

Implementation of the CFS Evaluation  
Recommendations 1 and 2  
Comments by PSM  
(24 January 2018)

**Clarification of what CFS seeks to achieve, how and by whom**

1. Does the results chain reflect the results expected from CFS (outputs and outcomes)?

PSM response: The development of a “results chain for CFS” is an important initiative and welcomed by PSM as it provides the basis for analysis and discussion. The results chain provides a good basis by which to address the Q1 posed by the co-facilitators and has both positive and negative features. Overall however, the results chain does not give the necessary confidence that the needed outputs and the consequent outcomes can be delivered. Secondly, given the primacy of the 2030 Agenda, this needs to be clearly shown in the Results Chain, potentially at several levels.

Points highlighted by PSM are as follows:

- It is correct to categorise the outputs and activities of CFS as being under the control of the CFS. The budget approved by CFS and the human resources allocated to the activities to produce the outputs are a function of the MYPoW and CFS approved budget. It does highlight however, the need to ensure adequate budgetary resources are available otherwise, as the Evaluation points out, activities do not take place in a timely or planned manner and the outputs achieved are below expectations.
- The activities listed, as a function of MYPoW and work of the Secretariat are, in effect two items: CFS workstream activities and communication and outreach activities. However, the discussions on Recommendations 7 and 11 have illustrated that the output ‘information shared....’ is not being as effectively achieved as intended. This leaves a single activity, ‘CFS workstream activities’ as the sole driver for the remaining ‘expected’ outputs listed. As pointed out by PSM during previous Evaluation discussions, this places emphasis on the CFS activities (as approved by MYPoW) to be adequately financed and with clear ToRs and results which can be monitored.

- The outputs already delivered (and those planned) by CFS should be able to contribute to the Outcomes that include Roles 1 and 2. But as correctly noted, the achievement of these roles are outside the control of CFS. The identification of relevant assumptions in the results chain would allow the risks associated with these outcomes/roles to be addressed. However, it is not clear from the results chain (and as confirmed by the evaluation) that the Outcomes associated with Roles 3, 4 and 5 are being achieved and that there are no clear activities or outputs which comprehensively support their achievement.

2. In the results chain, each of the six CFS roles has been associated with the expected result when the role is performed:

(i) How and by whom should these roles be performed, in particular roles 3, 4 and 5?

PSM response: The lack of clearly funded and resourced activities to produce outputs that support Roles 3, 4 and 5 raises concerns about the validity of the current Results Chain displayed. The Reform Document introduced the need for Phasing of Roles and as Action A1.1 indicates, the contribution of the Roles in achieving the vision of CFS needs to be 'clarified'. It may therefore be an option to modify the current Results Chain to include Roles 1 and 2 only and develop a second Results Chain that shows the Outcomes associated with roles 3, 4 and 5 as a second phase and introduce clearly defined activities and resulting outputs that would be needed these Outcomes. The activities required would build on the initial discussions on Recommendations 7 and 11 conducted in November 2017 and on January 19<sup>th</sup> 2018. As indicated in the revised Recommendation 7 this requires further detailed planning and discussion as they would principally occur at country and/or regional level.

(ii) What are the responsibilities of members and RBAs in implementing roles 3, 4 and 5?

PSM response: PSM would concur with the remarks by both FAO and IFAD on January 19<sup>th</sup> that indicated that RBAs work more effectively when specifically requested for action/support by member countries. PSM would welcome member countries' guidance on moving forward with roles 3 and 4 and PSM, as discussed with/requested by member countries during the bilateral meetings

conducted during CFS, would welcome the opportunity for further discussions on this type of engagement.

PSM would recommend that part of role 5 be developed as a function of the response to Recommendation 5 of the evaluation concerning the role of Plenary. However, PSM would suggest that assisting countries to monitor progress toward achieving their FSN objectives is beyond the scope of CFS and that the broader issues of accountability as regards CFS activities are being considered as part of Recommendation 10 and should be based on results framework associated with the MYPoW and not as separate monitoring programme.

(iii) How is CFS as a Committee expected to contribute to these roles? What are budget implications?

PSM response: The Committee could, in the case of roles 3 and 4, ask member countries to express interest in becoming pilot countries to implement those roles and assess the effectiveness and efficiency of such interventions. Budgetary support for these country/regional initiatives would be outside core CFS budgetary resources and require targeted funding, presumably from key donors in the countries concerned. This may require CFS secretariat/RBAs to develop short, country specific, funding proposals and using the respective country offices as needed for support/coordination, but on an incremental budget basis.

### **Proposed strategic objectives for CFS as a Committee for the next MYPoW**

3. Are the proposed strategic objectives adequate to guide CFS work as a Committee including prioritizing CFS activities, in the next MYPoW?

PSM response: The PSM welcomes the proposal to establish strategic objectives (SOs) and has two comments. Firstly, the SOs listed appear to be restatements of CFS roles and while linkage to some roles (e.g. Roles 1 and 2) would be appropriate, there needs to be a stronger linkage to the 2030 Agenda. A revised CFS global objective is suggested below and this should have stronger linkages to the proposed strategic objectives.

Secondly, the statement of objectives (equally applicable for platforms, programmes, agencies and companies) needs to be clearly stated, measurable and with a time bound delivery. The current three SOs do not provide this clarity. For example, SO1 'Platform' includes activities and outputs that can be applied to the Results Chain for CFS but does not actually give an objective. The statement "identify policy implications...." is an output and is already stated as an output in

the Results Chain diagram. The phrase to “use CFS’s inclusive, evidence based platform....” is listed as an activity (CFS workstream activity) in the results chain.

SO3 is also a restatement of activities and outputs which have been raised during the evaluation discussions on Recommendations 7 and 11. To recast this SO would require the question to be asked: What has changed or occurred if specific CFS products (give names) are used at country (how many countries) and regional (which region) level? The answer to that, and the process of developing that answer, would be the strategic objective.

### **MYPoW**

4. Do you agree with the proposed MYPoW structure?

PSM response: The CFS global objective (A2) should be merged into the CFS Vision (A1).

B2 (Results for 2020-23 should be given as the global objective. It is a more specific objective, measurable at country level and time bound. It would serve as a clear statement of CFS intentions over the next 5-7 years and provide a basis for resource mobilisation and communication.

The process of establishing outputs/activities and indicators could follow the suggested approach and linkage to strategic objectives, on the assumption that the SOs had been more clearly formulated. As outputs would be linked, at a minimum, to one biennium and as discussed in the evaluation, considered over two biennium, the activities would need to respond to this timeframe to allow proper allocation of resources over the period. Annual changes could be required but would need to fit into the overall results chain, unless new funding sources were made available.

5. What changes would you suggest to the criteria endorsed at CFS 42 (CFS 2015/42/12) for selecting MYPoW activities?

PSM response:

1. Align MYPoW to the Results Chain with clear link between the activities in the MYPoW and the Results Chain.
2. Any MYPoW presented at the CFS Plenary should include clear action orientated results and allocated budget to prioritized workstreams.
3. When there are funding deficits, the Bureau and Advisory Group should prioritise MYPoW workstreams to establish which key workstreams will be taken forward.

4. MYPoW should adopt a new process to take on and agree on new work:
  - Year 1 CFS frames the issue, develops ToR for the work, outlines the planned outcome (guidelines, convening), and speaks to those on the ground about what type of outcome they need.
  - MYPoW reviews this after year 1 and scope length of process needed to develop product properly
  - Commission HLPE work to fill those gaps, and other work
  - Plan for adequate length of OEWG work and negotiations
  - MYPoW should also allocate plenary time as a vital resource and ensure s promotion of work in other UN fora.
5. Include annual follow up and review process of MYPoW implementation.