

**Recommendation 10 (Developing an overarching monitoring framework)**

***Do you agree with the approach proposed in Recommendation 10, which includes five elements for CFS' role in promoting accountability and sharing good practices at all levels?***

We would partially accept this recommendation, as we agree with some of its elements, while we believe that others do not fully capture the achieved common understanding of the CFS monitoring function.

Before getting into the details, as a starting point we would like to recall the progress made by the CFS in the monitoring work in the past years.

We therefore suggest to firmly build the response to this important recommendation on the CFS monitoring function as agreed by the CFS so far, and would like to first address and clarify some of the ambiguous concepts used by the Evaluation in its recommendation:

- Monitoring to promote accountability is a permanent function of the CFS, and the development of an innovative monitoring mechanism of the CFS, as mandated by the CFS Reform, is still under way. The monitoring concept, agreed upon in the CFS is based on the five principles on monitoring and accountability defined in the GSF<sup>1</sup>, and which accepts a diversity of methodologies, including human rights based monitoring, qualitative and quantitative assessments, or sharing experiences and best practices.
- The monitoring function of the CFS is in its DNA since its constitution in 1975, when it was established with the aim of monitoring the outcomes of the World Food Conference of 1974, which was then followed by the monitoring mandate of the CFS on the World Food Summit Action Plan of 1996; with the Reform of 2009 the monitoring function was embedded into the function on to promote accountability and sharing best practices. We cannot forget to take this background for today's discussions about the CFS monitoring function.
- The evaluation report and its recommendation do not fully capture the monitoring exercise in the CFS, and the decisions taken by the plenaries. Their understanding of monitoring is technically too narrow, coming from an evaluator's perspective, or a programmatic approach (as previously discussed during recommendation I), rather than from an accountability perspective in relation to the realization of the CFS vision.
- In our view the CFS Evaluation's recommendation for an "overarching framework" cannot be separated from the CFS plenary decisions on the incremental development of an innovative monitoring mechanism for the CFS. Any follow-up to this recommendation needs to build on the decisions taken by the CFS on this topic over the last six years.
- The CFS Evaluation encourages the CFS to align its terminology and approach with the one of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. We believe, as stated in other occasions, that very fruitful synergies can be established within the following up and review process of the 2030 Agenda and the CFS monitoring work and function. It is not about aligning

---

<sup>1</sup> They should be human-rights based, with particular reference to the progressive realization of the right to adequate food; ii. They

terminology and approach but building on the GSF principles and linking relevant monitoring processes. One practical example of such synergy through linking monitoring processes has been that members would include in their Voluntary National Reviews to the HLPF the use and application of CFS policy outcomes in the country's efforts to achieving SDG 2 and the realization of the right to adequate food.

- We would like to stress once again that being the Monitoring a core function of the CFS, this workstream cannot be budget dependent and put on hold.

Are the five proposed elements sufficient for the incremental development of an innovative monitoring mechanism?

- The Monitoring mechanism of the CFS cannot be fully realized only by doing Global Thematic Events, conducting surveys, gathering quantitative data, commissioning evaluations and tracking systems of CFS processes and decisions. We cannot avoid to reaffirm, as agreed in the Plenary decision at CFS 42 and re-stated at CFS 43, the commitment to incrementally build the innovative monitoring mechanism for the CFS. This innovative monitoring mechanism allows to assess the use and application of CFS policy outcomes at national, regional and global level, and also if the use and application of such outcomes are effectively contributing in achieving and realizing CFS vision on the progressive realization to the right to adequate food.
- Moreover, what are we doing with all the lessons learned from the Global Thematic Event on the VGGTs of 2016? We need to ensure that the lessons learned and recommendations coming from the monitoring mechanism are being taken forward to revise, improve, consolidate the CFS policy coordination, convergence and coherence work. In which CFS policy space are we following up the issues raised in such contexts as results of the monitoring events at national and regional level?
- We would like to also stress once again the importance of also monitoring the more specific CFS policy recommendations and not only the most comprehensive outcomes.
- For the future, we suggest to further discuss and develop in the CFS:
  - The nexus between dissemination, use, application and monitoring of CFS policy outcomes in the light of realizing the CFS vision.
  - The further development of the innovative monitoring mechanism includes several elements started in the past but then not followed up, such as the voluntary in-depth country assessments or the continuation of the mapping exercise of FSN actions and platforms. These could also be enlarged to regional and global level actors.

#### **Recommendation 13 (Updates on HLPE work to the Bureau and Advisory Group)**

- ***How to ensure a closer engagement between the HLPE Steering Committee and the Bureau and Advisory Group for HLPE to better fulfill its role in CFS as per the CFS Reform Document?***

The CSM would accept this recommendation, as proposed by the HLPE in their input for this meeting, by acknowledging that the efforts for a close and dynamic engagement of the HLPE with the Bureau and AG are already ongoing. In this sense we would like to express our appreciation for the HLPE Chair and Secretariat's availability and engagement during the lasts inter-sessional periods.

Nevertheless we would like to highlight three main points to be taken into consideration when developing further the CFS Response to this recommendation:

- Highlight that the HLPE has a very clear mandate given by the CFS Plenary;
- Ensure the independence of the HLPE is preserved;
- Strongly encourage the CFS to take up the recommendation suggested by the HLPE, according to which the CFS can ask in advance to the HLPE StC to prepare focused interventions on specific matters; we believe this element could be very useful to enrich CFS substantial debates on key issues.

**Recommendation 14 (Review of the HLPE process on calling for experts)**

- *The selection processes for project experts and Steering Committee are set out clearly in the HLPE Rules of Procedure and is available on the HLPE website. How could HLPE ensure that these processes are effectively communicated to prospective applicants? How to ensure greater transparency of these selection processes?*
- *Who is the primary audience of HLPE Reports? How can the accessibility of HLPE Reports to the primary audience be improved?*

- We believe that the selection processes of the HLPE Steering Committee, team leaders and project team members are already transparent. The call is sent out by the HLPE, and it rests in each and every one of CFS members and participants to further out reach their constituencies to join the HLPE efforts in spreading as much as possible the call. This joint effort also guarantees the possibility to reach a wider range of researchers and experts, from different regions and disciplines. We agree with the HLPE inputs to this recommendation, proposing that in future calls more details could be available on the selection process and criteria.
- Nevertheless, we have a critical remark to make on the gender balance criteria. For the first time, this year, both the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Steering Committee are men, as both of the Team leaders for the reports on Multi-stakeholder partnerships and Agroecology and other innovations. We believe that this is not acceptable, so we encourage the HLPE to further work on this crucial element.
- We would like to also make an additional remark on the HLPE budget. The language translations of the HLPE Reports are a fundamental pre-requisite to ensure inclusiveness and participation to the substantial policy debates within CFS following the reports and leading to CFS policy decisions. We therefore would like to stress once again that HLPE translations costs should be included in the CFS Secretariat core budget.
- Concerning the accessibility and friendliness of the HLPE reports contents to non-technical readers, we would support the approach and response made by the HLPE StC. We also could encourage that the CFS provides technical and financial support to the HLPE for using users-friendly media (like interviews, webinars, social media, ...).