

Final draft decision for plenary and response to recommendations 4, 8, 9 based on the discussion of 28 Sep

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
- 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 in order to enable a review of and thereafter consider if changes are needed in the composition and processes of the Advisory Group to ensure that it is able to perform its functions effectively, related to CFS Evaluation recommendation 4; recognizing that Rule IV of the CFS Rules of Procedure states the appointment for the remainder of the Bureau’s Advisory Group is for two years term, taking into account the implementation of the response to Recommendation 4 and the need for any plenary decisions.](#)

Recommendation 4

1. 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.

2. 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.

3. 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

1. The importance of the Advisory Group in [providing substantive input to the Bureau on providing objective, scientific and evidence-based advice 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 issues to the Bureau, reflecting the broad spectrum of voices of its constituencies~~ was reiterated.

2. 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.~~ and CFS will review the composition and processes of the Advisory Group to ensure that it is able to perform its functions effectively.
3. ~~The re was general agreement to undertake the review~~ meetings in September 2017 highlighted the following elements for the Bureau's consideration in its review its appointment of the Advisory Group in line with the following guidance:

Process related:

- The Advisory Group should primarily contribute substantive ~~technical~~ work and provide advice to the Bureau on food security and nutrition, in line with the Reform Document and the Rules of Procedures.
- 1. ~~The Advisory Group is therefore expected to concentrate its efforts in providing upstream technical input to CFS work (e.g. via technical task teams and Open Ended Working Groups).~~
- The Bureau should clarify the support required from the Advisory Group before appointing it and, during ~~its~~ the two-year term, requesting specific ~~advice~~ guidance on substantial issues and agenda items.
- ~~Active engagement, and p~~ Attendance ~~articipation in CFS work, either through physical attendance or other means~~ virtual, 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 ~~size and composition of the Advisory Group is secondary to the quality of advice provided.~~
- 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.
- 2. ~~There is a need to hear from small and medium enterprises, particularly from developing countries, and this is presently absent.~~
- 3. ~~The Bureau may consider rotating seats depending on the thematic issues being discussed and to allow ensure flexibility and inclusiveness~~ plurality of voices, and to better respond to CFS priorities as reflected 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 8

1. 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

1. The Chairperson plays an important political and strategic role in Rome and beyond to achieve CFS vision and objectives. ~~Having the rank of~~ Having experience as a Permanent Representative to/ 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.
2. 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 ~~to include~~ considering the following ~~functions~~ points:
 - (i) Providing strategic leadership to the Committee;
 - ~~(i)~~(ii) Raising CFS' profile by promoting CFS as a ~~unique~~ inclusive ~~multi-stakeholder~~ international and intergovernmental platform and championing the outcomes and work of CFS in Rome and appropriate other fora;
 - ~~(ii)~~(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;
 - ~~(iii)~~(iv) Building trust ~~and~~ amongst stakeholders and promoting coherence in food security and nutrition work;
 - ~~(iv)~~(v) Advocacy for the use of CFS products by stakeholders, ~~including~~ in the context of the Sustainable Development Goals;
 - ~~(v)~~(vi) Playing a leadership role in intersessional work towards reaching consensus among stakeholders and the ongoing engagement ~~of~~ and collaboration with RBAs;
 - ~~(vi)~~(vii) Contributing to expanding the funding base from membership and other stakeholders, through political support and advocacy for resource mobilization.
4. 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, 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
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

- 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 9 is accepted

- ~~CFS will review and revise the~~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 ~~and~~. ~~They~~ will prepare a joint proposal with the Secretariat. The existing provision to invite other UN entities to ~~second~~~~and~~ 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 ~~and the expected contribution from~~. ~~The~~

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

[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.

- 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 priority within the current RBA collaboration agreement and RBAs will consider ways to strengthen this as necessary². ~~The Secretariat will share information on its organigram.~~

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	The 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>; ~~or~~, 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>