



COMMITTEE ON WORLD FOOD SECURITY

Fortieth Session

Rome, Italy, 7-11 October 2013

**A FRAMEWORK FOR MONITORING CFS DECISIONS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS**

*This document can be accessed using the Quick Response Code on this page;
a FAO initiative to minimize its environmental impact and promote greener communications.
Other documents can be consulted at www.fao.org*



mi320e

Matters to be brought to the attention of CFS

The Committee:

- a) Expresses its appreciation for the work of the Open Ended Working Group on Monitoring;
- b) Acknowledges document CFS 2013/40/8 as a framework for monitoring CFS decisions and recommendations. In particular the committee:
- c) Underlines the important role of the Committee as a platform for stakeholders to regularly share experiences and practices on monitoring work in strategic areas at all levels (global, regional, national);
- d) Recognises the importance of CFS monitoring process for improving the CFS effectiveness;
- e) Endorses the proposal for a plan of action to disseminate the CFS decisions in the context of the CFS Communications Strategy;
- f) Endorses the proposal to focus the CFS monitoring on the Committee's major, strategic and catalytic products;
- g) Endorses the conduct of periodic assessments of the CFS effectiveness in improving policy frameworks especially at country level and in promoting participation of and coherence among stakeholders on food security and nutrition. Specifically, it recommends carrying out a baseline survey to assess the current situation as the base of assessing progress;
- h) Highlight the need that CFS monitoring mechanisms should build on existing mechanisms at global, regional and national level;
- i) Requests/recommends that the Open Ended Working Group on Monitoring continue its work in 2014 as outlined in paragraph five and report back to CFS at its 41st Session, subject to available resources;
- j) Underlines the need to use monitoring and evaluation to improve the work of CFS and the formulation of future CFS recommendations bearing in mind that they should be simple, precise, concise, actionable, and time-bound.

1. The CFS Reform document identified one of the roles of CFS as:

Promote accountability and share best practices at all levels [and that]: (ii) The CFS should help countries and regions, as appropriate, address the questions of whether objectives are being achieved and how food insecurity and malnutrition can be reduced more quickly and effectively. This will entail developing an innovative mechanism, including the definition of common indicators, to monitor progress towards these agreed upon objectives and actions taking into account lessons learned from previous CFS and other monitoring attempts. Comments by all CFS stakeholders will have to be taken into account and new mechanisms will build on existing structures (CFS 2009/2 Rev.2, paragraph 6ii).

2. After taking stock of the update on Monitoring that was presented to CFS 39, the Committee endorsed the findings and recommendations contained in CFS 2012/39/9 related to the further development and clarification of CFS monitoring work, especially:

- that CFS recommendations be actionable and targeted at specific stakeholders;
- the need for CFS to respond to the CFS reform document's call for an "innovative mechanism" to help countries and regions, as appropriate, to address the question of whether food security and nutrition objectives are being achieved;
- that the OEWG on Monitoring continue its work in 2013 as outlined in Paragraph nine of CFS 2012/39/9 and report back to CFS at its 40th Session in October 2013.

3. The OEWG on Monitoring responded to this request and has met several times since CFS 39. The monitoring function in the context of CFS is firstly about how to monitor CFS decisions and recommendations, to determine how well the Committee is meeting its overall objective of contributing to the improvement of food security and nutrition at various levels. Secondly, it's about recommending approaches to monitoring by Member Countries, sub-regional and global bodies in order to promote more accountability and improvement in addressing food security and nutrition programme delivery.

4. Chronology of OEWG meetings in 2013¹

- a) January: OEWG meeting focused on identifying two streams of work, namely: i) monitoring of CFS decisions and recommendations, and, ii) the broader aim of facilitating monitoring of outcomes related to food security and nutrition at country and regional level.
- b) Feb – April: establishment of technical support team (TST), to gather examples of existing monitoring mechanisms at country, regional and global level and provide advice to the OEWG regarding what could be the characteristics and elements of such frameworks and what types of monitoring indicators would facilitate monitoring requirements at various levels.
- c) May: OEWG meeting focused on the linkages between the Monitoring Process and the Communication Strategy; preliminary discussion on the preparations of the presentations on VGGT at CFS 40; categorization of CFS decisions and recommendations and the need to set criteria for the preparation of CFS policy recommendations; review of the initial mapping of existing initiatives; preparations for the OEWG Monitoring Workshop in July, expected outcomes, initiatives to be presented.
- d) July 18: an OEWG workshop was held to consolidate the thinking of the OEWG drawing on the lessons learned derived from the background materials to the workshop as well as taking into consideration the perspectives from the presentations. Participants were asked to help identify key elements of innovative approaches, gaps/constraints and the possible collaboration amongst various actors and approaches.

5. Based on the outcomes of the OEWG meetings, that were consolidated during the July workshop, the following recommendations are made for the consideration of the Committee.

- a) The CFS monitoring process is an important activity and further efforts should be made in order to determine how well the Committee is meeting its overall objective of contributing to the improvement of food security and nutrition and to recommend monitoring approaches to Member Countries.
- b) The CFS Communication Strategy represents a crucial step for the monitoring process. Before monitoring the impact on the ground, all interested stakeholders should be made aware of CFS products and outputs. In this regard, a plan of action for the dissemination of CFS decisions should be prepared in conjunction with the Communication Strategy as well as encouraging working in partnership with all CFS stakeholders and making use of the extensive networks of the Rome based UN organizations, namely FAO, IFAD and WFP.
- c) The wide range of CFS decisions and recommendations imply different kinds of actions by various stakeholders as well as different forms/levels of monitoring their application/implementation. The following categorization was proposed to help rationalize the types of CFS decisions and recommendations².

¹ Ref: Background Document – Update on progress and setting the stage. OEWG Workshop on Monitoring, 18 July 2013, FAO, Rome. (http://www.fao.org/docrep/meeting/029/CFS-40-8-OEWG_Monitoring_Background_EN.pdf)

² REF: CFS 2013/40/Inf.14 "Following progress on decisions and recommendations of the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) (<http://www.fao.org/unfao/govbodies/gsbhome/committee-wfs/en/>)

- i) CFS Products – Final Outcomes: This group includes the final outcomes of CFS multi-stakeholder processes;
 - ii) CFS Policy Recommendations: This group includes primarily the outcomes of the Policy Convergence Round Tables sessions held during Plenary;
 - iii) Process-related recommendations: These are more specific recommendations addressed to the CFS Secretariat, Bureau, Advisory Group, and/or the HLPE. They include specific tasks or reporting requests.
- d) CFS should focus on decision and recommendations of category i) above; the major, strategic and catalytic Products/Final Outcomes, such as the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries, Forests in the context of National Food Security (VG GT) as well as the outcome of major workstreams set out in the current Multi-Year Programme of Work (MYPoW).
 - e) In this regard CFS should continue to provide a platform for CFS stakeholders to share their country, regional and global experiences and best practices on monitoring work in these strategic areas. Regular opportunities during CFS plenary sessions should be provided to present case studies on the application of CFS products. The possibility to establish pilot countries that promote CFS outcomes at regional and national level should also be explored.
 - f) Efforts should be made to improve the formulation of future CFS recommendations bearing in mind that they should be simple, precise, concise, actionable, time-bound, including as much as possible clear indications of the main actors involved and responsible for their implementation.
 - g) Monitoring mechanisms should build on existing mechanisms at global, regional and national level. Key characteristics of monitoring mechanisms include: local ownership, rights-based, inclusiveness and multi-stakeholder participation, be grounded in multi-sectoral policy frameworks, ensure adequate country capacities and resources and include both qualitative and quantitative aspects. They should be in line with the five principles set out in the Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition (GSF)³. They should primarily be useful to policy makers and all actors involved in programme implementation in order to assess implementation and results of policies and programmes.
 - h) Based on lessons learned from previous monitoring efforts⁴ and advice from the Rome-based agency monitoring and evaluation experts, a rigid framework for monitoring CFS decisions and recommendations should be avoided. The development of a light survey instrument followed by periodic assessments should be considered as a valid option. They should be flexible and adaptable to any specific circumstance, and not attempt to create a “one-size-fits-all” system.
 - i) Based on the work of the OEWG on monitoring, periodic assessments (every 4 or 5 years) of CFS should be done to assess the state of policy development and coherence from stakeholders and the effectiveness of CFS. This would imply the need to have a baseline survey, to ascertain the current situation from which to assess progress in the future in order to establish plausible attribution to CFS work and assess impacts.
 - j) The GSF is the key reference tool for use by CFS stakeholders for strengthening policy coherence, coordination, convergence and accountability at country, regional and global level on food security and nutrition. The GSF is not, as such, a monitoring tool, but offers

³ Ref: paragraph 92-93 of CFS 2012/39/5 Add.1 - Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition -

a) They should be human-rights based, with particular reference to the progressive realization of the right to adequate food in the context of national food security; b) They should make it possible for decision-makers to be accountable; c) They should be participatory and include assessments that involve all stakeholders and beneficiaries, including the most vulnerable; d) They should be simple, yet comprehensive, accurate, timely and understandable to all, with indicators disaggregated by sex, age, region, etc., that capture impact, process and expected outcomes; e) They should not duplicate existing systems, but rather build upon and strengthen national statistical and analytical capacities.

⁴ CFS 2008/3: Follow-up to the World Food Summit: Report on Progress in the Implementation of the Plan of Action <ftp://ftp.fao.org/docrep/fao/meeting/014/K3058E1.pdf>

essential elements for policy and programme monitoring, by providing principles on monitoring and accountability (art.92-93), guidance for country level action and strategies (art.72 and 75) and the content of policy decisions to be monitored (Chapter IV).