

**Consultation report for the preparation of the response to the evaluation
(Draft - 30 June 2017)**

Draft Decisions for Plenary

The Committee:

- Requests the Bureau through an inclusive process, to finalize the Plan of Action, preparing the responses to all recommendations that have not been presented to CFS 44.
- Requests the Bureau through an inclusive process to facilitate the implementation of the responses to Recommendations x, y and z endorsed by CFS 44 and Recommendations a, b and c that do not require Plenary endorsement and will be implemented during the 2018 intersessional period.
- For Recommendation 1, requests the Bureau through an inclusive process to facilitate the development of the medium to long term strategic content of a longer-term MYPoW, with strategic objectives and expected results/ outcomes, and to clarify the six roles set out in the Reform Document.
- For Recommendation 2, requests the Bureau through an inclusive process to: (i) facilitate the development of a new MYPoW structure and process; (ii) develop and apply clearer criteria for selecting CFS priorities; and (iii) define a comprehensive planning phase for MYPoW that will lead to a decision on the inclusion or not of each workstream in MYPoW.
- For Recommendation 6, agrees to create a new OEWG that will cover CFS internal matters comprising among others MYPoW, budget, monitoring and rules of procedures, starting after CFS 45.
- Endorses the roadmap for preparation of the response to the evaluation which will be implemented in the 2018 intersessional period.

1. Introduction

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 Mr 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 decisions 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 strategy to prepare the responses to all the evaluation recommendations that have not been presented to CFS 44, building on the results of the consultation process.

The final CFS Evaluation report was circulated to all CFS stakeholders on 14 April 2017. The report presents 14 recommendations. The evaluation has presented the recommendations in order of priority but advised that all the recommendations are necessary to improve the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the Committee.

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 mostly be developed 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. Stakeholders however insisted on producing strong deliverables for CFS 44, focusing on the most strategic recommendations.

2. Response to selected evaluation recommendation

Recommendation 1

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.

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.

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.

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.

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

CFS agrees that there is a need for more strategic direction to guide CFS work but CFS is not an organization and does not require a standalone strategic framework. Instead, CFS will integrate the missing strategic elements into 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 and goals, clarifying the 6 roles of CFS. The strategic elements of MYPoW will cross-reference global priorities (Agenda 2030), issues raised in HLPE Critical and Emerging Issues Note and RBAs strategic objectives.

| Actions to be taken | Implementing body | Timeframe | Further funding required (Y or N) |
|---|---|------------------|--|
| A1.1. Develop the medium to long term strategic content of MYPoW, with strategic objectives and expected results/ outcomes. | Bureau, facilitating an inclusive process with Members and Participants | By March 2018 | N |
| A1.2. Clarify the six roles set out in the Reform Document. | Bureau, facilitating an inclusive process with Members and Participants | By March 2018 | N |

Recommendation 2

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.

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

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 elements and a rolling section with activities that will be updated on a regular basis, taking into account resource availability. Priority will be given to emerging FSN issues which are relevant to RBAs work at country level, do not duplicate work with other bodies, to which CFS can add value, considering its roles, and potential synergy across issues. There will be a comprehensive planning phase led by stakeholders for the preparation of MYPoW which will lead to a decision on whether to adopt or not each workstream, based on a strong rationale for CFS engagement, the definition of objectives/ outcomes, explicit CFS added value, roles and responsibilities post endorsement, monitoring activities and budget.

| 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, with a standing section with the strategic elements and a rolling section with the activities that will be updated on a regular basis, linked to resource availability. | Bureau, facilitating an inclusive process with Members and Participants | By June 2018 | N |
| A2.2. Develop and apply clearer criteria for selecting CFS priorities that will provide a strong rationale for CFS engagement, the definition of objectives/ concrete outcomes, explicit CFS added value, roles and responsibilities post endorsement, monitoring activities and budget. | Bureau, facilitating an inclusive process with Members and Participants | By June 2018 | N |

| | | | |
|--|--|---------------------|----------|
| <p>A2.3. Define a process and the expected results of a comprehensive planning phase for MYPoW that will lead to a decision on the inclusion or not of each workstream in MYPoW, based on a strong rationale for CFS engagement, the definition of objectives/ concrete outcomes, explicit CFS added value, roles and responsibilities post endorsement, monitoring activities and budget.</p> | <p>Bureau, facilitating an inclusive process with Members and Participants</p> | <p>By June 2018</p> | <p>N</p> |
|--|--|---------------------|----------|

Recommendation 3

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 accepted

The CFS budget is dependent on contributions from the three Rome-Based Agencies (FAO, WFP and IFAD) that currently provide USD 4.05 million every biennium in cash and in staff (corresponding to about 40% of the total CFS budget, including Plenary and Workstreams, HLPE and CSM components), and 70% of the Plenary and Workstreams component in 2016/17, the rest being provided through voluntary contributions by member states and participants. CFS is facing a chronic budget gap and there is an urgent need for securing sustainable funding to ensure predictability and stability of CFS work. This was discussed during a meeting organized to discuss CFS sustainable funding issues early 2017.

- (i) CFS agrees to develop a resource mobilization strategy for CFS Plenary and workstreams, the HLPE and the CSM, once the new strategic elements for CFS are defined, with specific activities for each of the budget components.
- (ii) Efforts have already been made to interest a broad range of donors with limited success. Continued efforts will be made to expand CFS donor base, including CFS Member States as well as private foundations and the private sector. A document will be developed with safeguards to prevent potential conflicts of interest.
- (iii) CFS will request the RBAs to contribute the full amount of their stated contributions, with guiding principles for monetary and in-kind contributions, to formalize their contribution for predictability, effectiveness and efficiency and to increase their contribution to cover the updated core budget of USD 4.6 million per biennium of the Plenary and Workstreams Component.

- (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.
- (v) The Secretariat will consider recruiting a consultant experienced in resource mobilization, subject to resource availability and the follow up on recommendation 9 (revised structure of Secretariat).

| Actions to be taken | Implementing body | Timeframe | Further funding required (Y or N) |
|---|---|--|--|
| A3.1. (i) Develop a resource mobilization strategy for CFS Plenary and workstreams, the HLPE and the CSM, with safeguards to prevent potential conflicts of interest regarding funding. | CFS Secretariat with support from RBAs and after consultation with CSM | By June 2018 | Yes, to hire a consultant |
| A3.2. (ii) Expand the financing base from Members, and the private foundations and the private sector as well. | CFS Secretariat, with political support/outreach from CFS Chair, and dependent on willingness of contributors | Continuous | Y, linked to A3.6 (v) |
| A3.3. (iii) 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) Request RBAs to increase their annual contribution at RBAs' Governing Body meetings to at least cover the core budget of USD 4.6 million per biennium for the Plenary and Workstreams. | CFS Members during RBA Governing Body meetings | By June 2018 | N |
| A3.5. (iv) Clarify the need for additional information on actual expenditure and budget allocation decisions and provide agreed additional information to enhance transparency. | The Bureau, in consultation with the AG | By June 2018 | N |
| A3.6. (v) The Secretariat to consider recruiting a consultant experienced in resource mobilization to implement the strategy. | CFS Secretariat | As soon as the strategy is developed, subject to resources being available | Y |

Recommendation 5

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.

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

Plenary needs to be vibrant and the agenda needs to be attractive to attract Ministers who have the ability to bring about changes at national level. Instead of having long plenary statements, Plenary could have 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. CFS would be seen as a place for generating ideas.

An outcome from these plenaries will be a one page forward-looking high-level communique that Ministers issue with the presence of media. Senior officials will discuss and negotiate the draft communique in advance of the Ministers' endorsement. This is expected to lead to more Ministers attending CFS Plenary.

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 and attractive. | CFS Bureau | By June 2018 | Depending on the proposal, might require more funding |
| A5.2. Develop a first annual draft Ministerial communique that present a collective view of the results of plenary with some forward-looking elements and focus on food security and nutrition international developments. | CFS Bureau | Just before CFS 45 | Y, if interpretation/ translation envisaged |

Recommendation 6

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.

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

CFS will streamline its Open Ended Working Groups (OEWGs). One organizational OEWG will be created (i.e. an OEWG for dealing with all CFS internal matters) comprising among others MYPoW, budget, monitoring and rules of procedures as they are interrelated and there are synergies in grouping them. Criteria with specific conditions enabling decisions on whether an OEWG is needed will be established. Clear Terms of Reference will be drawn up before establishing other OEWGs and for existing OEWGs. The Terms of Reference will be time-bound and any extension will be a deliberate decision. 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. 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 OEWG dealing with internal matters, or whether a separate one is warranted.

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. Set up an organizational OEWG that will cover among other issues, MYPoW, budget, monitoring and rules of procedures. | Plenary | Starting in October 2018 | N |
| A6.2. Establish new criteria with specific conditions enabling decisions on whether an OEWG is needed. | Bureau, facilitating an inclusive process with Members and Participants | By June 2018 | N |
| A6.3. Establish clear Terms of Reference for new and existing OEWGs that will be submitted to the Bureau. | Bureau, facilitating an inclusive process with Members and Participants | By June 2018 | N |

