

On agenda item 2: CFS Evaluation: roadmap and consultation report

The CSM appreciates the way how the evaluation process has been conducted in the June and July meetings and wants to particularly thank Egypt and Iceland for co-facilitating the process.

With regards to the revised consultation report that aims to summarize the outcomes of the discussions last week and was circulated two days back, we have some key remarks. However, due to the short time since its circulation, we have not had the chance to fully analyze the document and its annexes in its revised version, and we were not able to translate the fourteen pages into the other languages and consult the CSM governing bodies. Therefore, our comments at this stage can only be preliminary. A more comprehensive comment on these documents will be provided by the CSM in a few weeks.

The main observations and suggestions we want to make at this point are:

- 1) **All important decisions of the CFS in response to the CFS must be endorsed by the CFS Plenary.** This principle was repeatedly reaffirmed during the evaluation meetings, also last Friday. This means that the responses on the politically important recommendations will either be endorsed during CFS 44, as part of the Consultation Report, or by the CFS 45, as Part of the Plan of Action.

This principle is recognized in the draft decision box presented to this meeting, but not fully operationalized through the document. This still needs to be done. This implies particularly significant changes to Annex 2 of the document.

We strongly believe that the **Plenary, not the Bureau should take decisions on politically important responses that affect the CFS as a whole.** This includes the responses to the Composition of the Advisory Group (recommendation 4), the role of the members (recommendation 7), the role of the Chair (recommendation 8), the role of the Secretariat (recommendation 9), and the response to the Monitoring function (recommendation 10), and to the HLPE Steering Committee (recommendation 14). The Bureau can develop a proposal for such decision, as part of the Plan of Action, but should not take a definitive decision on them.

The **only recommendations on which the Bureau should develop and implement a response on its own**, are in our view the more operational recommendation on communication (recommendation 11), dissemination of HLPE reports (recommendation 12, and Updates on HLPE and Bureau/AG work (recommendation 13).

- 2) There is a contradiction between paragraph d) of the draft decision box and the roadmap. The draft decision box states that the decision on the new composition of the Advisory Group should be taken until in March 2018 and after having discussed recommendation 4. However, these

discussions are scheduled in the roadmap for the period February to May 2018.

In any case, as the response to the recommendation 4 will only be preliminarily discussed before CFS 44, and will need to be endorsed by the Plenary of CFS 45, it is very difficult to already give a mandate and timeline to the Bureau for a decision on this topic. What will happen, if the outcome of the policy discussions on recommendation 4 is that the number of Advisory Group members should be increased, and therefore a change of the CFS rules and procedure is needed? This is not an unrealistic scenario.

In this sense, paragraph d) of the draft decision box should not mention a specific date for the Bureau decision. **Our proposal is that the decision box should exceptionally extend the mandate of the current Advisory Group, without setting a specific date, and request the Bureau to take a decision on its new Advisory Group after concluding the response to recommendation 4.**

- 3) If we look today into the column of the Consultation Report and the draft Roadmap that indicates the implementing body of this action, we find an **overwhelming list of tasks for the CFS Bureau and Advisory Group**. We recognize that this was generally agreed during the meeting last Friday. However, looking with fresh eyes at the full table of tasks of the consultation report and the roadmap particularly for the CFS Bureau, it seems that the Bureau will be strongly overloaded during the intersessional period of 2018. It might be good to first **calculate the number of meetings that might be required and then reconsider this decision**.
- 4) Paragraphs 26 and 28 of the consultation report need revision. It was not agreed, as paragraph 26 says, that the CFS Bureau and Advisory Group would take on issues such as “CFS agenda setting and resources, monitoring and accountability” etc, including tasks of the OEWG on MYPOW and monitoring. Also, the last sentence of paragraph 28 is unclear, as it refers to a “multi-functional OEWG” that was not mentioned before. Our understanding of the outcome of last Friday on this matter is much better captured in the table after paragraph 29. **The chapeau to this table, including paragraph 26 and 28 should be adjusted to the actions to be taken as outlined in the table.**
- 5) Finally, the **formulation on the robust safeguards to prevent conflict of interest** (Paragraph 18 (i) and Action A3.1: We would suggest to slightly adjust the formulation: *“The strategy will include robust safeguards to prevent potential conflict of interest, taking into account related guidelines and experiences from FAO and other UN agencies”* .