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Introduction
The vision of the reformed CFS is to “constitute the foremost inclusive international and intergovernmental platform for a broad range of committed stakeholders to work together in a coordinated manner and in support of country-led processes towards the elimination of hunger and ensuring food security and nutrition for all human beings.” CFS is often cited as an example of an UN body that has been able to reform itself to play an important role and is the only UN Committee cited in UN General Assembly’s resolution on the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Eight years on from its reform the Committee has developed an inclusive way of working that has led to global consensus on a number of policy guidance tools including those that took several years to develop (VGGT, RAI, and FFA).

At the time of the reform a major challenge was finding the right balance between inclusiveness and effectiveness. CFS has been able to demonstrate it can be inclusive and achieve concrete results.

It has to be recognized that an enduring international and intergovernmental committee that prides itself on its inclusiveness and its evidence base carries ongoing costs. Not providing predictable, adequate funding to enable the functioning of the joint Secretariat, the work of the HLPE and support for continued inclusiveness could jeopardize the whole CFS model.

The decision has to be taken whether the work of CFS warrants sustainable and adequate funding so that it can continue to play an important role, achieve its vision, contribute to achieving the 2030 Agenda, and build on the important work that has already taken place.

Objective
The objective of the meeting is to agree on how to ensure long-term sustainable funding for CFS. Sustainable funding here means that funding is committed for all MYPoW activities when the MYPoW is approved.

Background
Bureau and Advisory Group Members agreed during their July 2016 meeting that there should be a discussion with CFS Members and Participants beyond the Bureau and Advisory Group members, on ensuring sustainable funding to implement agreed MYPoW activities. This note builds on a note prepared by the CFS Secretariat for discussion during the 29 November 2016 Bur/AG meeting (CFS/BurAG/2016/11/29/07c) “Ensuring sustainable funding to implement agreed MYPoW priorities”. Attached to this paper is the table (annex) providing an “Overview of Funding of Similar Initiatives” presented at that meeting, which shows how the secretariats of some other initiatives are funded.

The CFS annual budget has varied from year to year since the CFS Reform, depending on specific activities, but indicatively amounted to around USD 10 million per biennium, including USD6 million
for Plenary and Workstreams, USD 2.4 million for the CFS High Level Panel of Experts (HLPE)\(^1\) and USD 1.6 million for the Civil Society Mechanism (CSM).

Part of the budget is provided by the Rome-based Agencies (RBAs) through a combination of staff\(^2\) and cash (USD 4.05 million per biennium)\(^3\); and part is provided by ad hoc voluntary contributions, most of which are earmarked.

The RBAs’ contribution funds part of the budget of the Plenary and Workstreams component; the HLPE and CSM are entirely funded through direct donor contributions and managed independently through separate trust funds.

This note focuses on ensuring sustainable funding for the Plenary and Workstreams component as the two other components are managed independently and are inherently different. All three components of the CFS budget (Plenary and Workstreams; HLPE; and CSM) are however important as a deficit in any component threatens key CFS values and the effective functioning of the whole.

**Elements to be considered in the discussion:**

1. The discussion of budget issues cannot be dissociated from the discussion on MYPoW, as the budget gap depends on the volume and ambition of MYPoW activities. In several instances, members have underlined the need to take into account the resources available when preparing the MYPoW.

2. Regarding the Plenary and Workstreams, the Secretariat organises, prepares documents for, and supports meetings of the membership as well as essential support to the CFS Chair and OEWG Chairs. USD 4.6 million would be sufficient to cover the costs associated with the staff coordinating 6 workstreams\(^4\) (most meetings without interpretation except for meetings where policy outcomes are negotiated\(^5\)), support to Bureau and Advisory Group intersessional work, interpretation and translation of documents for Plenary sessions, travel for the Chair, an assistant to the Chair and limited support to communication (see table below).

3. It is important to note that this is USD 1.1 million less than the 2016-17 budget and so assumes a lower volume of work and level of servicing and outreach than provided for the current and past bienniums.

4. The important assumptions for this budget include:
   a) Cash and staff contributions from the three RBAs are predictable and staff are allocated full-time to the work of the Secretariat. This is crucial to ensure the Secretariat can provide a minimal level of servicing to the Committee.
   b) Regarding workstreams: (i) the meetings take place in Rome; (ii) interpretation or translation services are limited; (iii) activities exclusively consist of 2-3 half day meetings per workstream with limited, simple background documents (no events, travel or other activities).

---

\(^1\) Includes the cost of in-kind support.
\(^2\) RBAs’ staff contribution includes one professional from each RBA.
\(^3\) RBA’s cash contribution is unearmarked and the commitment is revisited each biennium.
\(^4\) MYPoW for 2016-17 includes 8 workstreams per year.
\(^5\) Only costs for two negotiation processes by biennium, each process with 5 days interpretation (6 hours per day) and translation of about 12,000 words are included.
Table 1: Minimal budget for Plenary and Workstreams Component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Item</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STAFF</strong></td>
<td>1,600,000</td>
<td>1,600,000</td>
<td>3,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This includes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) CFS Secretary, FAO, IFAD and WFP in kind professional staff, two administrative staff, one professional staff and one communications officer;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Implementation of 6 workstreams without interpretation and translation services (with the exception of 2 negotiation processes per biennium), or additional technical support;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Support to Bureau and Advisory Group and intersessional work;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) CFS workstreams communication activities;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLENARY and CHAIR</strong></td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This includes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Interpretation of a 5-day plenary and one information session/briefing to delegates;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Documents production based on average costs of past plenaries (avg 95,000 words/year);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Travel of 10 panelists to Plenary and CFS Secretariat;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) CFS Chair related activities (assistant and avg 10 travels/year);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Support CFS communication (coverage at plenary, website maintenance, publicity material);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>2,300,000</td>
<td>2,300,000</td>
<td>4,600,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. This budget of USD 4.6 million would therefore allow the Committee to agree and implement a focussed MYPoW. It would not have any flexibility to respond to new issues or outreach without additional funding (eg for translation/interpretation of OEWG meetings, consultants to produce technical papers, events, regional consultations or other outreach). Funding proposals could be prepared by the Secretariat to encourage members to contribute to activities that complement the workstreams.

6. This budget does not consider the recommendations of the CFS Evaluation, which may propose activities entailing an increased level of resources.

---

6 This table has been revised compared to the one presented in Document No: CFS OEWG-MYPoW/2017/02/06/01. It increased by USD 200,000 to accommodate the recommendations of CFS43 (para 31, CFS 2016/43 REPORT) on ensuring that resources are available for translation and interpretation.
Options for sustainable funding

1. CFS43, when discussing the MYPoW, made the following specific recommendations as to funding. The Committee (document CFS 2016/43 FINAL REPORT, paragraph 31 e, f and g):
   
   e) Recommended that the MYPoW OEWG continues its work with a view to presenting a feasible and realistic proposal on the CFS activities to be carried out in the biennium 2018-2019 for endorsement by the CFS Plenary in 2017, taking into account available resources and the need for a manageable workload;

   f) Encouraged all CFS Members to contribute unearmarked extrabudgetary resources to the CFS budget and to ensure that resources are available for translation and interpretation, noting the importance of these services for stakeholders’ participation;

   g) Further encouraged CFS Members to explore long-term solutions to address CFS budget predictability based on consensus.

2. At the Bureau and Advisory Group meeting of 29 November 2016, participants mentioned different approaches that could move towards more sustainable funding and proposed a wider discussion beyond the Bureau and Advisory Group, including “the reliance on small contributions from all member countries and increased contributions from the RBAs and other institutions”\(^7\). At the Bureau meeting on 1 December some members underlined that there was no possible way to ensure sustainable funding without additional contribution from RBAs.\(^8\)

3. Some possible other options to be considered are:
   
   a) Trimming the budget to live within means, assuming the RBA contribution continues at current level, which could, for example, imply only holding plenary every two years;

   b) Increasing ‘secured’ resources from the RBAs to cover the plenary and workstreams;

   c) Reliance on regular unearmarked contributions from all member countries, based on a voluntary scale of contribution\(^9\),

   d) Continued reliance on earmarked resources from donors to bridge the gap between RBA’s contributions and the budget needed to implement MYPoW activities (ie no change)

   e) A combination of increased contributions from RBAs and other UN institutions

4. The first draft of the CFS Evaluation Report provides the following recommendations for CFS budget:
   
   a) RBAs to formalize their contribution (para ES 48: “... it is recommended that there be a formal agreement between the Committee and the Rome-Based Agencies to secure their annual financial contributions to the functioning of the Committee, and their contribution in the form of senior staff seconded to the Secretariat”)

   b) Voluntary resources to be unearmarked: (Para ES49: “Donors should not be permitted to select specific projects to fund. How the funding is spent should be determined by the MYPoW, and accounted for through the annual reporting of the Committee”).

---

\(^7\) Outcomes of the 29 November 2016 meeting of the Bureau and Advisory Group.

\(^8\) Outcomes of the 1 December 2016 meeting of the Bureau

\(^9\) For example as in the case of the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources, which is funded through a mechanism based on voluntary contributions.
### Annex: Overview of Governance and Funding of Similar Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name / Date Established</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Global Governance Structure (excludes regional bodies/technical working groups)</th>
<th>Reg. or Country Presence</th>
<th>Secretariat Staff</th>
<th>Budget (USD millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) Movement / 2010 | - Partnership to create an enabling political environment for scaling up nutrition programmes; adopting effective laws and policies; establishing best practices; aligning actions around high quality and well-costed country plans, and increasing resource allocation for these plans - Community if Practice established | 3 Tiers:  
- **5 networks**, each led by a facilitator: 4 of the networks (civil society, donor, UN and business) support the 5th (SUN Country Government Focal Points Network)  
- **Lead Group**: high-level leaders representing these networks to provide strategic oversight, improve coherence and resource mobilization, and ensure accountability  
- **Secretariat**: facilitates the work of the 5 networks and Lead Group, coordinates country Focal Points (FPs), and shares best practice and knowledge among members (no direct operational role) | **Country Focal Points**: to ensure country ownership and develop and monitor country-specific plans | **19.5 staff (2014)**:  
- 13 full time professionals  
- 6.5 admin, IT, finance | 2014 data: $4.56 for Secretariat staff, travel etc. Supported by Canada, France, Germany, Ireland, The Netherlands, the UK, the EU and Gates Foundation. $10 Multi-Partner Trust Fund mainly to support civil society in ca. 20 countries |
| Renewed Efforts Against Child Hunger & Undernutrition (REACH) / 2008 replaced ECHUI est. in 2007 by WFP & UNICEF | - Coordinate activities of different agencies and government departments to implement SUN processes to strengthen capacity and develop national child undernutrition action plans. - Governed by an MOU between FAO, WHO, WFP and UNICEF (Initiating 2 Tiers:  
- **Steering Committee**: 6 members (1 each from the 4 IPs + Secretariat Coordinator and Deputy ex officio) provide global strategic direction; approve annual work plan/budget and related guidelines; oversee resource mobilization; monitor and evaluate progress; and advise the Secretariat on staff and operational issues  
- **Secretariat**: implement and/or coordinate activities in the Global work plan; manage Activities ongoing in 12-13 countries overseen by the REACH Country Committee (RCC, usually includes the Country Directors/Reps | | **9 staff (2015)**:  
- 7 professionals  
- 2 admin/finance | 2014: $8.8 for country operations, 20 field staff and 8 Secretariat staff/CSTs Funded by Canada and EU in addition to WFP, FAO, Unicef, WHO and IFAD. |
Partners or IPs. IFAD has an advisory role.  
- Leads the UN SUN network
knowledge and information sharing among the partners, countries and organizations; prepare the global annual work plan and budget; and mobilize resources
of partner agencies)
Global Secretariat fully funded by WFP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name / Date Established</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Global Governance Structure (excludes regional bodies/technical working groups)</th>
<th>Reg. or Country Presence</th>
<th>Secretariat Staff</th>
<th>Budget (USD millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC) / 2004 | - Overall: provide consensus-based evidence for better FNS policy decisions by developing methods to integrate existing food security, nutrition and livelihood information into a severity classification. NB: IPC does not directly support, nor set standards for, primary FNS data collection activities | 2 Tiers:  
- Global Steering Committee: representatives of 11 UN, donor, NGO and regional institutions who ensure international positioning of the IPC, promote intra-agency institutionalisation, oversee and guide management of the IPC Global Strategic Programme, ensure global coherence and respect of IPC principles, and endorse IPC technical tools and guidelines  
- Global Support Unit (GSU): ensures normative development; planning, implementation and global coordination of IPC activities; communications; and overall management of staff, partnerships & budget | IPC activities implemented in 26 countries; and introduced or used in 40 countries | 16 staff (2015)  
- 11 in Rome: 9 professionals; 2 admin  
- 5 regional staff, 4 based in FAO regional offices, 1 in a regional institution (PRESANCA) | 2015-2017: $22 budget  
Supported by EU, UK, USA, Australia, Canada, Germany, Netherlands, Spain, Sweden |
| Global Strategy to Improve Agricultural and Rural Statistics (GSARS)/ 2009; funded from 2011 | - Improve developing countries’ statistical capacities to produce agricultural and rural statistics and use them to design more effective policies  
- 3 pillars: (1) produce a minimum set of core data; (2) better integrate agriculture into the National Statistical | 3 Tiers:  
- Global Steering Committee (GSC): provides strategic guidance, monitor progress and makes strategic decisions on the Global fund  
- Global Executive Board: An Executive committee of the GSC facilitates coordination among GSC members and makes decisions on functions delegated by the GSC  
- Global Office: coordinates activities, provides overall strategic direction and | - 5 Regional partners (AfDB, UNESCAP, UNECA & FAO Bangkok Reg. Office) liaise with/ provide technical support to | 19 staff  
- 11 support management, research or training  
- 8 support admin & editorial tasks | 2015 $ 13.1 overall budget; $8.2 resourced  
Of overall budget $5.2 is for the Global Office (100% resourced). Supported by the UK, Gates |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Governance and statistical capacity building</td>
<td>(3) Improve governance and statistical capacity building</td>
<td>Develops new statistical methods, guidelines and training material to support regional &amp; country GSIARS implementation</td>
<td>Countries and stakeholders - Targets 90 developing COs</td>
<td>Foundation, Italy and others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (CGRFA)/1983</strong></td>
<td>- Aims to reach international consensus on policies for the sustainable use and conservation of genetic resources for food and agriculture and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits derived from their use (International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture)</td>
<td><strong>Commission</strong>: Meets biannually supported by a Secretariat&lt;br&gt;<strong>Sectoral Working Group or other Subsidiary Body</strong>: Subject to the determination by the Director-General based on availability of necessary funds</td>
<td>Secretariat based in FAO and composed of FAO staff.</td>
<td>The expenses of the Secretariat of the Commission are determined and paid by FAO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture/2001</strong></td>
<td>Recognize the contribution of farmers to the diversity of crops; Establish a global system to provide farmers, plant breeders and scientists with access to plant genetic materials; Ensure that recipients share benefits they derive from the use of these genetic materials with the countries</td>
<td>2 Tiers&lt;br&gt;<strong>The Governing Body</strong>: Highest organ of the Treaty. Provides policy direction and guidance, and adopts plans and programmes for the implementation of the Treaty.&lt;br&gt;<strong>Secretary</strong>: Arranges for and provides administrative support for sessions of the Governing Body and assists it in carrying out its functions.</td>
<td>Secretary nominated by FAO DG</td>
<td>Core Admin Budget (funded at 85%) includes expenses of the Secretariat. It is funded through: - a FAO contribution (approx. 30%); - voluntary contributions from the Treaty's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>where they have been originated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(140) Contracting Parties. Secretariat prepares, based on the FAO/UN Scale of Assessments, a &quot;suggested&quot; contribution for each Contracting Party, usually adhered to.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>