



COMMITTEE ON WORLD FOOD SECURITY

Forty-fourth Session
"Making a Difference in Food Security and Nutrition"

Rome, Italy, 9-13 October 2017

**CONSULTATION REPORT FOR THE PREPARATION OF THE
RESPONSE OF THE CFS EVALUATION
WITH DRAFT DECISION**

MATTERS TO BE BROUGHT TO THE ATTENTION OF THE COMMITTEE

The Committee considered the document CFS 2017/44/12 Rev.1 "Consultation report for the preparation of the response to the evaluation", as presented by Dr. Khaled El Taweel (Egypt) and Mr Jón Erlingur (Iceland), co-facilitators of the process.

The Committee:

- a) Expresses its appreciation to Dr. Khaled El Taweel, Egypt, and Mr Jón Erlingur, Iceland, for facilitating the preparation of the response to the evaluation leading up to CFS 44.
- b) Endorses the "Consultation report for the preparation of the response to the evaluation" (CFS 2017/44/12 Rev.1).
- c) Requests the Bureau, after consultation with the Advisory Group, seeking additional input as needed, to:
 - Finalize the Plan of Action for endorsement at CFS 45, as outlined in Annex 1 of document CFS 2017/44/12 Rev.1, by preparing the response to all recommendations that have not been presented to CFS 44.
 - Implement the response to the recommendations that do not require plenary endorsement, as listed in Annex 2 of document 2017/44/12 Rev.1, and report to CFS 45.
 - Implement the response to Recommendations 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 9, based on the indications in document CFS 2017/44/12 Rev.1, and report to CFS 45

*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*



mu233

- d) Requests the Bureau to implement the response to Recommendation 8, seeking additional input as needed, considering the indications in document CFS 2017/44/12 Rev.1, and report to CFS 45.
- e) Decides, exceptionally, that the Bureau may appoint its Advisory Group until March 2018 and thereafter consider if changes are needed in the composition of the Advisory Group for the remainder of the Bureau's term, taking into account the implementation of the response to Recommendation 4 and the need for any plenary decisions.

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This report presents the results of the consultation process that was conducted in June-July 2017 for the preparation of the response to the CFS independent evaluation leading up to CFS 44. The process was co-facilitated by Dr. Khaled El Taweel, Egypt, and Mr Jón Erlingur, Iceland, who were nominated by the CFS Bureau. The process included a series of meetings: inclusive meetings on 1 and 5 June, 11 and 14 July, 26 and 28 September, and an extended Bureau and Advisory Group meeting on 7 June and extended Bureau Retreat on 8 June. The report includes proposed actions made in response to evaluation recommendations 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8 and 9 on which consensus was reached among CFS stakeholders during the consultation process and captures on-going or completed work that is relevant to address the evaluation recommendations. The roadmap will present the indicative schedule to prepare the response to all the evaluation recommendations that have not been presented to CFS 44, building on the results of the consultation process.

2. The final CFS Evaluation report was circulated to all CFS stakeholders in April 2017. The Evaluation underlined that the 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 reports of the High-Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition (HLPE). It recognized CFS contribution towards enhancing global coordination on food security and nutrition issues. The Evaluation has presented 14 recommendations to improve 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. The Plan of Action will be completed during the 2018 intersessional period and presented at CFS 45 for endorsement, as time was not sufficient to discuss and agree on a response to all recommendations for CFS 44. The response to Recommendations 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8 and 9 will be implemented during the 2018 intersessional period, based on the indications of the Consultation Report, together with the other recommendations that do not require Plenary endorsement.

RESPONSE TO SELECTED EVALUATION RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1

4. The Committee should direct the Bureau to lead the development of a strategic plan/framework to guide CFS's work 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 paper 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 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. 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 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 consider 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 Paper of the HLPE, and information on what other global actors are doing in 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 Rome-Based Agencies and WHO are well-placed to provide information on national priorities and national platforms.

Recommendation is partially accepted

9. CFS is the only multi-stakeholder platform within the UN system for global coordination on food security and nutrition. 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 MYPoW and expand MYPoW 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 CFS’ vision, clarifying the contribution of the 6 roles of CFS set out in the Reform Document to achieving CFS 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 MYPoW will cross-reference global priorities (2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development), issues raised in HLPE Critical and Emerging Issues Note and RBAs 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 work streams 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 extrabudgetary 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 RBAs 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 RBAs;
- Potential duplication with other bodies;
- Expected added value taking into account CFS roles and vision; and
- Potential synergy across issues.

14. The preparation of 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

or not the activity. The decision to include new activities in 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 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 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 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 (FAO, IFAD and WFP), who provide 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 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 Chair). The full amount contributed by the RBAs has to be agreed by all three based on the respective governing body decision. 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 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 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 CFS donor base, including by reaching out to CFS Member States as well as private foundations and the private sector, and financial institutions.
- iii) (a) 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.
- iii) (b) CFS members will request RBAs to adjust their contribution in a sustainable way to cover the core budget for CFS Plenary and Workstreams starting from 2020-21 biennium.
- iv) Accounting of actual expenditure for CFS Plenary and Workstreams, HLPE, CSM and PSM is now being incorporated into the CFS Annual Progress Report, which is an annual information session document, starting from 2017 Annual Progress Report. Budget allocation decisions are stated under the assumptions section of the budget table in 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 Chair, 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 Chair	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
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 AG	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 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 multi-stakeholder 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 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 food security and nutrition 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 food security and nutrition, 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 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 food security and nutrition, ensuring a balance with the decision-making function of Plenary. This would reinforce 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

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 MYPoW and budgeting. The status of the 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 a policy-related OEWG, there should be a date for the expiry of the term of the OEWG. Terms of reference should include roles and responsibilities of the 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 Open Ended Working Groups (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 CFS' contribution to 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 HLPF) 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 8

36. 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

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

38. 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 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) Advocacy for the use of CFS products by stakeholders, including in the context of the Sustainable Development Goals;
- (vi) Playing a leadership role in intersessional work towards reaching consensus among stakeholders and the ongoing engagement and collaboration with RBAs;
- (vii) Contributing to expanding the funding base from membership and other stakeholders, through political support and advocacy for resource mobilization.

39. The Terms of Reference of the Secretary will be reviewed, ensuring clarity and coherence with the Terms of Reference of the Chair, 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 Chair; the technical/administrative functions of the Secretary as well as the applicable rules and regulations of FAO. The accountabilities of CFS Chair, 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

40. 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 Rome-Based Agencies on the secondment of staff, including an agreement to fill secondments within the timeframes they use to fill vacancies in their respective agencies.

Recommendation is accepted

41. 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 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 apply¹. The structure will allow flexibility in order to take into account the agreed workstreams in MYPoW and specific priorities and needs. The expected contribution from Technical Task Teams is addressed in Action A6.3 through the establishment of Terms of Reference for alternative working arrangements which includes Technical Task Teams.

42. RBAs will strengthen coordination amongst themselves and look for efficient ways to ensure that the biennial commitments linked to Rec 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

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

priority within the current RBA collaboration agreement and RBAs will consider ways to strengthen this as necessary².

Actions to be taken	Implementing body	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)
A9.1. Review the levels and TORs 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	No
A9.2. Ensure the agreed RBAs' contributions to the joint CFS Secretariat are met in a timely manner	RBAs	On-going	No

² 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>

ANNEX 1

Roadmap for the preparation of the Plan of Action in response to the CFS Evaluation

Introduction

The roadmap presents the strategy to prepare the response to all evaluation recommendations that have not been presented at CFS 44 for information or endorsement, building on the results of the consultation process. The report of the CFS Evaluation was finalized in April 2017 and proposed 14 recommendations. An inclusive consultation process was conducted from June 2017 to September 2017 to prepare the response to recommendations 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8 and 9, as well as the roadmap.

Process

The CFS Bureau has the responsibility of preparing the Plan of Action for presentation to Plenary in response to the CFS Evaluation. It oversaw the consultation process from June 2017 to September 2017 leading to CFS 44 through the nomination of two members of the Bureau as co-facilitators, Mr Khaled El Taweel, Egypt, and Mr Jón Erlingur, Iceland. It is proposed that the Bureau, after consultation with the Advisory Group, seeking additional input as needed, finalizes the preparation of the Plan of Action during the 2018 intersessional period.

The improvements proposed to address the evaluation findings that go beyond the evaluation recommendations will be incorporated into the responses to the related recommendations.

Timeframe

The Plan of Action will be completed during the 2018 intersessional period and the responses to the evaluation recommendations that were not presented at CFS 44 for endorsement will be presented at CFS 45, some of them for endorsement and others for information. A total of 5 Bureau & Advisory Group meetings (in blue) and Bureau meeting (in orange) are envisaged for completing the Plan of Action from November 2017 to March 2018, as shown in the following indicative calendar of meetings. The format and content of the Plan of Action are presented thereafter.

Indicative Calendar of Meetings (November 2017 – March 2018)



DATE	PRELIMINARY AGENDA	CONCURRENT REQUEST FOR INPUTS
NOV 2017 (1/2day)	Discussion on recommendations 7 & 12 ³ 7: Actions by CFS members to improve CFS 12: Dissemination of HLPE reports	<u>Recommendation 11</u> (Responsibilities for communication and outreach activities) Send questionnaire to governments for indication of interest to hold events at regional/national level
Late JAN 2018 (1/2day)	Discussion on recommendations 10 & 11 ⁴ 10: Developing an overarching monitoring framework 11: Responsibilities for communication and activities	<u>Recommendations 13 & 14</u> (Updates on HLPE work to the Bureau & Advisory Group & Review HLPE process on calling for experts) Consultative meeting with HLPE
FEB 2018 (1/2day)	Discussion on recommendations 13 & 14 ⁵ 13: Updates on HLPE work to the Bureau & Advisory Group 14: Review HLPE process on calling for experts	
FEB 2018 (full day)	Discuss drafted responses to recommendations 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14	
MAR 2018 (full day)	Agree on drafted responses to recommendations 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14	

³ Recommendations 7 and 12 relate to actions CFS members could undertake to improve CFS and should be discussed together

⁴ Recommendations 10 and 11 related to dissemination and monitoring of CFS products and should be discussed together

⁵ Recommendations 13 and 14 relate to the functioning of HLPE and its processes and should be discussed together

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

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
Evaluation Recommendation	Response 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	Implementing body	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)		
Recommendation x	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 on additional funding	

ANNEX 2

Categorization of recommendations for the preparation of the response to the Evaluation

Original Recommendations by the Evaluation	Categorization		
	I: Submitted at CFS 44 for endorsement II: May not require Plenary endorsement; Bureau to decide if it is to be submitted to CFS 45 for information or for endorsement III: Planned to be submitted for endorsement at CFS 45		
	Category I	Category II	Category III
1. Developing a Strategic Plan	For endorsement		
2. Revising MYPoW structure and process	For endorsement		
3. Ways to secure a sustainable CFS budget	For endorsement		
4. Reviewing composition and processes of Bureau & Advisory Group	For endorsement		For endorsement if there are changes to the Rules of Procedures IV or Plenary decisions
5. Making plenary more vibrant	For endorsement		
6. Streamlining OEWGs	For endorsement		
7. Actions by CFS members to improve CFS		II	
8. Expectations of CFS Chairperson	For endorsement		For endorsement if there are changes to the Rules of Procedures II or Plenary decisions
9. Revising structure of CFS Secretariat	For endorsement		For endorsement if there are changes to the Rules of Procedures VI or Plenary decisions
10. Developing an overarching monitoring framework			For endorsement
11. Responsibilities for communication & activities		II	

Original Recommendations by the Evaluation	Categorization		
12. Disseminating and using of HLPE reports		II	
13. Updates on HLPE work to the Bureau & Advisory Group		II	
14. Review HLPE process on calling for experts		II	For endorsement if there are changes to the Rules of Procedures V or Plenary decisions