities of the Bureau/Advisory Group and OEWGs, allowing OEWGs to focus on substantive issues. The CFS Bureau and Advisory Group will manage inter-related, non-thematic issues. These will be determined over the 2018 intersessional period and may include such issues as CFS agenda setting and resources, monitoring and accountability functions, and effectiveness (formerly in OEWGs on MYPoW and Monitoring, and the working group on Rules of Procedure).

33. Criteria with specific conditions enabling decisions on whether an OEWG is needed or whether existing OEWGs should continue will be established. Clear terms of reference will be drawn up before establishing new OEWGs and for existing OEWGs which meet the criteria for continuation. The terms of reference will be time-bound and any extension will be a deliberate decision.

34. Apart from OEWGs, alternative working arrangements such as specific task forces (e.g. for the CFS contribution to the High Level Political Forum (HLPF) and Technical Task Teams or other ad hoc arrangements will be explored. Clear terms of reference for these alternative working arrangements will be established. The work of the GSF OEWG is concluded, until there is a need for a future GSF periodic update.

35. All work streams, including HLPE reports, will be directly linked to the CFS budget and no workstream activities will be approved without budget being secured.

Actions to be taken	Implementing body	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)
A6.1. Establish new criteria with specific conditions enabling decisions on whether an OEWG is needed and whether existing OEWGs should continue.	Bureau, after consultation with the Advisory Group	By June 2018	N
A6.2. Establish Terms of Reference for new and existing OEWGs that meet the criteria for establishing or continuing an OEWG (Action 6.1), which will be submitted to the Plenary for endorsement.	Bureau, after consultation with the Advisory Group	By June 2018	N
A6.3. Establish Terms of Reference for alternative working arrangements (such as specific task forces (e.g. for CFS contribution to HLPE) and Technical Task Teams or other ad hoc arrangements).	Bureau, after consultation with the Advisory Group	By June 2018	N
A6.4. Clarify the respective roles and responsibilities of the Bureau/Advisory Group and OEWGs, allowing OEWGs to focus on substantive thematic issues	Bureau, after consultation with the Advisory Group	By June 2018	N

Recommendation 7

36. CFS is an intergovernmental committee within the United Nations system, and it is the CFS Members who ultimately bear the duty of ensuring that the Committee delivers on its mandate. In this regard, there are a number of actions that CFS Members can take to improve the functioning of the CFS:

- a) CFS Members should review the flow of information to and from their capitals and address gaps to ensure that, among other things, CFS policy products and recommendations reach the relevant ministries.
- b) CFS Members should advocate for the use and application of CFS products and recommendations in their respective countries, according to their needs and priorities.
- c) CFS Members should, where feasible, contribute in cash or in kind to the resources of the Committee.

Recommendation is accepted

37. CFS Members have primary responsibility for promoting CFS and the use and application of CFS policy products and recommendations, but support is needed from all stakeholders as part of a

collective effort, as underlined in the response to Recommendation 11. In particular, support is needed for developing capacity in developing and least developed countries to use and apply CFS policy products and recommendations. A number of activities are being implemented in countries, led by governments, Rome-based agencies (RBAs), participating organisations of the CSM, PSM and other stakeholders, but there is no consolidated overview of these activities.

38. The following elements were suggested to facilitate communication and awareness:

- Nomination by CFS members of a CFS focal point at country-level in the most relevant ministry or multi-stakeholder platform to promote the dissemination and use and application of CFS policy outcomes and report on CFS-related activities in countries.
- Establishing or leveraging on existing food security and nutrition multi-stakeholder platforms and structures at regional and country levels, that are inclusive, particularly to those most affected by food insecurity and malnutrition, with, where feasible and suitable, the active engagement of the RBAs and their country offices
- Involvement of ministries and all relevant actors, including experts from capital from the beginning in policy convergence processes to increase ownership of policy convergence outputs at country and regional levels.
- Increased collaboration and engagement with, and strengthened commitment from RBAs to: (i) facilitate the use and application of CFS policy convergence work in countries, at the request of countries, including through work programs and partnership agreements with countries and stakeholders and (ii) support the development of communication and outreach materials, in line with the response to Recommendation 11.
- Packaging CFS outputs in a simpler and concise way, tailoring them to different audiences (e.g. toolkits, checklists, briefs, key messages, tools), subject to resource availability.
- Encouraging the RBAs, through the appropriate channels, to include CFS as a regular agenda item in their Governing Body meetings.
- Inviting member countries to make voluntary commitments and draft concrete plans on the use and application of CFS products and recommendations, and presenting the results of their efforts in Plenary.
- Collecting experiences at country level on existing food security and nutrition multistakeholder platforms and structures.
- Inviting Member countries to strengthen the links between CFS policy processes and outcomes and ongoing initiatives and agendas of regional intergovernmental mechanisms and organisations, to strengthen policy coherence at this level.

39. Point (iii) of the recommendation is addressed under Actions A3.1 and A3.2 of the Consultation Report for the preparation of the response to the CFS evaluation¹, endorsed at CFS 44.

Actions to be taken	Implementing body	Timeframe	Further funding

¹ Consultation Report for the preparation of the response to the CFS Evaluation with draft decision, CFS 2017/44/12 Rev.1.

			required (Y or N)
A7.1. Prepare a proposal for actions that could be taken by Members, supported where needed by other stakeholders, to improve the functioning of CFS and to better promote the dissemination, use and application of CFS policy outcomes.	Bureau, in consultation with the Advisory Group	By June 2018	N

Recommendation 8

40. The Committee and the Bureau should clarify the expectations that they have of the position of Chairperson beyond the chairing of the Plenary and the Bureau/Advisory Group meetings. This clarification should include what are the expected outcomes of the outreach activities of the position, and these should be taken into account in the planning and budgeting of the Committee's activities. The role of the position of Chairperson with regard to the CFS Secretariat should also be clarified so that 'grey' areas are addressed. This may necessitate a review and revision of the terms of reference of the Secretary. The Chairperson, RBAs and the Secretary should agree on a protocol for reporting from the CFS Secretariat.

Recommendation is accepted

41. The Chairperson plays an important political and strategic role in Rome and beyond to achieve the CFS vision and objectives. Having experience as a Permanent Representative/ Member of a Permanent Representation and familiarity with the work of CFS and the RBAs is important, enabling wider reach and influence among the Membership and the RBAs.

42. CFS will clarify the role of Chairperson beyond chairing CFS Plenary and Bureau and Advisory Group meetings. Terms of Reference for the position of Chairperson will be developed, considering the following points:

- i) Providing strategic leadership to the Committee;
- ii) Raising of the CFS profile by promoting CFS as an inclusive international and intergovernmental platform and championing the outcomes and work of CFS in Rome and appropriate other fora;
- iii) Outreach and engagement with stakeholders at global, regional and national levels, in consultation with the Bureau, taking into account available resources and expected outcomes, consistent with the response to Recommendation 11 of the evaluation to be prepared in 2018;
- iv) Building trust amongst stakeholders and promoting coherence in food security and nutrition work;
- v) Advocating for the use of CFS policy work by stakeholders, including in the context of the Agenda 2030;
- vi) Playing a leadership role in intersessional work towards reaching consensus among stakeholders and the ongoing engagement and collaboration with the RBAs;
- vii) Contributing to expanding the funding base from the Membership and other stakeholders, through political support and advocacy for resource mobilization.

43. The Terms of Reference of the Secretary will be reviewed, ensuring clarity and coherence with the Terms of Reference of the Chairperson, and the roles and functions of the Bureau. Any changes to the Terms of Reference of the Secretary will take into consideration the political function of the Chairperson; the technical/administrative functions of the Secretary as well as the applicable rules and regulations of FAO. The accountabilities of the CFS Chairperson, Secretary and FAO will be clarified and reporting lines between them will be made explicit, taking into account the experience of other committees. This will result in greater mutual transparency and accountability.

Actions to be taken	Implementing body	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)
A8.1. Develop Terms of Reference for the position of CFS Chairperson	CFS Bureau, seeking additional inputs as needed (e.g. Advisory Group, FAO Legal Office, other Committees, Secretary, RBAs)	By March 2018	N
A8.2. Review Terms of Reference of Secretary, clarifying accountabilities and reporting lines	CFS Bureau, seeking additional inputs as needed (e.g. Advisory Group, FAO Legal Office, other Committees, Secretary, RBAs)	By March 2018	N

Recommendation 9

44. The structure of the CFS Secretariat should be revised to ensure that the Secretariat can effectively support the work of the Committee, and to ensure efficient utilization of staff. The levels and terms of reference of all positions should be reviewed and revised as necessary. It is essential that the RBAs fill vacant secondments within a reasonable timeframe to ensure continuity in the operations of the CFS Secretariat. It is recommended that there be a formal agreement between the Committee and the RBAs on the secondment of staff, including an agreement to fill secondments within the timeframes they use to fill vacancies in their respective agencies.

Recommendation 9 is accepted

45. The structure of the CFS Secretariat will be reviewed and revised as appropriate to ensure that the Secretariat can effectively support CFS and to make the most efficient use of staff and resources, and the results presented to the Bureau. The RBAs support this recommendation and indicated willingness to review and revise levels and terms of reference of the positions in the joint CFS Secretariat. They will prepare a joint proposal with the Secretariat. The existing provision to invite other UN entities to contribute staff according to the needs of the Secretariat will continue to apply². The structure will allow flexibility in order to take into account the agreed workstreams in the MYPoW and specific priorities and needs. The expected contribution from Technical Task Teams is

² See modalities and requirements in "Inclusion in the Secretariat of other UN entities" in CFS 2013/40/10/Rev.1

addressed in Action A6.3 through the establishment of Terms of Reference for alternative working arrangements which includes Technical Task Teams.

46. The RBAs will strengthen coordination amongst themselves and look for efficient ways to ensure that the biennial commitments linked to Recommendation 3 (iii) are met on a timely basis, through either secondments, staff loans, consultants, or the equivalent funds, in line with the guiding principles in Action A3.3. The provision of financial and staffing support to the joint CFS Secretariat is already a priority within the current RBA collaboration agreement and the RBAs will consider ways to strengthen this as necessary³.

Actions to be taken	Implementing body	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)
A9.1. Review the levels and Terms of Reference of all positions in the joint CFS Secretariat and submit to the Bureau for consultation	RBAs, in collaboration with the CFS Secretary	By March 2018	N
A9.2. Ensure the agreed RBAs contributions to the joint CFS Secretariat are met in a timely manner	RBAs	On-going	N

Recommendation 10

47. CFS should develop an overarching framework that spells out its role in various activities that it has grouped together as monitoring. A great deal of confusion has been created by the generic use of the term to cover different but interrelated functions. CFS should align its terminology and approach with that of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. The following approach is recommended for CFS role in promoting accountability and sharing good practices at all levels:

- i) The function of CFS is to follow up and review progress made with the implementation of the main CFS policy products and recommendations from the policy workstreams. These are periodic reviews and there should be a schedule for the reviews taking place during the biennium.
- ii) The function of CFS is to convene special events to share experiences and good practices. These events can be informed by intelligence gathered through the periodic reviews.
- iii) Detailed monitoring of policies, programmes and plans are the responsibility of national governments. CFS should consider conducting a voluntary survey every two years to obtain information on use and application of CFS products and policy recommendations.
- iv) CFS should commission independent evaluations when required, on major aspects of its work.

³ See: CL 155/12 Rev.2 <http://www.fao.org/3/a-mr918rev1e.pdf>; WFP/EB.2/2016/4-D/Rev.1 <http://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/eb/wfp286749.pdf>; EB 2016/119/R.45; <https://webapps.ifad.org/members/eb/119/docs/EB-2016-119-R-45.pdf>

- v) It is essential that the process decisions and recommendations of CFS are monitored and reported on. The CFS Secretariat should improve the current system of tracking them. The system should at a minimum identify the decision, the action taken, and the reasons for deviation or non-completion of the action.

Recommendation is partially accepted

48. As stated in the CFS 44 Final Report (CFS2017/44/Report), monitoring has an important role in improving the effectiveness of the work of CFS. CFS recognizes the importance for stakeholders to have a common understanding of the CFS monitoring function, which is not presently the case. The five elements of the approach recommended by the evaluation team do not cover all monitoring activities that were previously endorsed by CFS, specifically country in-depth voluntary assessments and the incremental development of an innovative monitoring mechanism for CFS. The implementation of Recommendations 1 and 2, which are expected to clarify how CFS intends to achieve its vision, might influence what to monitor, how and by whom.

49. The approach to monitoring should consider resource availability, cost-effectiveness and CFS added value in monitoring. The approach should take advantage of possible synergies with other systems, in particular within the RBAs, and not duplicate existing monitoring mechanisms acknowledging on-going reporting including for the Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development and the Second International Conference on Nutrition (ICN2).

50. CFS agrees with Points (i) and (ii) of the recommendation (i.e. conduct of periodic reviews to take stock of progress in implementing main CFS policy products and recommendations and the convening of events to share experiences and good practices), which are part of the monitoring approach endorsed by CFS 44⁴. Global events are expected to contribute to raising awareness and understanding of CFS and CFS policy work, issues addressed in the response to Recommendations 7 and 11. Independent evaluations, mentioned under Point (iv), may be useful providing the scope of such evaluations is carefully defined as CFS products are implemented on a voluntary basis, and evaluations are subject to resource availability. Point (v) has been addressed in the 2017 Annual Progress Report (CFS2017/44/INF/22) where detailed progress is monitored on implementing the decisions and recommendations of CFS 43 through the OEWGs and the Bureau and Advisory Group and Bureau meetings.

51. The regular conduct of a voluntary survey (Point (iii) of the recommendation) is considered cost-effective, bringing important information at low cost, and is part of the monitoring approach endorsed at CFS 41. It is important to provide precise guidelines to stakeholders to help them answer questions meaningfully. The role of CFS in conducting voluntary in-depth country assessments and in helping countries and regions monitor progress towards agreed food security and nutrition objectives through the development of an innovative monitoring mechanism⁵ should be further discussed, considering:

- The conclusions of the Evaluation (detailed monitoring of national policies, programmes and plans are the responsibility of national governments).

⁴ "Monitoring the implementation of CFS main policy products and other CFS policy recommendations – with draft decision", (CFS 2017/44/11).

⁵ "...CFS should help countries and regions, as appropriate, address the questions of whether objectives are being achieved and how food insecurity and malnutrition can be reduced more quickly and effectively. This will entail developing an innovative mechanism, including the definition of common indicators, to monitor progress towards these agreed upon objectives and actions taking into account lessons learned from previous CFS and other monitoring attempts..." (CFS Reform Document, CFS: 2009/2 Rev.2, paragraph 6 ii)

- The fact that no country in-depth assessment has been undertaken since the decision was made at CFS 41, as no country has volunteered and no resources have been made available, and terms of reference for them were not agreed.
- Monitoring of trends and progress in achieving the FSN targets of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development is already carried out under “The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World” (SOFI) and the Regional Panoramas on Food Security and Nutrition. The Voluntary National Reviews (VNRs) on progress towards achieving the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, report on the implementation of national policies, programmes and plans related to FSN and sustainable agriculture in the context of the Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development, and CFS has been providing space to discuss and learn about country progress through the VNRs since CFS 43.

Actions to be taken	Implementing body	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)
A10.1. Taking into account previous discussions, decisions and experience gained, review the framework for monitoring in CFS, clarifying the roles of CFS at all levels.	Bureau, after consultation with the Advisory Group	By June 2018	N

Recommendation 11

52. CFS should adopt the principle that communication about CFS is the responsibility of all CFS Members and Participants, supported by the communication function in the CFS Secretariat. Consideration should be given to having Bureau Members facilitate an outreach activity in the respective regions. This will spread the responsibility of communicating and profiling CFS at regional levels. Non-Bureau Members should be requested to facilitate an outreach activity in their respective countries. The CFS Secretariat can assist by developing short information briefs, including a standardized presentation on CFS. These information briefs can be used by members of the Advisory Group in their outreach activities, should they need the assistance. The RBAs have a critical role to play in the dissemination and application of CFS policy products and recommendations at country level, and the Committee through the Bureau should request them to intensify their communication efforts.

Recommendation is partially accepted

53. Communication is the responsibility of all CFS Members and Participants, including the RBAs and other UN bodies, CGIAR, CSM, PSM and philanthropic and financial institutions. Communication refers to two distinct sets of activities: (i) activities aiming at raising awareness of CFS and its work and (ii) activities towards the use and application of CFS products and recommendations at country level for which Member countries have primary responsibility, as mentioned in the response to Recommendation 7. These two sets of activities are distinct but can be mutually reinforcing to promote the uptake of CFS policy guidelines and recommendations.

54. The CFS Secretariat should continue to focus on raising awareness of CFS and its work through the CFS website and social media, reporting to global bodies such as UN ECOSOC and sharing information with other UN bodies as appropriate, and supporting, subject to available resources, outreach efforts of the CFS Chairperson and Vice Chair in consultation with the Bureau.

55. The RBAs have a key role to play in facilitating the use and application of CFS products and recommendations at country level. They provide advice and technical support on specific topics, at the request of the countries, drawing upon various resources including the work of CFS. Therefore, in response to countries' requests, the RBAs should continue to leverage their interactions with national authorities and stakeholders to actively promote CFS and mainstream its work into policies and programmes, where relevant to their priorities.

56. The CFS communication strategy⁶ endorsed by the Committee at its 40th session in 2013 will be reviewed to promote CFS and its work and the use and application of CFS policy products and recommendations at country level. The strategy will include activities, specific roles and responsibilities and a timeline for implementation.

57. The implementation of the communication and outreach strategy will be subject to resource availability.

Actions to be taken	Implementing body	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)
A11.1. Revise the CFS communication and outreach strategy to support the dissemination, use and application of CFS policy products and recommendations, and raise awareness of CFS.	Secretariat, with advice from RBAs, and after consultation with the Bureau & Advisory Group	By June 2018	N

Recommendation 12

58. Member countries are encouraged to disseminate the HLPE reports to the relevant ministries at country level. The RBAs should consider the HLPE reports in their programme of work.

Recommendation is partially accepted

59. The HLPE is fundamental to CFS work. The HLPE is commissioned by CFS to develop independent, scientific, evidence-based reports to support stakeholders in making informed decisions in the policy convergence process. HLPE reports are freely available on the HLPE website in all UN languages.

60. HLPE reports are background documents for CFS. They are used as a basis for the Committee to reach agreement on policy convergence through an inclusive process. CFS policy recommendations are then presented to Plenary for endorsement. CFS stakeholders are encouraged to continue disseminating HLPE reports to the relevant ministries at country level, recognizing that they are not CFS-endorsed policy recommendations. The RBAs are encouraged to consider CFS-endorsed policy recommendations in their programme of work.

61. This recommendation will be considered in the implementation of the response to Recommendation 7. CFS recognizes that more time should be dedicated to engaging and discussing the findings and substance of the HLPE reports before embarking on the policy convergence process. HLPE reports could include both convergent and divergent views as these could be innovative and

⁶ Communication Strategy for the Committee on World Food Security, CFS 2013/40/4.

useful to discuss. More focus should be placed on the proper and better use of these reports on furthering the work of CFS Plenary and the Bureau.

Recommendation 13

62. The Chairperson of the HLPE Steering Committee should interact with the Bureau and Advisory Group to keep them abreast of developments with the work of the HLPE. Such informational briefings do not pose a threat to the independence of the HLPE, and can serve to encourage Bureau and Advisory Group Members to promote the work of the HLPE. Similar discussions should take place between the CFS and HLPE Secretariats, so that there is a mutual appreciation of each other's work.

Recommendation is accepted

63. The HLPE Steering Committee, through the Chairperson of the Steering Committee, has on various occasions, interacted with the Bureau and Advisory Group and presented its work at Bureau and Advisory Group meetings and intervened at the OEWG meetings, including through teleconference.

64. The collective nature of HLPE work will benefit from interaction between the Bureau and Advisory Group and the HLPE Steering Committee as a whole. More regular and sustained interaction between the HLPE Steering Committee and the Bureau and Advisory Group, in particular on substantive issues, is important for CFS to maximise the value it receives from the HLPE in supporting CFS policy convergence work. Interaction should be focused on substantive issues, with requests for HLPE input sent to the HLPE Steering Committee in advance of the meetings. Such interaction could continue to be in the form of a joint informal meeting between the whole Steering Committee and the Bureau and Advisory Group, scheduled to be held after each renewal of the Steering Committee, plus through additional engagement with the Chairperson and/or Project team leaders at particular points. Regular interaction between the Chairpersons (CFS and HLPE Steering Committee) would also be useful to build stronger mutual understanding of the work of CFS and the role of the HLPE in supporting it.

65. Regular procedural and budget updates regarding HLPE work are given at each meeting of the Bureau and Advisory Group as part of CFS workstream updates. The HLPE coordinator based in Rome attends these meetings and answers procedural queries related to the work of the HLPE, or can assist in conveying these to the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee is also ready to prepare focused interventions on specific issues upon request by CFS made in advance.

66. CFS agrees that greater interaction between the HLPE and the Bureau and Advisory Group does not pose a threat to the independence of the HLPE and could result in better use of the work of the HLPE in CFS, recognizing that HLPE reports are not CFS-endorsed policy recommendations

67. Coordination and collaboration between the HLPE Secretariat and CFS Secretariat could be further intensified to maximise efficiency and effective use of resources.

Actions to be taken	Implementing body	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)
A13.1. Propose how and when to lift engagement with the HLPE Steering Committee to discuss substantive issues in order to improve the use of HLPE outputs in CFS.	CFS Bureau, after consultation with the Advisory Group	June 2018	N

Actions to be taken	Implementing body	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)
A13.2. Propose how to improve coordination and engagement between the CFS and HLPE Secretariats to maximise efficiency and effectiveness and inform the Bureau.	CFS Secretary and HLPE Coordinator	June 2018	N
A13.3. Provide advice and focused interventions on substantive issues at the request of CFS, as a complement to the main HLPE products (typically substantive reports).	HLPE Steering Committee based on Bureau request, subject to HLPE resources	On-going	N

Recommendation 14

68. The HLPE Steering Committee should address the concerns raised by interviewees, and misunderstandings regarding the processes for calling for project experts. This entails reviewing the existing communication processes for calling for experts to identify improvements. The Committee should also take steps to improve the accessibility of HLPE reports to non-technical readers.

Recommendation is accepted

69. CFS acknowledges the HLPE's efforts in ensuring the transparency of the selection process of the HLPE project team members, as well as the timing and dissemination of the call for their nominations. CFS emphasizes the importance of ensuring scientific and technical relevance as well as gender balance and regional representation in the selection process.

70. Transparency of the selection process and the call for nominations of project team members will be improved through:

- Providing more detailed information to the candidates in future calls for nominations on the selection process, selection criteria and the time commitment expected from each project team member, as well as feedback to candidates once the process is completed. The calls will include a link to the "Internal procedures and methodological guidelines for the work of the HLPE".
- Ensuring a wider diffusion of the calls for project team members. The calls will be sent to CFS stakeholders, including the Bureau and Advisory Group Members; other CFS Members, Participants and Observers; HLPE Steering Committee Members; academic institutions worldwide; experts that have been involved in the HLPE in the past, including external peer reviewers; those who have contributed to HLPE open e-consultations organized by FAO's Global Forum on Food Security and Nutrition.

71. The HLPE has taken steps to ensure that their reports are accessible to a diverse audience, both in terms of their substance and format. The HLPE will give specific attention to the format and readability of future reports and consider the following:

- Having future reports also reviewed by non-experts in order to assess their readability.
- For future reports preparing a shorter document containing the main findings and recommendations of the full report, adapted to diverse readers, subject to the HLPE workload and available resources.

72. CFS underlines the importance of timely translation of HLPE reports to make them more accessible to stakeholders and ensure inclusiveness and participation in the policy convergence process. This will be discussed under the implementation of Action A2.47, as the budget for MYPoW activities is expected to be established during the MYPoW comprehensive planning phase.

Actions to be taken	Implementing body	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)
A14.1. Provide more detailed information to the candidates on the selection process, selection criteria and the time commitment expected from each project team member for future calls for nominations, and provide to the CFS Bureau more detailed statistics on the candidates.	HLPE Secretariat	On-going	N
A14.2 Ensure a wider diffusion of the calls for project team members.	HLPE Secretariat	On-going	N
A14.3. Improve the accessibility of HLPE reports, including to non-technical readers by giving specific attention to the format and readability of future reports.	HLPE Steering Committee	On-going	Y

⁷ Consultation report for the preparation of the response to the CFS evaluation with draft decision (CFS 2017/44/12/Rev.1.