

**Preliminary Contributions of the CSM to the meeting on the Implementation of the CFS Evaluation, 18 September 2018**

**Agenda Item 1+2: Mandate of the CFS Chairperson and Secretary**

**Observations:** In principle, the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the mandate of the CFS Chairperson and Secretary seem quite clear and well developed. Our comments are based on two points that require more clarity:

- 1) The exact interrelationship between the Chairperson and the Secretary, the RBAs and the Bureau;
- 2) Accountabilities for the Secretariat and Chairperson in this context.

**Regarding the first point on the interrelationship between bodies:** on the one hand, the Secretary ToR state that the Secretary works "under the overall guidance of the CFS Chair". On the other hand, the Chairperson ToR state that the Chairperson "work(s) in collaboration with the CFS Secretariat".

The terms are not clear enough, especially for situations when the Chairperson and Secretary have different opinions. The role of the CFS Bureau in this interrelation is also not taken into consideration. In this sense, the key challenge is to formulate conditions and division of labour to achieve clarity, harmony and coherence between the four bodies, based on an understanding that they need to work on decisions taken by the Plenary and the CFS Bureau.

*Regarding the ToR of the Secretary, we suggest the following amendment:*

"Under the overall guidance of the CFS Chair, [in line with decisions taken by the CFS Bureau](#), in collaboration with the Rome-Based Agencies and under the administrative supervision of the responsible FAO manager, the incumbent will..."

*Regarding the ToR of the Chairperson, paragraph g), we suggest the following amendment:*

g) Work in collaboration with the CFS Secretariat [in line with decisions taken by the CFS Bureau](#), and meet regularly with the CFS Secretary to get updates on the implementation of the technical work carried out by the team, as well as discuss ways the Chair could provide support to the successful implementation of the activities agreed upon in the MYPoW, in consultation with the Bureau;

The **second point is on the need for a clarification on accountabilities**. The CFS response to Recommendation 8 (fourth paragraph of the document) clearly states that: "The accountabilities of the CFS Chairperson, 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."

This requirement still needs to be added to the ToRs of the Chairperson and Secretary. The key question is: Who is made accountable to whom, and who shares information with whom?

We suggest that the Chairperson (a) be accountable to the CFS Plenary and Bureau, and (b) share reports with the Secretary and Advisory Group.

We suggest a new paragraph h), which reads as follows: "[Be accountable and report to the Plenary and the Bureau and share these reports with the Advisory Group and the Secretariat.](#)"

The CFS Secretary would have to (a) be accountable to the CFS Bureau and Chairperson on the implementation of decisions taken the by Plenary and Bureau, (b) report to FAO regarding administrative matters, and (c) share these reports with the Advisory Group. In this respect, we suggest including an additional bullet point, which reads as follows point:

- "Be accountable and report to the Bureau and Chair on the implementation of the decisions taken by the CFS Plenary and Bureau; report to FAO on administrative matters; and share these reports with the Advisory Group."

#### Agenda Item 3+4: Composition and Processes of the Advisory Group

Generally speaking, we believe that the comments and proposals made by the co-facilitators are pertinent and positive, because they build on discussions held within the framework of the evaluation, and they also point towards future processes. Nevertheless, we have several comments and specific suggestions:

*Paragraph 5.* It is worth noting that, according to the Reform Document, the Advisory Group (AG) is not only the Bureau AG, but also a consultation body in itself that reflects, during the inter-sessional period, all categories of CFS participants as the CFS Reform. In this respect, the first sentence of paragraph 5 could be drafted as follows: "Each Bureau has the prerogative to establish the process of interaction with the AG."

*Paragraph 6.* In principle, the interaction between the Bureau and the AG is very important, as mentioned in paragraph 5. In this respect, we suggest adding a sentence to paragraph 6 in order to explain this and to apply it to Bureau/AG joint meetings:

6 iv (new). Bureau/AG joint meetings to allow for and facilitate interaction and dialogue between CFS members and participants on issues at hand.

*Paragraph 9.* If the paragraph is kept, it should be added that any possible change should be endorsed by a CFS Plenary decision.

*Paragraph 10.* Where it is mentioned that "ways to encourage other mechanisms to be established" should be encouraged, clarification is needed on the fact that such mechanisms refer to the categories of participants:

"The Reform Document encourages the establishment of permanent coordination mechanisms for participation in CFS. Ways to encourage other mechanisms to be established for the categories of participants, building on the experience of the Civil Society Mechanism (CSM) and the Private Sector Mechanism (PSM), to ensure more inclusiveness should be considered."

*Paragraph 16 b) and c).* We understand and support the spirit of this proposal for procedures and criteria for participation in the Advisory Group, but they need to be in line with the rules and functioning of the AG and Mechanisms. It is neither appropriate nor correct to establish a procedure that allows for individual organisations to directly request a seat in the AG. Rather, individual organisations must first choose their category of participant, whose coordination mechanisms and institutions will define their representatives for the AG.

Additionally, we believe that the proposal for concrete criteria is a second separate element in itself, and should be developed for the assessment of participation in the Advisory Group.

In this respect, we propose the following changes to paragraph 16 b) and a new 16c):

16b) establishing a **formal procedure for potential candidate organizations who wish to participate in the CFS** to allow as much inclusiveness as possible. Interested organizations are invited to request their inclusion to the coordination mechanisms or institutions of the pertinent participant categories.

16c) new: In line with para ES56 of the evaluation, **concrete criteria** should be developed to assess the participation of members of the Advisory Group, along the ones mentioned by the evaluation.

Katie 17/9/18 16:56

Deleted: its own

Katie 17/9/18 18:09

Deleted: to request a seat

Katie 17/9/18 18:11

Deleted: requests for seats on

The criteria should be developed after CFS 45 by a Technical Task Team and presented to the Bureau and AG.

The previous paragraph 16c) can thus be removed, as it would no longer make sense.

Consequently, we suggest the following changes for the proposed new para 26:

Proposed new para 26: "The Bureau encourages existing AG members to strengthen their coordination roles within their constituencies ~~will strengthen the coordination roles of existing AG members and~~ will make more strategic use of the ad hoc participation by appropriate decisions to improve AG's effectiveness and enhance inclusiveness. The Bureau will decide on criteria for assessing the participation of AG members. Organizations interested to participate in the CFS are invited to request their inclusion to the coordination mechanisms or institutions of the pertinent participant categories.

Katie 17/9/18 18:16

Deleted: and timeframe regarding a procedure for potential candidate organizations to request a future seat in the AG.