

CSM Messages for CFS Evaluation meeting on 14July

I. Discussion on Consultation report (morning session):

On 1. Introduction:

- The draft text has substantially improved. We agree with most of the suggested changes.
- However, in the last paragraph of the Introduction, there are two significant changes proposed we cannot support:
 - the important notion that the Plan of Action on the CFS evaluation needs endorsement of the CFS 45 Plenary, was removed. It must be reinstated. The adoption of the Plan of Action cannot be left to the Bureau, it needs the approval of the Plenary. So, the previous wording must be reinstated: the Plan of Action on the CFS evaluation will be presented to CFS 45 for endorsement.
 - The last sentence of the introduction needs to be reformulated. The current sentence should be deleted and replaced by a clearer sentence: *“The responses to Recommendations 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6, will be implemented during the 2018 intersessional period, based on the indications of this Consultation report.”*

On 2. Recommendation 1:

- We can live with the formulation that is now proposed on *“clarifying the 6 roles of CFS set out in the Reform Document and their contribution to achieving CFS vision and how and by whom they should be implemented.”*
- We suggest to include in Action 1.1 and Action 1.2 that on both items, the Action to be taken is that the Bureau *“develops a proposal for”* the strategic content of MYPOW or for clarifying the roles, *“for endorsement at CFS 45”*. The mandate given here to the Bureau is for conducting a process, not for the final approval of its result. The final approval of politically relevant issues like the strategic objectives of the CFS need to be with the Plenary.

On 3. Recommendation 2:

- We generally welcome the proposed improvements in this section.
- On the sentence, Priority will be given to critical and emerging FSN issues, we suggest to include *urgent* issues as well. Also to include this notion of critical, emerging *and urgent* issues in (old) A2.3
- The concept of *“comprehensive planning phase”* still sounds as if there is a huge and long-lasting effort. We believe that the MYPOW process needs a better planning, but not necessarily longer or exhaustive. As long as no specific proposal is on the table or agreed, we would rather say: *“define specific planning elements”* or *“define a specific planning phase”*, taking out the word *“comprehensive”*. Same in (new) A2.3.
- We understand that the proposal on the structure and process of the MYPOW, as A2.1 indicates, will be presented to the CFS 45 for endorsement, as part of the Action Plan. For the sake of clarity, it might be worthwhile to include it here: *“for endorsement at CFS 45”*.

On 4. Recommendation 3:

- We also here welcome the many improvements and clarifications to the previous draft.
- We still believe that the issue of safeguards against conflict of interest is not only applying to the funding mechanism, but also to the policy process in the CFS. We will raise this issue in the discussions on the Plan of Action in 2018, but we can live with the formulation as it is here, focusing on safeguards in relation to funding.
- We suggest a re-formulation of iii (b) in the following way: *“CFS will request RBAs to continue to support and eventually increase their contribution in a sustainable way to help covering the budget of the CFS.”*
- This proposal would combine the notion of continuation with the one to consider a possible increase in the future, and it would underline the significant contribution from RBAs to help covering the full budget of CFS, as said in the introductory part of this section.

On 5. Recommendation 5

- The proposed changes are all acceptable to us.
- We would suggest to include one important notion which was proposed also in the discussions last Tuesday: to use these high level roundtables and debate sessions *“to generate political commitment for the use and application of CFS policy outcomes”*.

On 6. recommendation 6:

- The proposal for a “multi-functional OEWG” is not convincing to us. It shows that there is still no full common understanding of what the monitoring function of the CFS actually means. Therefore, it is probably best to first discuss Recommendation 10 of the CFS Evaluation which refers to the monitoring function of the CFS and decide about the need and possible role of an OEWG on Monitoring after having conducted this discussion.
- This would be in line with what the OEWG on monitoring could agree on, after lengthy discussions:
- The OEWG on monitoring has agreed (as it is now in the draft decision box, that the CFS
- “Recognizes the importance of following up on previous decisions of CFS on monitoring in the context of the CFS evaluation Action Plan of Action, subject to resource availability; and”
- “Recognizes that the need for and role of the OEWG on monitoring may be reconsidered in light of the decisions of the Committee related to the follow-up to the independent evaluation of CFS.”
- So, instead of having a discussion on a new OEWG here, that would include monitoring, without having discussed Recommendation 10 of the Evaluation, we suggest to leave this suggestion out of the text here.
-

II. Discussion on Categorization and Roadmap (afternoon session)

The key considerations and suggestions here are:

- The plenary is the space where all important decisions are taken, either at CFS 44 as part of the consultation report, or at CFS, as part of the Plan of Action.
- During the intersessional period, the Bureau should, in consultation with the Advisory Group, members and participants address and further develop the proposals and drafts for being discussed and eventually approved at the Plenary.

- In that sense, category II should be reframed in a way that the first sentence is deleted: (~~does not need plenary endorsement~~) and the second is amended: Will be addressed and further developed by the CFS Bureau in consultation with the Advisory Group during the 2018 intersessional period.
- In category III: all those decisions on the CFS evaluation recommendations that were not endorsed at CFS 44 (as part of the Consultation report) should be endorsed by CFS 45 (as part of the Plan of Action).