

Consultation report for the preparation of the response to the CFS evaluation

Draft Decisions for Plenary

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).
- 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, 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.
 - Implement the response to Recommendations 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6, based on the indications in document CFS 2017/44/12.
- d) Decides, exceptionally, that the Bureau may appoint its Advisory Group until March 2018 in order to enable a review of the composition and processes of the Advisory Group to ensure that it is able to perform its functions effectively, in response to CFS Evaluation recommendation 4; recognizing that Rule IV of the CFS Rules of Procedure states the appointment of the Bureau’s Advisory Group is for two years.

Introduction

1. This report presents the results of the consultation process that was conducted in June-September 2017 for the preparation of the response to the CFS independent evaluation leading up to CFS 44. The process was co-facilitated by Dr. Khaled El Taweel, Egypt, and Mr Jón Erlingur, Iceland, who were nominated by the CFS Bureau. The process included a series of meetings: inclusive meetings on 1 and 5 June and 11 and 14 July, extended Bureau and Advisory Group meeting on 7 June and extended Bureau Retreat on 8 June. The report includes proposed actions made in response to evaluation recommendations 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6 on which consensus was reached among CFS stakeholders during the consultation process and captures on-going or completed work that is relevant to address the evaluation recommendations. The roadmap will present the indicative schedule to prepare the response to all the evaluation recommendations that have not been presented to CFS 44, building on the results of the consultation process.
2. The final CFS Evaluation report was circulated to all CFS stakeholders in April 2017. The Evaluation underlined that the CFS was the only platform within the United Nations system that brings together a broad range of diverse stakeholders at the global level to develop policy guidelines and recommendations on food security and nutrition with the participation of civil society and the private sector in all its major processes, drawing on the evidence base provided by the reports of the

High-Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition (HLPE). It recognized CFS contribution towards enhancing global coordination on food security and nutrition issues. The Evaluation has presented 14 recommendations to improve relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the Committee in order of priority and advised that all of them are necessary.

3. There was a general agreement among CFS stakeholders that the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations provided a solid and comprehensive basis to strengthen CFS. CFS stakeholders also proposed improvements to address the evaluation findings that go beyond the evaluation recommendations. These improvements are incorporated into the related recommendations. The Plan of Action will be completed during the 2018 intersessional period and presented at CFS 45 for endorsement, as time was not sufficient to discuss and agree on a response to all recommendations for CFS 44. The response to Recommendations 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6 will be implemented during the 2018 intersessional period, based on the indications of the Consultation Report, together with the other recommendations that do not require Plenary endorsement.

Response to selected evaluation recommendations

Recommendation 1

4. The Committee should direct the Bureau to lead the development of a strategic plan/framework to guide CFS's work over the medium-to-long term, using the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development as its frame of reference, and informed by amongst other things, the Critical and Emerging Issues paper of the HLPE. While the Bureau leads the process, it should be an inclusive process that draws on the insights of all CFS Members and Participants, and other relevant stakeholders. An OEWG structure supported by a Technical Task Team should be tasked to develop the plan/framework.
5. The evaluation team does not wish to prescribe the particular planning regime that the Committee should adopt, as each organization needs to find what approach is best suited for its mandate. The United Nations system has adopted a results-based approach to planning, and the Committee is advised to incorporate the principles of a results-based approach into its framework. It would be useful to consider the approaches adopted by the Rome-Based Agencies. FAO has a 10-year strategic framework, and within this, a four-year medium-term plan and a two-year programme of work and budget. IFAD has a 10-year strategic framework, with three-year medium-term plans, while WFP has five-year strategic plan.
6. The planning horizon for CFS should be at least six years, covering three biennia, and should be reviewed and updated as necessary. The strategic plan/framework does not replace the MYPoW – it sets the direction within which the MYPoW should be formulated. The MYPoW represents the programme of activities that CFS intends to implement for the duration of the MYPoW.
7. The strategic plan or framework should set out the vision of CFS and its overarching goal(s), as well as a small number of strategic objectives to direct it towards achieving or contributing to the goal(s). While there is no prescription on the number of strategic objectives, it is advisable to have no more than five, clearly articulated objectives, and the results or outcomes to be achieved. It is important that the Committee consider the pathways for achieving the intended outcomes or results, and here the indicative programme logic developed in the course of the evaluation, can be used as a guide. The development of the strategic plan/framework also provides an opportunity for the Committee to clarify the six roles set out in the Reform Document, and the modalities for carrying out these roles. Figure 1 shows schematically the indicative elements of a strategic plan/framework.

8. As part of the process of developing the strategic plan/framework, CFS should draw on the forthcoming Critical and Emerging Issues Paper of the HLPE, and information on what other global actors are doing in FSN, to enable CFS to clarify its niche and where it can add value. The strategic plan/framework should be informed by the realities ‘on the ground’: the CFS should obtain information on the national FSN priorities, as well as information on existing and planned national platforms. The Advisory Group, the Rome-Based Agencies and WHO are well-placed to provide information on national priorities and national platforms.

Recommendation is partially accepted

9. CFS is the only multi-stakeholder platform within the UN system for global coordination on food security and nutrition. CFS agrees that there is a need for more strategic direction to guide CFS work but as a platform does not require a standalone strategic framework. CFS will strengthen the strategic content of MYPoW and expand MYPoW to cover at least two biennia with regular updating of activities. CFS will develop strategic objectives and expected results/ outcomes to be included in the longer-term MYPoW to provide direction towards achieving CFS’ vision, clarifying the contribution of the 6 roles of CFS set out in the Reform Document to achieving CFS vision and the modalities for carrying out these roles (including how and by whom they should be implemented), based on experience since the CFS reform. The strategic content of MYPoW will cross-reference global priorities (2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development), issues raised in HLPE Critical and Emerging Issues Note and RBAs strategic objectives.
10. Recommendations 1 and 2 are interlinked and will be implemented together.

Actions to be taken	Implementing body	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)
A1.1. Develop the strategic content of a medium to long term MYPoW; and clarify the contribution of the six roles set out in the Reform Document to achieving CFS vision, and how and by whom they should be implemented, based on experience gained since the CFS reform	Bureau, after consultation with the Advisory Group	By March 2018, to be endorsed by CFS 45	N

Recommendation 2

11. The MYPoW structure and process should be revised. The MYPoW should be informed by, and aligned to the strategic framework, and there should be a clear link between the activities in the MYPoW and the results or outcomes in the strategic framework. CFS is investigating the option of a four-year MYPoW. Given the difficulty that CFS has in securing a firm budget for a two-year period, extending the MYPoW to four years will simply mean having a plan with many unfunded activities. The need for a medium-term perspective is catered for by the introduction of a strategic plan/framework that covers three biennia.
12. The MYPoW should be linked to the budgeting process to reduce the chronic funding deficits faced by the MYPoW. While CFS seeks to ensure sustainable funding, it should also prioritize its work, streamlining workstreams and potentially de-emphasizing other work streams where appropriate. CFS

needs to determine the delicate balance between quality and quantity of workstreams and avoid spreading itself too thinly. Any MYPoW presented at the CFS Plenary should include a committed budget with specific allocation to prioritized workstreams. There should be an understanding that other workstreams should not start until extrabudgetary funding is available.

Recommendation is partially accepted

13. CFS will revise the MYPoW structure and process. The new MYPoW, starting in 2020 and covering at least 2 biennia, will include a “standing” section with the medium-to-long term strategic content, referring to global priorities (Agenda 2030), and informed by the HLPE Critical and Emerging Issues Note and RBAs strategic objectives, and a rolling section with activities that will be updated on a regular basis, taking into account resource availability. Priority will be given to critical, emerging and urgent FSN issues, considering their impact on people most affected by food insecurity and malnutrition. Plenary will be invited to propose, discuss and give guidance on issues to be considered, taking into account:

- Information provided by the HLPE and global developments, considering their relevance to the work at country level of stakeholders including RBAs;
- Potential duplication with other bodies;
- Expected added value taking into account CFS roles and vision; and
- Potential synergy across issues.

14. The preparation of MYPoW will include a comprehensive planning phase led by stakeholders to identify priority areas of work and will comprise for each activity a strong rationale for CFS engagement, objectives and outcomes, explicit CFS added value, roles and responsibilities post endorsement, monitoring activities and budget. The process will lead to a decision on whether to adopt or not the activity. The decision to include new activities in MYPoW will be conditional on resource availability, taking into account other factors, such as workload.

Actions to be taken	Implementing body	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)
A2.1. Develop a proposal for a new MYPoW structure and process which is linked to Agenda 2030, with a standing section with the strategic content (see A1.1 and A1.2) and a rolling section with activities linked to resource availability.	Bureau, after consultation with the Advisory Group	By June 2018, to be endorsed at CFS 45	N
A2.2. Develop and apply clearer criteria for selecting CFS activities.	Bureau, after consultation with the Advisory Group	By June 2018	N
A.2.3. Give Plenary the opportunity to propose, discuss and give guidance on critical, emerging and urgent FSN issues to inform the preparation of MYPoW.	Bureau, after consultation with the Advisory Group	By February each year for plenary in October	N

Actions to be taken	Implementing body	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)
A2.4. Define a comprehensive planning phase for MYPoW to identify activities, taking into account resource availability.	Bureau, after consultation with the Advisory Group	By June 2018	N

Recommendation 3

15. The ability to carry out activities in the MYPoW is dependent on a sustainable CFS budget. The Bureau should take the following actions to secure sustainable funding for CFS:

- (i) It should develop a resource mobilization strategy as a matter of urgency. The resource mobilization strategy should be underpinned by a clear, simple message about CFS that will appeal to potential funding partners. The resource mobilisation strategy should be for CFS Plenary and workstreams, the HLPE and the CSM.
- (ii) The sources of funding should be diversified. Private foundations and the private sector should be considered, provided there are no conflicts of interest. The donor base from public sources should be expanded, with an appeal to those CFS Member States that have not funded CFS since the reform.
- (iii) The RBAs should formalize their contribution through a Memorandum of Understanding and could be approached for an increase in their annual contribution. It is not possible to predict the size of the increase as this would depend on the number of workstreams in a given MYPoW.
- (iv) There should be greater transparency in the budgeting process, showing how budget allocation decisions have been arrived at. Equally important is transparency in the expenditure. There should be accounting of actual expenditure where this is currently not the case, except for the HLPE and CSM.
- (v) Consideration should be given to having a position in the Secretariat that is dedicated to resource mobilization, budget analysis and expenditure reporting.

Recommendation is partially accepted

16. CFS relies on the contributions of the three RBAs (FAO, IFAD and WFP), who provide 4.05 million in cash and in kind each biennium, towards the cost of CFS plenary and Secretariat. This amount, established since the CFS reform, formerly covered the full CFS core budget but now only covers part of it due to increases in running costs, changes in the composition of the Secretariat which presently includes a full time secretary and three senior staff seconded from RBAs, and additions to what is considered 'core' (funds for some intersessional interpretation and an assistant to the CFS Chair). The full amount contributed by the RBAs has to be agreed by all three based on the respective governing body decision. The discussion of this recommendation is interlinked with the structure of the Secretariat that the Evaluation has recommended to revise in Recommendation 9. HLPE and CSM

are entirely funded by voluntary contributions.

17. All three components of CFS budget (Plenary and Workstreams, HLPE and CSM), are facing a chronic budget gap and depend on voluntary contributions from Members and Participants to ensure predictability and stability of CFS work. There is an urgent need for making sure that this is balanced by better prioritization of CFS activities and appropriate resource mobilization. This was a priority in discussions of the CFS Bureau and Advisory Group and an open meeting on CFS sustainable funding on 9 March 2017.

18. Response to the recommendation is the following:

- (i) CFS agrees to develop and implement, with support from RBAs, a resource mobilization strategy for CFS Plenary and workstreams, the HLPE and the CSM to implement agreed MYPoWs, once the new strategic content of MYPoW is defined, with specific activities for budget component. The strategy will include robust safeguards in line with FAO guidelines to prevent potential conflicts of interest.
- (ii) Continued efforts will be made to expand CFS donor base, including by reaching out to CFS Member States as well as private foundations and the private sector, and financial institutions.
- (iii) (a) CFS will request the RBAs to contribute the full amount of their stated contributions, with guiding principles for monetary and in-kind contributions, and to formalize their contribution for predictability.
- (iii) (b) CFS will request RBAs to adjust their contribution in a sustainable way to cover the core budget for CFS Plenary and Workstreams starting from 2020-21 biennium.
- (iv) Accounting of actual expenditure for CFS Plenary and Workstreams, HLPE, CSM and PSM is now being incorporated into the CFS Annual Progress Report, which is an annual information session document, starting from 2017 Annual Progress Report. Budget allocation decisions are stated under the assumptions section of the budget table in MYPoW. Need for additional information on actual expenditure and budget allocation decisions will be clarified and additional information provided as agreed to enhance transparency.

Actions to be taken	Implementing body	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)
A3.1. (i) Develop and implement a resource mobilization strategy for CFS Plenary and workstreams, the HLPE and the CSM to support CFS priorities, with clear and robust safeguards in line with FAO guidelines to prevent potential conflicts of interest regarding funding.	Secretariat, with advice from RBAs and after consultation with CSM	By June 2018	Y

Actions to be taken	Implementing body	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)
A3.2. (ii) Diversify the financing base from Members, private foundations and the private sector, and financial institutions.	Secretariat with political support/outreach from CFS Chair, the Bureau, and dependent on willingness of contributors	Continuous	Y
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.	CFS Chair	By June 2018	N
A3.4. (iii) (b) Request RBAs to adjust their contribution to cover the core budget for CFS Plenary and Workstreams starting from 2020-21 biennium.	CFS Members during RBA Governing Body meetings	Aligned with governing bodies calendar in 2018	N
A3.5. (iv) Clarify stakeholders' need for, and provide, additional information on actual expenditure and budget allocation decisions and consider how to improve the accessibility and transparency of information.	The Bureau, after consultation with the AG	By June 2018	N

Recommendation 5

19. The CFS Plenary Session is the high point and culmination of the work done during the year, and the Bureau should ensure that the Plenary is a vibrant platform where there is dialogue on the key FSN issues of the day. The many side events should not be seen as threat to the main Plenary, but as an opportunity to raise the profile of CFS to an audience wider than the audience in the main Plenary. The side events should also be used to have a dialogue on difficult or contentious issues that have not found their way onto the main agenda of the CFS Plenary.
20. The Bureau should revisit the recent practice of having negotiations well in advance of the plenary week. The negotiation process is as important as the policy recommendations that are finally endorsed, and it is essential that the process be as inclusive as possible. While these processes do take time, being inclusive is likely to be more efficient in the long-run, than short-term efficiency approaches that inadvertently exclude those who cannot travel to Rome several times a year. The Committee could consider a different approach, taking reference from other intergovernmental meetings, where, for example, side events and negotiations at the level of officials precede the plenary attendance and discussions that involve ministerial level delegates.

Recommendation is partially accepted

21. Plenary needs to be vibrant and the agenda needs to attract Ministers who have the ability to bring about changes at national level and high-level representatives. Instead of having long plenary statements, Plenary should have an attractive agenda reflecting an interesting MYPoW with high-level, innovative roundtables or forums that comprise stakeholders from the mechanisms, think tanks and research mechanisms to encourage more interactive and substantive dialogues on food security and nutrition, ensuring a balance with the decision-making function of Plenary. This would reinforce CFS’ function as a platform and CFS would be seen as a place for generating ideas.
22. Suggestions for making plenary vibrant and attractive included a possible joint declaration by Ministers or heads of delegations, high level roundtables and debate sessions to catalyze partnerships, a communication strategy to increase the visibility of CFS, which would include a media plan for plenary and the presentation of important reports and global developments related to FSN.
23. It should be noted that the Committee commended the practice of having negotiations in advance of the plenary week at CFS 43 [Final report of 2016, para. 15].

Actions to be taken	Implementing body	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)
A5.1. Prepare a proposal for making the plenary more vibrant, attractive and substantive, taking into account ideas generated through the consultation process.	CFS Bureau, after consultation with the Advisory Group	By February 2018	Depending on the proposal, might require more funding

Recommendation 6

24. The Bureau should streamline the number of OEWGs by consolidating OEWGs with related functions, as well as take stock of OEWGs which have completed their tasks given by the Plenary and need not continue. It should consider creating an OEWG for MYPoW and budgeting. The status of the GSF OEWG should be revisited once it has completed its review of the GSF, as updating the GSF following each Plenary does not require a fully-fledged OEWG.
25. All OEWGs should develop terms of reference to govern their functioning. The terms of reference should outline the objectives of the OEWG, the results the OEWG must achieve over the biennium, and if the OEWG is a policy-related OEWG, there should be a date for the expiry of the term of the OEWG. Terms of reference should include roles and responsibilities of the Chair, participants and the technical task teams that support the OEWG. Where the work of two or more OEWGs or other policy workstreams are interrelated, provision should be made for joint meetings of OEWG chairs.

Recommendation is accepted

26. CFS will streamline its Open Ended Working Groups (OEWGs). The Bureau, in consultation with the Advisory Group, will clarify the respective roles and responsibilities of the Bureau/Advisory Group and OEWGs, allowing OEWGs to focus on substantive issues. The CFS Bureau and Advisory Group will manage inter-related, non-thematic issues. These will be determined over the 2018 intersessional

period and may include such issues as CFS agenda setting and resources, monitoring and accountability functions, and effectiveness (formerly in OEWGs on MYPoW and monitoring, and the working group on Rules of Procedure).

27. Criteria with specific conditions enabling decisions on whether an OEWG is needed or whether existing OEWGs should continue will be established. Clear Terms of Reference will be drawn up before establishing new OEWGs and for existing OEWGs which meet the criteria for continuation. The Terms of Reference will be time-bound and any extension will be a deliberate decision.
28. Apart from OEWGs, alternative working arrangements such as specific task forces (e.g. for CFS' contribution to HLPF) and technical task teams or other ad hoc arrangements will be explored. Clear Terms of Reference for these alternative working arrangements will be established. The work of the GSF OEWG is concluded, until there is a need for a future GSF periodic update. At that time, a decision could be taken on incorporating its work into the multi-functional OEWG, or whether a separate OEWG is warranted.
29. All work streams, including HLPE reports, will be directly linked to the CFS budget and no workstream activities will be approved without budget being secured.

Actions to be taken	Implementing body	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)
A6.1. Establish new criteria with specific conditions enabling decisions on whether an OEWG is needed and whether existing OEWGs should continue.	Bureau, after consultation with the Advisory Group	By June 2018	N
A6.2. Establish Terms of Reference for new and existing OEWGs that meet the criteria for establishing or continuing an OEWG (Action 6.1), which will be submitted to the Plenary for endorsement.	Bureau, after consultation with the Advisory Group	By June 2018	N
A6.3. Establish Terms of Reference for alternative working arrangements (such as specific task forces (e.g. for CFS contribution to HLPF) and technical task teams or other ad hoc arrangements).	Bureau, after consultation with the Advisory Group	By June 2018	N
A6.4. Clarify the respective roles and responsibilities of the Bureau/Advisory Group and OEWGs, allowing OEWGs to focus on substantive thematic issues	Bureau, after consultation with the Advisory Group	By June 2018	N

ANNEX 1

Roadmap for the preparation of the Plan of Action in response to the CFS Evaluation

Introduction

The roadmap presents the strategy to prepare the response to all evaluation recommendations that have not been presented at CFS 44 for information or endorsement, building on the results of the consultation process. The report of the CFS Evaluation was finalized in April 2017 and proposed 14 recommendations. An inclusive consultation process was conducted from June 2017 to July 2017 to prepare the response to recommendations 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, as well as the roadmap.

Process

The CFS Bureau has the responsibility of preparing the Plan of Action for presentation to Plenary in response to the CFS Evaluation. It oversaw the consultation process from June 2017 –July 2017 leading to CFS 44 through the nomination of two members of the Bureau as co-facilitators, Mr Khaled El Taweel, Egypt, and Mr Jón Erlingur, Iceland. It is proposed that the Bureau, after consultation with the Advisory Group, seeking additional input as needed, finalizes the preparation of the Plan of Action during the 2018 intersessional period.

The improvements proposed to address the evaluation findings that go beyond the evaluation recommendations will be incorporated into the responses to the related recommendations.

Timeframe

The Plan of Action will be completed during the 2018 intersessional period and the responses to the evaluation recommendations that were not presented at CFS 44 for endorsement will be presented at CFS 45, some of them for endorsement and others for information. A total of 11 Bureau & Advisory Group meetings (in blue) and Bureau meetings (in orange) are envisaged for completing the Plan of Action from November 2017 to October 2018, as shown in the following indicative calendar of meetings. The format and content of the Plan of Action are presented thereafter.

Indicative Calendar of Meetings

November 2017 – February 2018



DATE	PRELIMINARY AGENDA	CONCURRENT REQUEST FOR INPUTS
NOV 2017 (1/2day)	Discussion on recommendations 7 & 12 ¹ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7: Actions by CFS members to improve CFS 12: Dissemination of HLPE reports 	<u>Recommendation 9</u> (Revising the structure of the CFS Secretariat) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inputs from joint Secretariat (CFS Secretariat and HLPE Secretariat) Inputs from RBAs and technical task team participants <u>Recommendation 4</u> (Reviewing composition and processes of Bureau & Advisory Group) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposals from current Advisory Group members for increase of seats
Late JAN 2018 (1/2day)	Discussion on recommendations 8 & 9 ² <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 8: Expectations of CFS Chairperson 9: Revising structure of CFS Secretariat 	<u>Recommendation 11</u> (Responsibilities for communication and outreach activities) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Send questionnaire to governments for indication of interest to hold events at regional/national level
FEB 2018 (1/2day)	Discussion on recommendation 4 ³ (Reviewing composition and processes of Bureau & Advisory Group)	<u>Recommendations 13 & 14</u> (Updates on HLPE work to the Bureau & Advisory Group & Review HLPE process on calling for experts) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultative meeting with HLPE
FEB 2018 (full day)	Discuss drafted responses to recommendations 4, 7, 8, 9, 12	
FEB 2018 (1/2day)	Discuss drafted responses to recommendations 4, 7, 8, 9, 12	

¹ Recommendations 7 and 12 relate to actions CFS members could undertake to improve CFS and should be discussed together

² The discussion will reference previous consultations held in September 2017. These recommendations are interlinked and time is needed for additional inputs from the joint Secretariat, RBAs and Technical Task Team participants to provide information for reference for the discussion

³ The discussion will reference previous consultation held in September 2017. Time is needed for the current Advisory Group to provide inputs to provide information for reference for the discussion, as well as for new Bureau members to familiarize themselves with Advisory Group matters

March 2018 – Oct 2018



DATE	PRELIMINARY AGENDA
MAR 2018 (½day)	Discussion on recommendations 10 & 11 ⁴ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10: Developing an overarching monitoring framework • 11: Responsibilities for communication and activities
MAR 2018 (½ day)	Discussion on recommendations 13 & 14 ⁵ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 13: Updates on HLPE work to the Bureau & Advisory Group • 14: Review HLPE process on calling for experts
APR 2018 (full day)	Discuss drafted responses to recommendations 4, 10, 11, 13, 14
APR 2018 (½ day)	Discuss drafted responses to recommendations 4, 10, 11, 13, 14
MAY 2018 (full day)	Discuss draft Plan of Action (includes proposed responses to recommendations 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 and implementation updates on recommendations 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6)
MAY 2018 (full day)	Discuss and agree on refined Plan of Action for CFS 45
31 JUL 2018	Send Plan of Action for translation
OCT 2018	Presentation of the responses covered in the roadmap at CFS 45 for information or endorsement

⁴ Recommendations 10 and 11 related to dissemination and monitoring of CFS products and should be discussed together

⁵ Recommendations 13 and 14 relate to the functioning of HLPE and its processes and should be discussed together

Format and content of the Plan of Action

The Plan of Action will provide an overall response to the evaluation and a response by recommendation with the following information:

- Whether the recommendation is accepted, partially accepted or rejected
- Actions to be taken and/or actions already taken and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection
- Responsible group/body
- Timeframe for the implementation of the proposed actions
- Whether further funding is needed to implement the proposed actions
- Need for Plenary endorsement (yes/no)

Plan of Action in response to the CFS Evaluation Report

- 1 Overall opinion about the evaluation and its report, findings, conclusions and usefulness
- 2 Response matrix

			Date			Plenary decision
Evaluation Recommendation	Response Accepted , partially accepted or rejected	Plan of Action				
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Responsible body	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)	Requires Plenary decision (Y or N)
Recommendation x	Insert brief explanatory comment on the decision to accept, partially accept or reject the recommendation; mention progress already made in implementing the recommendation, if any.				Mention whether implementation of a recommendation is dependent on additional funding	
...						

ANNEX 2

Categorization of recommendations for the preparation of the response to the Evaluation

Original Recommendations by the Evaluation	Categorization I: Planned to be submitted at CFS 44 for endorsement or information II: Does not require Plenary endorsement; but will be submitted to CFS 45 for information III: Planned to be submitted for endorsement or information at CFS 45		
	Category I	Category II	Category III
1. Developing a Strategic Plan	For endorsement		
2. Revising MYPoW structure and process	For endorsement		
3. Ways to secure a sustainable CFS budget	For endorsement		
4. Reviewing composition and processes of Bureau & Advisory Group		II	For information or for endorsement (if the intention is to increase the number of seats)
5. Making plenary more vibrant	For endorsement		
6. Streamlining OEWGs	For endorsement		
7. Actions by CFS members to improve CFS		II	For information
8. Expectations of CFS Chairperson		II	For information or for endorsement (if the intention is to change the TORs of the Chair and/or the Secretary)
9. Revising structure of CFS Secretariat		II	For information
10. Developing an overarching monitoring framework			For endorsement
11. Responsibilities for communication & activities		II	For information
12. Disseminating and using of HLPE reports		II	For information
13. Updates on HLPE work to the Bureau & Advisory Group		II	For information
14. Review HLPE process on calling for experts		II	For information or for endorsement (if it requires a change in HLPE processes/ mandate)