

Draft CSM comments on Proposed Response to CFS Evaluation Recommendations 7, 10 -14

Contribution to CFS evaluation meeting 19 January 2018

Agenda item 1: recommendations 7, 11 and 12:

On Recommendation 7:

General remark: we believe that the proposed response on recommendation 7 reflects many of the key issues raised at the last meeting, and rightly focuses on the need and collective commitment to strengthen the use and application of CFS policy outcomes.

Specific remarks:

On para 2: **correction** – “A number of activities are being implemented in countries, led by governments, Rome-based agencies (RBAs), **participating organizations of the** CSM, PSM and other stakeholders, but there is no consolidated overview of these activities.” Explanation: CSM does not operate on the country level as CSM, all work is done through its participating civil society organizations, grassroots groups and social movements.

On para 3:

- Chapeau: **amendment** - “The following elements were suggested to facilitate communication and awareness **for a better use and application** “. Explanation: to better reflect the title and scope of this recommendation.
- First and fifth bullet point: while we welcome the proposal for nominating a CFS focal point, we believe it needs to be connected to the multi-actor mechanism that is mentioned in the fifth bullet point, on the second page. Therefore: **Change of the order and amendment:** The fifth bullet point should become the second bullet point and clearly spell out the particular need to **include into these national multi-actor platforms the organizations of the CSM constituencies of smallholder and family farmers, pastoralists, fisherfolks, indigenous peoples, women, youth, agricultural and food workers, landless, consumers, urban food insecure and NGOs.** Explanation: It is important to ensure their proper participation in any national platform of inclusive governance on food security and nutrition on the national level.
- Current bullet point two: could then be linked to the existing or upcoming national multi-actor platforms, encouraging the “involvement of ministries **and all relevant actors**” (not only experts), particularly civil society.
- A clarification in bullet three: it should say “facilitate the use and application of CFS policy convergence work in countries, including through **their program work and** partnership agreements and” Explanation: partnership agreements are not with countries but with other actors.
- Last bullet point: no need to emphasize the voluntary character of the commitment, this is anyway clear for all CFS policy outcomes. The commitment should, however, be as concrete and practical as possible. Alternative formulation: “Inviting member countries to **draft concrete plans** on the use and application of CFS products.”
- On important aspect was left out and should be included: the regional level. The **Amendment** could be formulated like this: “**Inviting member countries to strengthen the links between CFS policy processes and outcomes and ongoing initiatives and agendas of regional intergovernmental mechanism and organizations, to foster policy coherence with this level.**”

On recommendation 11:

Para 11: include, after UN ECOSOC: ***Regional UN Commissions, CBD and UN HR Council***

On recommendation 12:

We do not agree with the proposal to fully reject the recommendation. It should be partially accepted. The recommendation does not say that members and RBA have any obligation, but they just should be encouraged to help disseminating the HLPE reports. When promoting a specific CFS policy recommendations, such as water or forestry or livestock, all CFS members and participants are encouraged to also mention and make known the corresponding HLPE reports.

HLPE reports are not only “intermediate” CFS products: they are full and stand-alone products of an essential and independent body of the CFS which was created by the CFS Reform. HLPE reports are, of course, different in term of political status and legitimacy from CFS policy outcomes, but there is no point in not inviting members and participants to disseminate them. Whether or not they do so can be left to their own decision.

In our view, it is important to secure more and stable resources for translation and dissemination for the HLPE reports.

Agenda item 2: recommendations 10, 13, and 14

On Recommendation 10:

General remark:

The proposed response rightly acknowledges that the five elements mentioned by the evaluation report do not cover the full spectrum of monitoring elements of the CFS, but then refers only to these five elements.

The response should acknowledge and build also on those elements of the incrementally developed innovative monitoring mechanism that have already been agreed and put into practice by the CFS. The development of an innovative monitoring mechanism is part of the role of the CFS “to promote accountability and share best practices”, as defined in the CFS Reform Document.

Specific changes to the text (***suggested changes highlighted in bold and italic***):

New para 6 (after current para 5): “The further review and incremental development of the innovative monitoring mechanism should take into account all decisions taken by the CFS with regards to monitoring so far, including the Terms of reference to share experiences and good practices in applying CFS decisions and recommendations through organizing events at national, regional and global levels (CFS 2016/43/7), the Plenary decisions of CFS 43 and CFS 44 on Global Thematic Events to monitor the use and application of major policy products, and the principles on monitoring and accountability enshrined in the GSF, adopted by CFS 39.”

Para 8: The role of CFS in conducting voluntary in-depth country assessments and in helping countries and regions to monitor progress towards agreed food security and nutrition objectives

through the development of an innovative monitoring mechanism should be further discussed, considering:

- **All decisions and recommendations adopted so far by the CFS on monitoring**
- The conclusions of the Evaluation (detailed monitoring of policies, programmes and plans are the responsibility of national governments).
- The fact that no country in-depth assessment has been undertaken since the decision was made at CFS 41, ~~as no country has volunteered and no resources have been made available.~~ **as no consensus could be achieved within the CFS about TOR for them.**

.....

Actions to be taken

A10.1. Review the framework for monitoring CFS decisions and recommendations, **considering the further incremental development of the CFS innovative monitoring mechanism, and** clarifying the role of CFS in national level monitoring, **promoting accountability and sharing best practices**

On recommendation 13: no further comments

On recommendation 14:

Para 27: (proposal for revision): **With regards to** the selection process and the call for nominations of project team members, **the following measures will be taken:**

Paragraph 29: does not belong to this section, is an issue of Budget and MYPOW in general, not related to CFs evaluation recommendation 14 on the selection of HLPE project team members.