

## Plan of Action of the CFS Evaluation Background document for the meetings of 26 and 28 September 2017

**Objective of the meetings:** Prepare the response to the Evaluation Recommendations 8, 9 and 4. The Recommendations will be discussed on 26 September. The responses will then be drafted, based on the discussion on 26 September, and presented on 28 September for discussion. The results might be presented to CFS 44 for information or endorsement if consensus is reached.

### Recommendation 8: Expectations from the Chairperson

Recommendation 8 includes two distinct sub-recommendations to the Committee and the Bureau:

- Clarify the expectations of the position of the Chairperson with expected outcomes of the outreach activities of the position and inclusion of these activities in CFS planning and budget;
- Clarify the role of the position of the Chairperson with regards to the CFS Secretariat so that “grey” areas are addressed.

*“The Committee and the Bureau should clarify the expectations that they have of the position of the Chairperson beyond 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 the Chairperson with regards to the CFS Secretariat be clarified so that ‘grey’ areas are addressed. This may necessitate a review and revision of the terms of reference of the Secretary<sup>1</sup> (Annex B). The Chairperson, the Director of the ESA and the Secretary should agree on a protocol for reporting from the CFS Secretariat.”*  
[Extract: Final report of the evaluation of the CFS, Recommendation 8, paragraph 291]

Recommendation 8 will be discussed together with Recommendation 9 (see Agenda of the meeting). The CFS Chair and previous CFS Chairs will provide inputs during the meeting. It is important to note that the results of the discussion on Recommendation 8 might have budget implications.

---

<sup>1</sup> Terms of Reference for CFS Secretary: <http://www.fao.org/docrep/meeting/029/MI037e.pdf>

## 1. Expectations from Chairperson

### 1.1 Background

*“The Chairperson,..., shall preside at meetings of the Committee or the Bureau and exercise such other functions as may be required to facilitate its work”<sup>2</sup>. The TORs of the Secretary are in Annex.*

### 1.2 Relevant paragraphs in the CFS Evaluation Report

*“The Chairperson is crucial to guiding the meetings of the Committee at Plenary and during the inter-sessional period, to see that the agenda and objectives are met, and to ensure fruitful outcomes. The Rules of Procedure do not spell out the nature of the other functions that the Chairperson may carry out, in effect leaving each Chairperson to shape the contents of their term of office, subject to the mandate they receive from the CFS Plenary and the Bureau. Over time, the Chairpersons of the Committee have taken on a role in outreach to raise the profile of the Committee and its products in international fora, including the United Nations bodies at the UN headquarters in New York and Geneva, as well as with relevant regional bodies. The Chairperson for the current biennium participated in many major events and presented the reports on the CFS Plenary Sessions to the FAO Regional Conferences in the regions of Africa, Asia, Europe, Latin America and Near East. The Chairperson has also hosted bilateral meetings with stakeholders to canvass for contributions to minimize the gaps in the Committee’s budget.”*  
[Extract: Final report of the evaluation of the CFS<sup>3</sup>, paragraph 129]

*“One of the themes that emerged from the evaluation interviews was the need for the Committee’s profile to be raised, especially at global fora, and in the headquarters of the United Nations, and an expectation that Chairpersons of the Committee should carry out missions to raise the profile of CFS. The outreach role and other functions of the Chairperson that are not currently spelled out in the Rules of Procedure are likely to have resource implications. The Committee and Bureau’s expectations about these evolving functions should be clarified, so that they are planned and adequately resourced to achieve their intended outcomes”*  
[Extract: Final report of the evaluation of the CFS, paragraph 130]

*“The CFS Evaluation found that the role of the Chairperson went beyond chairing the Plenary and Bureau meetings, to an active role in outreach and interaction with the United Nations headquarters in New York, the regional conferences, as well as addressing meetings outside CFS in Rome, and other countries, on request. While the Rules of Procedure made provision for the Chairperson to do more than chair meetings, these other functions were not made explicit in the rules...”*

---

<sup>2</sup> CFS Rules of Procedure, Rule 2, Para.6.

<sup>3</sup> Final report of the Evaluation of the Committee on World Food Security:  
[http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/cfs/Docs1617/Evaluation/CFS\\_Evaluation\\_Final\\_Report\\_14\\_April\\_2017.pdf](http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/cfs/Docs1617/Evaluation/CFS_Evaluation_Final_Report_14_April_2017.pdf)

[Extract: Final report of the evaluation of the CFS, Conclusion 6, paragraph 262]

**2. Role of the Chairperson with regards to the CFS Secretariat**

**Relevant paragraphs in the CFS Evaluation Report**

*“The evaluation found that there was lack of clarity regarding the reporting lines of the Secretary and the extent to which the Chairperson of the Committee has any authority over the Secretariat. The Secretary has two lines of reporting, one to the Director of FAO’s Agriculture and Economics Division (ESA), and one to the Chairperson of the Committee, the former for reporting on finances as funding for the Committee flows through FAO, as well as reporting on administrative matters. The Director is also responsible for assessing the performance of the Secretary. The second reporting line refers to reporting on the substantive work of the CFS Secretariat in supporting the Committee and its structures. The terms of reference of the Secretary states that the Secretary carries out all functions, including managing and supervising the Secretariat, under the overall supervision of the CFS Chair but it is unclear what this supervision entails. The CFS Rules of Procedure also do not create a supervision link between the CFS Chair, whose role is to preside over meetings, and the Secretariat, whose role is to support the work of the Committee. Managing the political-administrative interface is a common challenge in the public sector, and is exacerbated by the lack of clear rules to govern the relationship between political heads and administrative heads. The extent of the Chairperson’s authority over the CFS Secretariat is unclear as the FAO rules and regulations do not make provision for political office bearers to exercise administrative control over units within FAO.”*

[Extract: Final report of the evaluation of the CFS, paragraph 159]

**Recommendation 9: Revising the structure of the CFS Secretariat**

**1. Background**

The CFS Evaluation made a recommendation to revise the structure of the CFS Secretariat and, as necessary, the levels and terms of reference of all positions. The RBAs have been asked to provide inputs to prepare the response as they jointly fund the Secretariat. The CFS Chair and former CFS Chair will share their views during the meeting.

*“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.”* [Extract: Final report of the Evaluation of the CFS<sup>1</sup>, Recommendation 9, (paragraph 292)]

This recommendation seems mainly justified by concerns about the efficient utilization of staff as the Evaluation concluded that the Secretariat performs its functions effectively<sup>4</sup>. This recommendation should be considered together with Recommendation 3 on sustainable funding, as improving the efficiency of the Secretariat could lead to savings and contribute to reduce/eliminate the funding gap of CFS core budget. Both Recommendations 3 and 9 also mention the need for formalizing RBAs' contribution to ensure predictability of resources<sup>5</sup>.

The Secretariat is part of the CFS set up mentioned in the CFS Reform Document and addressed in the CFS Rules of Procedure<sup>6</sup> but no indication was provided on its structure, beyond stating it would be a joint Secretariat, staffed by the RBAs<sup>7</sup>.

## 2. Relevant paragraphs in the CFS Evaluation Report

*“Given the wide scope of work undertaken by the CFS Secretariat, it is essential for stable and predictable staffing to ensure continuity in work being done, including retaining institutional memory and reducing the costs associated with the time and effort needed to train new people and for them to deliver what is expected from them.... The number of staff fluctuates, depending on the programme of work and the resources to fund the work. Due to the misalignment between the work required and the Secretariat permanent staffing arrangements, the CFS Secretariat team is complemented by short-term or project posts, and consultants to jointly implement the programme of work of the Committee.”*

[Extract: Final report of the evaluation of the CFS, paragraph 155]

*“The Secretariat receives 38 percent of its contribution from the Rome-Based Agencies in the form of senior staff at the P5 level seconded to the Secretariat. These positions have been vacant at various times because of delays by the Rome-Based Agencies in filling them, for example, the FAO position was vacant for well over a year, while WFP at times could only provide short-term temporary staff. IFAD currently does not have a senior professional (P5 level) located in the Secretariat, although it has a consultant at mid-level, and a senior liaison person who meets with the Secretariat from time-to-time. The senior communication consultant is on a short-term contract. The Secretariat is highly reliant on predictable contributions from the RBAs, whose in-kind contributions plus cost-sharing of the Secretary role form the largest proportion of the staff budget. Therefore, when their staff contributions are delayed, and delays*

---

<sup>4</sup> “The CFS Secretariat was generally perceived by CFS Members and stakeholders to perform its functions effectively ...” (Conclusion 7, para.ES34 of the CFS Evaluation Report) and “... most interviewees expressed satisfaction with the performance and support provided by the CFS Secretariat...” (Para.154 of the CFS Evaluation Report).

<sup>5</sup> Issues on fulfilling secondments are expected to be covered under Action A3.3. (iii), which is proposed in response to Recommendation 3 for endorsement at CFS 44 in October. [Reference: 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.]

<sup>6</sup> “The Committee is assisted by a small, permanent joint secretariat, located in the headquarters of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations in Rome. Its task will be to assist the Plenary, the Bureau, the Advisory Group and the High-Level Panel. The Secretariat shall be headed by a Secretary and comprise staff from the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the International Fund for Agricultural Development and the World Food Programme.” [Extracts: Reform Document<sup>6</sup> (2009) paragraphs 33-34, Rules of Procedure<sup>6</sup> Rule VI]

<sup>7</sup> CFS also has an extended Secretariat in the form of Technical Task Teams for the Open Ended Working Groups, where the Advisory Group members and other relevant organizations are invited to provide their technical inputs and share their experiences (e.g. UN Women was invited to join the Technical Task Team for the OEWG on Women's Empowerment, even if they are not part of the Advisory Group).

are not compensated in cash, it has a major impact on the capacity of the Secretariat to deliver the work required for the workstreams. This in turn places the effectiveness of the CFS Secretariat at risk.”

[Extract: Final report of the evaluation of the CFS, paragraph 156]

“The current structure has one Director-level 1 position, four P5 level positions, one P3-level position, and two mid-level consultants (excluding those in the HLPE Secretariat). It appears from the interviews and available documents, the structure and functioning of the CFS Secretariat post-2009, below the level of the Secretary, were not worked out in any detail. While individual incumbents have terms of reference, there appear to be no documents that provide a coherent overview of the CFS Secretariat’s structure, functions and rationale for the number and levels of posts, or a clear definition of roles.”

[Extract: Final report of the evaluation of the CFS, paragraph 157]

Guiding questions for Recommendations 8 and 9 are provided in the Agenda of the meetings of 26 and 28 September 2017.

#### **Recommendation 4: Reviewing the composition and processes of the Advisory Group**

The Evaluation recommended the Bureau review the composition and processes of the Advisory Group<sup>8</sup>.

*“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.*

*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.*

<sup>8</sup> A new Bureau will be elected at CFS 44 and will have to appoint its Advisory Group (AG). In order to give sufficient time to allow the review of the AG composition and processes, Plenary has been asked on an exceptional basis to let the Bureau appoint its AG until March 2018.

*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 Organization 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.*

[\[Extract: Final Report of the CFS Evaluation, Recommendation 4, paragraphs 284-286\]](#)

## **1. Background**

### Mandate

The members of the Advisory Group shall be appointed for a term of two years<sup>9</sup>.

### Roles and Functions

The function of the CFS Advisory Group is to provide inputs to the Bureau regarding the range of tasks which the CFS Plenary has instructed it to perform. Decision making will be in the hands of the member States. It is expected that members of the Advisory Group should be able to contribute substantive work and provide advice to the CFS Bureau<sup>10</sup>.

At its 41<sup>st</sup> session, the Committee endorsed the proposed amendments to paragraphs 3 and 4, Rule IV, of the CFS Rules of Procedure, concerning the roles to be performed by the CFS Advisory Group.

### **[CFS Rules of Procedure, Rule IV; para 3]**

Each member of the Advisory Group should be responsible for the establishment, maintenance and strengthening of regular linkages with organizations and entities within the category it represents

<sup>9</sup> CFS Rules of Procedure, Rule IV (Advisory Group), paragraph 1

<sup>10</sup> CFS Reform Document, paragraph 32. CFS 2009/rev.2

with a view to:

- a) Promote the engagement of interested organizations and entities that are represented in each of the five categories of the Advisory Group in order to ensure a two way exchange of information during CFS inter-sessional periods;
- b) Facilitate the participation and provision of inputs, comments and proposals regarding ongoing CFS activities from those entities represented in each category that could provide relevant contributions to CFS discussions;
- c) Assist the Bureau in the identification of important developments in the area of food security and nutrition at global, regional and national levels and raise awareness towards the ongoing activities carried out by the different entities represented in each category;
- d) Contribute to the dissemination of CFS outcomes and deliberations.

**[CFS Rules of Procedure, Rule IV, para 4]**

At the end of each inter-sessional period, each member of the Advisory Group should prepare a report to inform the Bureau about the work carried out during the year to fulfil their roles. Particular attention should be devoted to the achievements obtained in involving their constituencies and facilitating a two way exchange of information and inputs among their stakeholders and the Committee.

Categories, number of seats, present and past composition

In accordance with paragraph 32 of the CFS Reform Document and Rule IV, paragraph 1, of the CFS Rules of Procedure, the composition of the Advisory Group reflects the following five constituencies of CFS Participants as listed in paragraph 11 of the Reform Document:

- a) UN agencies and bodies with a specific mandate in the field of food security and nutrition such as FAO, IFAD, WFP;
- b) Civil society and non-governmental organizations particularly organizations representing smallholder family farmers, fisherfolks, herders, landless, urban poor, agricultural and food workers, women, youth, consumers and indigenous people;
- c) International agricultural research institutions;
- d) International and regional financial institutions such as the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, regional development banks and the World Trade Organization;
- e) Private sector associations and philanthropic foundations.

The number of members of the Advisory Group shall not exceed that of the members of the Bureau including the Chairperson, unless otherwise decided by the Committee<sup>11</sup>. Currently, 6 seats are assigned to UN agencies and bodies, 4 to CSOs/NGOs, 1 to International Agricultural Research Institutions, 1 to International and Regional Financial Institutions and 1 each to Private Sector Associations and Philanthropic Foundations. The number of Advisory Group members is currently 14 which exceeds the number of Bureau members including the Chair as a result of the decision taken at CFS 36 in 2010 to include the United Nations Standing Committee on Nutrition (SCN) in the Advisory Group<sup>12</sup>. Two additional ad hoc seats were assigned to the World Health Organization and the World Farmers Organization for the 2016-17 biennium.

---

<sup>11</sup> CFS Rules of Procedure, Rule IV (Advisory Group), paragraph 1

<sup>12</sup> CFS 2010/Final Report, paragraph 12.

The distribution of seats among each category of the Advisory Group, and the size of the Advisory Group subject to the limits above is a prerogative of the Bureau. In 2015, the current Bureau decided not to change the distribution of the existing 14 seats among the five categories. Furthermore, at its meeting on 29 October 2015, the Bureau recommended the Chair make use of her authority to invite, after consulting with the Bureau, other important bodies to participate in Advisory Group meetings on an ad hoc basis on particular agenda items.

<b>Composition of CFS Advisory Group 2016-2017</b>	
<b>Advisory Group Members</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>UN agencies and bodies</b> – FAO (1 seat), WFP (1 seat), IFAD (1 seat), Special Rapporteur on the right to food (1 seat), UN High-Level Task Force on the Global Food and Nutrition Security (1 seat), UN Standing Committee on Nutrition (1 seat)</li> <li>• <b>International Agricultural Research Institutions</b> – CGIAR (1 seat)</li> <li>• <b>International and Regional Financial Institutions</b> – World Bank (1 seat)</li> <li>• <b>CSO/NGOs</b> - Civil Society Mechanism (4 seats)</li> <li>• <b>Private sector associations</b> – Private Sector Mechanism (1 seat)</li> <li>• <b>Philanthropic Foundations</b> – Bill &amp; Melinda Gates Foundation (1 seat)</li> </ul>
<b>Ad hoc Participants</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• World Health Organization (1 seat)</li> <li>• World Farmers Organization (1 seat)</li> </ul>

At its meeting on 10 February 2017, the Bureau underlined the need to keep ensuring the inclusion of a plurality of views in the Advisory Group, with particular attention to the most vulnerable and those most affected by food insecurity and malnutrition. The Bureau also noted that the selection of engaged participants is key for the Advisory Group to be effective. The Bureau noted that when Advisory Group members cannot physically attend CFS meetings, they should be encouraged to provide written inputs concerning the different agenda items. The Bureau suggested to assess the level of participation and the contribution of current Advisory Group members as a starting point. It was suggested that in the future regional financial institutions such as Multilateral Development Banks could be appointed as members of the Advisory Group as foreseen in paragraph 11.iv) of the CFS Reform Document. The Bureau noted that the mandate of ad-hoc Participants should be time-bound. [CFS Bur/2017/02/10/Outcomes]

#### Selection Procedures

Under the current legal framework and practice<sup>13</sup>, the selection procedure of the members of the Advisory Group depends on the nature of the constituency.

<b>Category of Advisory Group</b>	<b>Selection Procedure</b>
1: UN Agencies and Bodies	The Bureau invites FAO, IFAD and WFP to appoint their representatives. All other UN agencies and bodies are selected by the Bureau and are invited to designate their respective representatives.
3: International Agricultural Research Institutions 4: International Financial and Trade Institutions	The Bureau selects the institutions.

<sup>13</sup> CFS Rules of Procedure, Rule IV.



2: CSOs / NGOs	Designates its own representatives through the Civil Society Mechanism (CSM) in accordance with paragraphs 16, 17 and 32 of the CFS Reform Document who are then communicated to the CFS Bureau.
5: Private sector associations and philanthropic foundations	The Private Sector designates its representative through the Private Sector Mechanism (PSM) who is then communicated to the CFS Bureau. The Bureau selects the representative of Philanthropic Foundations.

## 2. Other relevant paragraphs from the CFS Evaluation Report

*“The CFS Evaluation found that there is a difference in opinion within the Committee about the desirable composition of the Advisory Group and the distribution of seats, and several proposals, often conflicting, were put forward to the evaluation team. These included a call for parity of seats between PSM and CSM; more seats for the CSM, establishing a farmers’ mechanism distinct from CSM and PSM and giving a seat to this mechanism; a seat for the World Health Organization (WHO); and maintaining the status quo. There were also suggestions to reallocate seats from members who were frequently absent from Bureau-Advisory Group meetings. The issue of Advisory Group seats should be resolved and should not be about having more or an equal number of seats. The Advisory Group should have enough seats to effectively represent and convey the diversity of views of the constituencies they represent.”*

[Extract: Final Report of the CFS Evaluation<sup>14</sup>, paragraph 144]

*“The contestation over the membership of the Advisory Group to ensure adequate representation of all stakeholders threatens to reduce the effectiveness of the Advisory Group. The Civil Society Mechanisms and the Private Sector Mechanisms play an important role in facilitating the contributions of non-state actors in the work of the Committee. Both mechanisms are seeking to have the requisite ‘space’ to ably facilitate the views of their participating organizations. The Joint Bureau-Advisory Group meetings are a platform for influencing the decisions of the Bureau and ultimately, the Plenary. It is therefore not surprising that there is contestation over the representation and the distribution of seats in the Advisory Group.”*

[Extract: Final Report of the CFS Evaluation, Conclusion 5, paragraph 261]

Guiding questions for Recommendation 4 are provided in the Agenda of the meetings of 26 and 28 September 2017.

---

<sup>14</sup> Final report of the Evaluation of the Committee on World Food Security:  
[http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/cfs/Docs1617/Evaluation/CFS\\_Evaluation\\_Final\\_Report\\_14\\_April\\_2017.pdf](http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/cfs/Docs1617/Evaluation/CFS_Evaluation_Final_Report_14_April_2017.pdf)

## **Annex: Terms of Reference of CFS Secretary<sup>15</sup>**

### Terms of Reference for a D1-level CFS Secretary

Under the overall supervision of the CFS Chair and in close collaboration with the Bureau and the Advisory Group and the Chairs of the working groups as representatives of CFS Members and Participants, the incumbent will:

- Manage and supervise the Secretariat;
- Manage, report on and be accountable for the CFS budget.
- Be responsible for the implementation of the CFS Resource Mobilization Strategy;
- Be responsible for the implementation of the CFS Communication Strategy, the communication among CFS stakeholders and the dissemination of CFS publications;
- Ensure technical, administrative and logistical support to the CFS Chair and the Chairs of the different working groups and technical teams;
- Supervise and provide technical inputs in the preparation of CFS publications, working documents and meetings;
- Exercise overall supervision of the CFS Secretariat's support to the High-Level Panel of Experts;
- Ensure that the Heads of the three Rome-based agencies are kept informed on the work of the Committee through the appropriate channels;

The Secretary will be subject to the FAO Regulations and Rules.

---

<sup>15</sup> <http://www.fao.org/docrep/meeting/029/MI037e.pdf>