



---

# **Evaluation of the effectiveness of the CFS Reform**

## **Inception Report**

**14 July 2016**

## Table of Contents

<b>Acronyms and Abbreviations .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Summary.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1 Introduction.....</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1 Purpose of evaluation.....	5
1.2 Background and context .....	5
1.3 Scope of the evaluation .....	8
<b>2 Evaluation methodology and approach .....</b>	<b>8</b>
2.1 Evaluation criteria and evaluation questions .....	9
2.2 Scoping mission.....	10
2.3 Evaluation activities.....	11
2.4 Limitations mitigation strategies.....	13
<b>3 Managing the evaluation .....</b>	<b>14</b>
3.1 Evaluation team .....	14
3.2 Quality assurance .....	14
3.3 Indicative timetable.....	15
3.4 Evaluation report.....	15
3.5 Budget .....	16
<b>Annex A: Evaluation Matrix Tools .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Annex B: Brief profile of evaluation team.....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Annex C: List of documents reviewed .....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Annex D: List of institutions and stakeholders consulted.....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Annex E: Long list of potential countries for field work.....</b>	<b>33</b>

**Acronyms and Abbreviations**

CFS	Committee on World Food Security
CSM	International Food Security and Nutrition Civil Society Mechanism
ECOSOC	United Nations Economic and Social Council
EU	European Union
PSM	Private Sector Mechanism
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FSN	Food Security and Nutrition
GSF	Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition
HLPE	High Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition
ICN2	Second International Conference on Nutrition
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
M&E	Monitoring & Evaluation
MYPoW	Multi Year Programme of Work
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
OECD/DAC	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development's (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC)
OEWG	Open-Ended Working Group
PSM	Private Sector Mechanism of the Committee on World Food Security
RBA	Rome-Based Agencies (i.e. FAO, IFAD and WFP)
UNSCN	United Nations Standing Committee on Nutrition
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
SUN	Scaling Up Nutrition
VGGT	Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security
WHA	World Health Assembly
WHO	World Health Organization
WFP	World Food Programme of the United Nations

## **Summary**

The Bureau of the World Committee on Food Security (CFS) commissioned an independent evaluation of the CFS Reforms that were approved for implementation in 2009. This inception report follows on from the scoping mission conducted from 26 May to 3 June 2016. The report sets out the methodology for conducting the evaluation, including the key questions for the evaluation, describes the data collection methods and sources of data, and provides an indicative timetable for conducting the evaluation. It also shows an updated budget estimate for the evaluation.

## **Introduction**

### ***1.1 Purpose of evaluation***

1. The Committee on World Food Security (CFS) commissioned an independent evaluation of the effectiveness of the CFS reforms that were initiated in 2009. The CFS is an intergovernmental Committee in the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), with a mandate to serve as a global forum for review and follow-up on food security policies. In October 2013 at its Fortieth Session, the Committee endorsed the recommendation to conduct periodic assessments of CFS effectiveness in improving policy frameworks, especially at country level, and in promoting participation of and coherence among stakeholders on food security and nutrition. At the same session, the Committee decided that an evaluation of the progress of the reforms should be conducted including progress made towards the overall objective of the CFS and its three outcomes.

2. The purpose of the evaluation as set out in the Concept Note endorsed by the Bureau of the CFS is to:

- a) Produce evidence regarding whether CFS, as a multi stakeholder forum, is achieving the vision outlined in the Reform Documents and its expected outcomes;
- b) Assess the extent to which CFS is performing its roles outlined in the Reform Document, efficiently and effectively, and if so, with what impact;
- c) Review the working arrangements, including the multi-year programme of work of CFS in order to assess how the decision-making processes and planning may be impacting effectiveness;
- d) Propose forward-looking recommendations to enable CFS to respond effectively to the emerging food security and nutrition challenges, to further strengthen its comparative advantages and to enhance its leadership role in improving global food security and nutrition; and
- e) Generate learning regarding multi-stakeholder collaboration, to which the CFS represents a possible model to be replicated.

### ***1.2 Background and context***

3. The Committee on World Food Security (CFS) was established as an intergovernmental body in 1974, to serve as a forum for review and follow up of food security policies. It reports to the United Nations General Assembly through the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), and to the FAO Conference.

4. In 2009, the CFS embarked on a process of reform following a review of the institution. The impetus for the reform came from concerns about rising food prices in 2007-2008, the global financial and economic crisis in 2008-2009, and increasing variability of climate and extreme weather that negatively impacted on livelihoods. These crises once again brought to the fore, the high levels of structural poverty and hunger around the world. The second set of drivers for the reforms came from concerns about the effectiveness of the CFS to respond to these challenges.

5. The reform crafted a vision for the CFS “...as a central component of the evolving Global Partnership for Agriculture, Food Security and Nutrition will constitute the foremost inclusive international and intergovernmental platform for a broad range of committed stakeholders to work together in a coordinated manner and in support of country-led processes towards the elimination of hunger and ensuring food security and nutrition for all human beings. The CFS will strive for a world free from hunger where countries implement voluntary guidelines for the progressive realization of the right to adequate food in the context of national food security.”<sup>1</sup>

6. The Members of the CFS agreed that the reforms would be implemented in two phases, with the CFS gradually taking on additional roles in Phase II.<sup>2</sup> In Phase I, the CFS’s roles were to be: Coordination at the global level; Policy convergence; and Support and advice to countries and regions. The reforms included a number of changes to the structures and process of the CFS to align it with the vision and enhance its overall effectiveness. The two phases of the reforms are captured in the Table 1.

**Table 1: Roles of Reformed CFS**

<b>Roles: Phase I</b>	<b>Additional roles: Phase II</b>
<p><i>Coordination at global level.</i> Provide a platform for discussion and coordination to strengthen collaborative action among governments, regional organizations, international organizations and agencies, NGOs, CSO, food producers’ organizations, private sector organizations, philanthropic organizations and other relevant stakeholders, in a manner that is in alignment with each country’s specific context and needs.</p>	<p><i>Coordination at national and regional levels.</i> Serve as a platform to promote greater coordination and alignment of actions in the field, encourage more efficient use of resources and identify resource gaps. As the reform progresses, the CFS will build, as appropriate, on the coordination work of the United Nations High Level Task Force (HLTF). One guiding principle to support this role will be to build on and strengthen existing structures and linkages with key partners at all levels.....</p>
<p><i>Policy convergence.</i> Promote greater policy convergence and coordination, including through the development of international strategies and voluntary guidelines on food security and nutrition on the basis of best practices, lessons learned from local experience, inputs received from the national and regional levels, and expert advice and opinions from</p>	<p><i>Promote accountability and share best practice at all levels.</i> One of the main functions of the CFS has been to monitor actively the implementation of the 1996 World Food Summit Plan of Action (WFS-PoA). Although countries are taking measures to address food insecurity, the specific programmes as they are presented do not necessarily help to report quantitatively on</p>

<sup>1</sup> CFS, Reform of the Committee on World Food Security, Thirty-fifth Session, Rome, October 2009, CFS:2009/2 Rev.2, p.2

<sup>2</sup> CFS, Reform of the Committee on World Food Security, Thirty-fifth Session, Rome, October 2009, CFS:2009/2 Rev.2, p.2-3

<p>different stakeholders.</p>	<p>progress towards realizing the WFS-PoA objectives. 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 more 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. ....</p>
<p><i>Support and advice to countries and regions.</i> At country and/or region request, facilitate support and/or advice in the development, implementation. Monitoring and evaluation of their nationally and regionally owned plans of action for the elimination of hunger, achievement of food security and the practical application of the “Voluntary Guidelines for the Right to Food” that shall be based on the principles of participation, transparency and accountability.</p>	<p><i>Develop a Global Strategic Framework for food security and nutrition</i> in order to improve coordination and guide synchronized action by a wide range of stakeholders. The Global Strategic Framework will be flexible so that it can be adjusted as priorities change. It will build upon existing frameworks such as the UN’s Comprehensive Framework for Action (CFA), the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP), and the Voluntary Guidelines to Support the Realization of the Right to Adequate Food in the Context of National Food Security.</p>

7. The CFS currently comprises Members, participants, and observers reflecting one of the key reform objectives of ensuring that the voices of all relevant stakeholders are heard. Members of FAO, WFP, IFAD and non-member states of FAO that are Member states of the United Nations may be **Members** of the CFS. **Participants** include representatives of UN agencies that have a specific mandate in the field of food security and nutrition; civil society organizations; international agricultural research systems; international and regional financial institutions; and representatives from private sector associations and private foundations. Participants are actively involved in the work of the CFS, participate in the Plenary and inter-sessional activities through the Advisory Group established by the CFS Bureau. **Observers** are organizations or bodies invited to observe entire sessions or specific agenda items of the Committee or its Bureau. Organizations or bodies may apply for observer status to participate regularly or for specific issues.

8. The CFS has a permanent Secretariat with staff from the Rome-Based Agencies, and headed by a Secretary. Located in Rome, the role of the CFS Secretariat is to support the work of the Plenary, the Bureau, the Advisory Group, the High Level Panel of Experts, and the ad hoc Open-Ended Working Groups of the CFS<sup>3</sup>.

---

<sup>3</sup> For CFS structure and background see <http://www.fao.org/cfs/cfs-home/about/structure/en/>

### 1.3 Scope of the evaluation

9. The evaluation covers the period 2009 to 2015, and the expectation is that it should be a comprehensive evaluation. All CFS bodies including the CFS Plenary, the Bureau, the Advisory Group, the High Level Panel of Experts (HLPE) and the HLPE Secretariat, and the Joint CFS Secretariat, will contribute with their key views and evidence to the present evaluation. The evaluation is also required to include other ad hoc bodies, for example, the Open Ended Working Groups.

10. The Multi Year Programme of Work (MYPoW 2014-2015) adopted by the CFS at its 40<sup>th</sup> session in October 2013, articulated the overall objective and outcomes of the CFS as reflected below. These Outcomes are based on the roles of the CFS as set out in the CFS Reform Document. The evaluation will cover these three Outcomes and assess the extent to which they contribute to achieving the overall Objective.

<b>Overall Objective</b>	<i>Contribute to reducing hunger and malnutrition and enhancing food security and nutrition for all human beings</i>
<b>Outcome A</b>	Enhanced global coordination on food security and nutrition questions
<b>Outcome B</b>	Improved policy convergence on key food security and nutrition issues
<b>Outcome C</b>	Strengthened national and regional food security and nutrition actions

### Evaluation methodology and approach

11. The main aim of the evaluation is to determine whether the reforms that have been put in place -plus the existing mechanisms in place- are the most appropriate to accomplish the Overall Objective and Outcomes of the CFS to address relevant food security and nutrition priorities at global, regional and national levels. The Evaluation will emphasize the effectiveness and coordination among all CFS structures, namely the Bureau, The Secretariat, the Regional Groups, the High Level Panel of Experts (HLPE), the Open ended Working Groups, the Civil Society Mechanism, the Private Sector Mechanism, as well the Rome Based Agencies (FAO, IFAD, WFP), other UN agencies, and national partners.<sup>4</sup>

12. The evaluation will adopt a mixed methods approach and follows a series of pre-determined steps to collect qualitative and quantitative data including a) A scoping mission to the CFS Headquarters in Rome; b) Desk review of relevant CFS documents; c) Interviews to key informants and focus group sessions, d) survey; e) fieldwork including selective country visits; and f) data analysis and preparation of the report.

13. The evaluation is required to comply with UNEG Standards and Norms for Evaluation, and so must be credible, based on evidence. This is an independent evaluation and the Evaluation Team has the flexibility to define the details of the evaluation. The

---

<sup>4</sup> For CFS structure, collaboration and activities see <http://www.fao.org/cfs/cfs-home/activities/en/>

Evaluation Team will adopt a consultative approach within the parameters of independence, as it is important that the CFS Bureau has ownership of the evaluation and uses the results of the evaluation.

#### 1.4 Evaluation criteria and evaluation questions

14. The evaluation will use the criteria of **relevance**, **efficiency** and **effectiveness** defined by the OECD-DAC<sup>5</sup>: *Relevance*: The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners' and donors' policies.. *Efficiency*: A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results. *Effectiveness*: The extent to which the development intervention's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance. The evaluation will also be guided by the OECD-DAC evaluation principles of impartiality and independence, credibility and usefulness of evaluations<sup>6</sup>. The Evaluation Team places a emphasis on the usefulness of the evaluation, through formulating findings that are relevant to the CFS Bureau and stakeholders.

15. To facilitate the evaluation, the evaluation aim and purposes, and key evaluation questions are organised into a conceptual framework as shown below. A set of sub-questions to serve as data collection points is shown in the evaluation matrix in Annex A.

<b>Aim of evaluation:</b> <i>The main aim of the evaluation is to determine whether the reforms that have been put in place -plus the existing mechanisms in place- are the most appropriate to accomplish the Overall Objective and Outcomes of the CFS to address relevant food security and nutrition priorities at global, regional and national levels.</i>	
<b>Purpose</b>	<b>Key evaluation questions</b>
<p><b>Purpose 1: To verify that the reform led to the intended outcomes</b></p> <p>This covers relevance and effectiveness: <i>did the reforms work?</i></p>	<p>1.1 To what extent has the reformed CFS enhanced global <b>coordination</b> of food security and nutrition questions?</p> <p>1.2 To what extent has the reformed CFS improved <b>policy convergence</b> on key food security and nutrition issues?</p> <p>1.3 To what extent has the reformed CFS strengthened national and regional food security and nutrition <b>actions</b>?</p>

<sup>5</sup> OECD. Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management. 2010. The evaluation criteria are derived from the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) from: Glossary of Key Terms In Evaluation and Results Based Management. Available at: <http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/2754804.pdf>.

<sup>6</sup> OECD-DAC, Principles for Evaluation of Development Effectiveness, 1991

<p><b>Purpose 2: To describe the elements &amp; processes of the reforms that are contributing to the outcomes</b></p> <p>Note: This covers relevance, effectiveness and efficiency: <i>how is the reformed CFS functioning?</i></p>	<p>2.1 To what extent are the new <b>roles, working arrangements, management systems, and structures</b> associated with the outcomes?</p> <p>2.2 To what extent are <b>new strategies, tools, products, recommendations</b> associated with the outcomes?</p> <p>2.3 To what extent are the <b>stakeholder platforms, interactions, structures</b> associated with the outcomes?</p> <p>2.4 What <b>unexpected outcomes</b> &amp; dynamics have emerged from the new roles and structures?</p>
<p><b>Purpose 3: To generate lessons on the multi-stakeholder collaboration model</b> (for possible replication of the platform model among member agencies)</p> <p>Note: This covers effectiveness and efficiency with regards to collaboration; <i>is the collaboration approach worth replicating?</i></p>	<p>3.1 To what extent has the multi-stakeholder platform engaged a <b>diversity of voices</b> in policy-making?</p> <p>3.2 To what extent are <b>gender and youth interests integrated</b>?</p> <p>3.3 What are the <b>assumptions, factors, and conditions</b> necessary for the platform to function effectively?</p>

16. The CFS does not have a Results Framework that specify the outputs and indicators. However, the nature of the work of the CFS involves complicated and complex processes of policy-making at the global level and with uncertain outcomes. For this reason the Evaluation Team will seek to make explicit the ‘**Theory of Change**’ underlying the work of the CFS. A theory of change, put simply, is a process of defining the pathways to achieving the longer-term goal or ultimate outcome of a programme or intervention. The theory of change will assist the Evaluation Team in contextualising the activities and outputs of the CFS and analysing the data collected on these.

### 1.5 Scoping mission

17. The Evaluation Manager conducted a scoping mission to the Headquarters of the Rome-Based Agencies (RBAs) from 26 May to 3 June 2016. The specific objective of the mission was to meet the CFS Bureau Members, the structures of the CFS, and the Rome-Based Agencies (RBAs) to obtain information on the following:

- (i) Their role and functions in the CFS;
- (ii) Their views on specific issues they wanted the evaluation to focus on;
- (iii) Any information (documents, reports, etc.) that they thought might be of value to the evaluation team; and
- (iv) Suggestions for key informants for the evaluation

18. The Evaluation Manager met with the CFS Chair, Amira Gornass; Former CFS Chairperson: Gerda Verburg; Former CFS Chair: Yaya Olanarin; Kostas Stamoulis (on behalf of Director-General); CFS Secretariat – Secretary and Secretariat staff; HLPE Chair and Vice-Chair (Skype) and Secretariat; Bureau Members/Regional Groups: All regional

groups; Chairs of 6 Open-Ended Working Groups; Civil Society Mechanism Secretariat; World Farmers' Organization; Private Sector Mechanism (Skype discussion); Evaluation offices of FAO, IFAD and WFP; Programme officials from FAO, IFAD and WFP (including those involved in the CFS Advisory Group); High Level Task Force: David Nabarro (telephone discussion); Representative from the UN Standing Committee on Nutrition; and Dr Branca, Director: Nutrition, WHO (telephone discussion). The full list of persons consulted during the scoping mission is shown in Annex D.

19. The informal debrief session held at the end of the scoping mission gave an overview of the key issues raised by key informants, for exploration in the evaluation.

### **1.6 Evaluation activities**

20. The evaluation will draw on qualitative and quantitative information from a range of sources. As the subject matter of the evaluation is in the area of institutional reform and policy development at the intergovernmental level, the emphasis will be on qualitative information.

#### **Document review**

21. The Evaluation Team will review a large number of documents and reports, published and unpublished. Some of the key documents to be reviewed include the proceedings and reports of the CFS Plenary, reports of the HLPE, MYPoW documents, and other reports that emanate from the CFS structures. Special attention will be given to reviewing the various products of the CFS, for example, the Voluntary Guidelines on Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land (VGGT). The Evaluation Team will review documents from sources other than the CFS, for example, strategy and programme documents of the Rome-Based Agencies, and past evaluations conducted on the work and structures of the CFS and related topics. An electronic document repository has been established for all Evaluation Team members to access and to upload additional documents.

#### **Key informant interviews and Small Group discussions**

22. The semi-structured interviews of key informants will be a major source of information for the Evaluation Team. Key informants will be identified through a "snow-ball chain" approach of contacts and references from various sources. The categories of potential interviewees at global, regional and national levels are shown in Annex A. Most of the interviews will be face-to-face at headquarters in Rome, and in the sample of countries selected for field visits. The Evaluation Team will conduct the remaining interviews by Skype or telephone. The information collected through the interviews will be confidential and only for use by the Evaluation Team. Nonetheless, informed consent will be sought from the interviewees to reproduce statements or parts of the interview. No information will be disclosed that will enable it to be traced back to the source.

23. Interview protocols/guides will be developed for the interviews to ensure consistency in application across the Evaluation Team. The interview guides will be based on the main evaluation questions. Different categories of stakeholders will have questions that are specific to them, in addition to a set of common questions for all stakeholders. Interviewers will have the flexibility to include supplementary questions or skip questions,

depending on the interviewee. On average, an interview is expected to last 60-90 minutes. Interviews may be recorded, subject to the informed consent of the interviewee. On the completion of each interview, the Evaluation Team member will be required to prepare notes on the interview, based on an agreed template. This will facilitate the analysis of the interview data at a later stage. Sensitive interviewing (Patton 2003) informal and conversational is a central strategy to collect meaningful data. There are several key components to take into account such as sensitive listening and questioning, judging responses, recording interviews sessions (when permission is granted) and finally conducting a self-critical review.

24. The Evaluation Team will also use small group discussions or focus group discussions. These discussions are particularly useful as a means of soliciting diverse views within stakeholder groups. This method of data collection tends to be also helpful to interpret the meaning generated along with other tools for data collection.

### **Survey**

25. The CFS conducted an effectiveness survey in 2015 with assessment criteria that are pertinent to the evaluation: Relevance of CFS; Inclusiveness and Participation; Coordination and Engagement; Promotion of Policy Convergence; Evidence-based decision-making; CFS Communication Strategy; CFS Responsiveness; CFS Influence; and Capacity for uptake. As the survey is recent and covers most aspects of relevance to the evaluation, the team proposes to use the raw data of the survey and summarise the emerging findings. This information can be presented to key stakeholders to confirm assumption and/or to find divergent aspects or points of view that will help to further analyse and interpret the findings

### **Country visits/ Fieldwork**

26. There are 137 Members of the CFS from 7 regions. The evaluation will visit a sample of countries that have a range of existing institutions necessary for the CFS to perform its functions, prioritising those countries where regional or sub-regional institutions/entities addressing Food Security & Nutrition are based. The maximum number of countries that will be visited is 10. Smaller regions will have 1 country visited, while larger regions will have 2-3 countries visited. The countries will be selected on the basis of the following criteria:

- (i) Strong FAO presence (Regional, Sub regional and country level)
- (ii) Whether the country has shown consistent progress towards achieving food security
- (iii) Have used or applied the VGGT
- (iv) Whether the country is representative of a particular geographic region
- (v) Whether lessons learned can be drawn upon to reflect on strategic issues affecting the country's performance to achieve food security and nutrition

27. Table 2 shows the potential interviewees at country level. All efforts would be made to include stakeholders who have been directly involved in the policy process in any given country. Where appropriate, group discussions will be conducted. A provisional 'long list' of potential countries is shown in Annex E.

**Table 2: Potential interviewees at country level**

Category	Potential interviewees
Government	Office of Prime Minister/President, Ministries of Agriculture, Forestry, Fisheries, Health, Trade & Industry, Commerce, Women's Ministry or Office
United Nations	Resident Coordinator, Country offices of FAO, WFP, IFAD, WHO, other UN agencies resident in country
Civil society	Civil society organizations involved in Food Security & Nutrition, Farmer Organizations, Cooperatives
Academia and Research Centres	Universities, National Agricultural Research Institutions (NARS), CGIAR
Private Sector	Business enterprises, Industry and other private-public partnerships (PPP)

### Data analysis

28. In reviewing the various documents that include reports and literature, the Evaluation Team will identify themes, guided by the main evaluation questions and sub-questions. The document review will also serve as a source of triangulation of data from other sources, namely, the semi-structured interviews and country visits.

29. The qualitative data collected through semi-structured interviews will be fed into a matrix that will allow identification of common themes and divergent ones. The matrix will convey the information collected through the questionnaires by group of stakeholders and the CFS various bodies. The Evaluation Team will also use case stories/studies that illustrate 'moments of truth'; in the form of an actual change in policy with connection to CSF products, services, or advice. This information would help illustrate different stages facilitating the creation of categories and sub-categories to make data analysis manageable. Vignettes can be also utilized to make categories more explicit and illustrative.

30. The Evaluation Team will analyse the raw data from the 2015 Effectiveness Survey, running different analyses of both the quantitative and qualitative data. The intention is not to duplicate what already exists, but rather to drill deeper into those aspects that are most pertinent to the evaluation.

31. Validity will be pursued at all levels, and the triangulation of the information collected through various methodological tools. The data analysis done by each team member will be subjected to scrutiny by the rest of the team. The Evaluation Team will also convene a session with the Bureau and selected stakeholders to test the emerging findings.

### 1.7 Limitations and mitigation strategies

32. The recruitment of the Evaluation Team, including the Evaluation Manager took longer than originally envisaged in the Evaluation Concept Note. To minimise further delays, the Evaluation Manager undertook the scoping mission prior to the recruitment of the other

members of the Evaluation Team. The Evaluation Team members therefore do not have the benefit of the exposure to the CFS structures and Rome-Based Agencies and the issues discussed during the scoping mission. Every effort will be made to orientate the team to the work of the CFS and the issues raised during the scoping mission.

33. Time is a constraint that will have to be considered. As many individuals at headquarters will be away from mid-July to end August, interviews at headquarters will have to be conducted between mid-September to mid-October. Time, as well as the budget will place a limitation on the number of countries that can be visited. The Evaluation Team will visit at least 7 countries (one per region), and 1 additional country in 3 regions. As there is considerable diversity amongst countries for the same region, it will be difficult to identify a country that is representative of a particular region. The Evaluation Team will use the opportunity presented by the CFS October Plenary to interview delegates attending the Plenary. This will provide the team with perspectives from those countries that could not be visited.

## **Managing the evaluation**

### ***1.8 Evaluation team***

34. A team of five, seasoned programme evaluators includes the Evaluation Manager, the Quality Assurance Advisor, the Evaluation Team Leader, two Thematic Experts in areas of Nutrition and Public Policy and a Research Assistant. The main areas of expertise include knowledge of evaluation and implementation procedures (assessment, data collection and analysis), nutrition and food security, public policy and private sector engagement, high-level expertise and experience in food systems value chains; gender and empowerment issues that pertain to food security. The team profile is shown in Annex B.

### ***1.9 Quality assurance***

35. The following are built into the evaluation process to assure the quality of the evaluation process and the evaluation reports:

- (i) A Quality Assurance Adviser has been appointed to review the inception report, data collection instruments, data analysis and final report. The Quality Assurance Adviser is a credentialed evaluator with experience in evaluating complex development programmes.
- (ii) Where appropriate, the Evaluation Team will consult the Evaluation Offices of the Rome-Based Agencies on methodological issues without undermining the independence of the evaluation.
- (iii) The Evaluation Team will share its initial impressions and observations with the Bureau and selected stakeholders to avoid surprises in the final report.
- (iv) The draft evaluation report will be circulated to the Bureau and selected stakeholders for comments, emphasising the importance of receiving their timely feedback on the future use of the findings and recommendations. Comments on which would be the top priority recommendations, and the conditions or steps/procedures that need to be flagged to ensure that recommendations are on the relevant meeting agendas for example, will be sought to improve the utilisation of the evaluation. All comments will be logged and considered. As this is an independent evaluation, the Evaluation Team will make the final decision on the contents of the report

### 1.10 Indicative timetable

36. Table 2 shows the indicative timetable for the evaluation. The dates for the deliverables and activities

**Table 3: Indicative timetable for evaluation**

<b>Deliverable/Activity</b>	<b>Indicative Time Frame</b>
Recruitment of core team	mid-July 2016
Inception report quality assured and consulted with the CFS Bureau	End July 2016
Document review	July/August 2016
Data collection	August/September 2016
Data collection and analysis	September/October 2016
1.10.1.1.1.1 Presentation of emerging findings and areas of recommendation	1.10.1.1.1.2 October 2016
First draft report quality assured and for circulated for comment	End November 2016
Second draft incorporating comments	End December 2016
Final evaluation report quality assured and submitted to CFS Bureau	End January 2017

### 1.11 Evaluation report

37. The final evaluation report will be a maximum of 30 pages excluding the annexes. It will include an executive summary that will also serve as a stand-alone document. The indicative outline is shown below. The Evaluation Team will convene a workshop with the Bureau and key stakeholders to share emerging findings and areas of recommendation, prior to drafting the report. The draft report will be distributed for comment, and finalised once all comments have been received and considered. The main sections of the report are as follows:

#### **Executive Summary**

##### **1. Introduction**

1.1 Purpose of the evaluation

1.2 Methodology of the evaluation

##### **2. Context**

2.1 Overview of CFS

2.2 CFS reforms 2009

##### **3. Key findings of the Evaluation**

3.1 Findings discussed according to the key evaluation questions

3.2 Findings discussed according to evaluation criteria

##### **4. Conclusions and recommendations**

4.1 Conclusions

## 4.2 Recommendations

**Annexes:**

Annex A:	Terms of reference
Annex B:	Documents consulted
Annex C:	Persons consulted
Annex D:	Data collection instruments
Annex E:	Information from survey and country cases

**1.12 Budget**

The estimated cost of the evaluation as set out in the Evaluation Concept Note is USD 450 305 including project service costs. Table 4 shows the original budget estimates and revised estimates. Further refinements will be made to the budget once the countries have been selected. Some savings have been made on the fees of the Evaluation Team. The original budget estimates for the travel and DSA are insufficient, and the revised estimate provides for a reduction in the number of missions to Rome and visits to 1 country in each of 7 regions. From a methodological perspective, it would be preferable for the larger regions to have 2-3 countries to be visited.

**Table 4: Budget estimates for evaluation of CFS reform**

<b>1.12.1.1.1.1.1 Original Budget</b>		<b>1.12.1.1.1.1.2 Current estimate</b>	
<b>1.12.1.1.1.1.3 Evaluation Team</b>	1.12.1.1.1.1.8 210 000	<b>1.12.1.1.1.1.9 Evaluation Team</b>	1.12.1.1.1.1.14 199 260
1.12.1.1.1.1.4 - Evaluation Manager		1.12.1.1.1.1.10 - Evaluation Manager	
1.12.1.1.1.1.5 - Evaluation Team Leader		1.12.1.1.1.1.11 - Evaluation Team Leader	
1.12.1.1.1.1.6 - Thematic Experts X 2		1.12.1.1.1.1.12 - Thematic Experts X 2	
1.12.1.1.1.1.7 - Quality Assurance Advisor		1.12.1.1.1.1.13 - Quality Assurance Advisor	
<b>1.12.1.1.1.1.15 Travel/DSAs</b>	81 000	<b>1.12.1.1.1.1.18 Travel/DSAs</b>	1.12.1.1.1.1.23 86 596
1.12.1.1.1.1.16 - Evaluation Manager and Team Leader (3 missions to Rome)		1.12.1.1.1.1.19 - Evaluation Manager (3 missions to Rome including inception mission)	
1.12.1.1.1.1.17 - Thematic Experts (5 missions to selected countries/regions)		1.12.1.1.1.1.20 - Team Leader (2 missions to Rome)	
		1.12.1.1.1.1.21 - 2 Thematic Experts (1 mission to Rome)	
		1.12.1.1.1.1.22 - Country/region missions by	

		team (pairs of 2 per mission) X 7 countries	
1.12.1.1.1.1.24 Translation costs	1.12.1.1.1.1.25 107 500	Translation costs	1.12.1.1.1.1.26 107 500
<b>Total</b>	<b>1.12.1.1.1.1.27 398 500</b>	<b>1.12.1.1.1.1.28 Total</b>	<b>1.12.1.1.1.1.29 393 356</b>
1.12.1.1.1.1.30 Project Service Costs (13%)	1.12.1.1.1.1.31 51 805	1.12.1.1.1.1.32 Project Service Costs (13%)	1.12.1.1.1.1.33 51 136
<b>1.12.1.1.1.1.34 Grand Total</b>	<b>1.12.1.1.1.1.35 450 305</b>	<b>1.12.1.1.1.1.36 Grand Total</b>	<b>1.12.1.1.1.1.37 444 492</b>

## Annex A: Evaluation Matrix Tools

The main aim of the evaluation is to determine whether the reforms that have been put in place -plus the existing mechanisms in place- are the most appropriate to accomplish the Overall Objective and Outcomes of the CFS to address relevant food security and nutrition priorities at global, regional and national levels.

The evaluation will use the criteria of **relevance, efficiency, effectiveness**, also taking into account **sustainability and impact**

<b>1.12.1.1.1.1.38 Overall Objective</b>	<i>1.12.1.1.1.1.39 Contribute to reducing hunger and malnutrition and enhancing food security and nutrition for all human beings</i>
<b>1.12.1.1.1.1.40 Outcome A</b>	1.12.1.1.1.1.41 Enhanced global coordination on food security and nutrition questions
<b>1.12.1.1.1.1.42 Outcome B</b>	1.12.1.1.1.1.43 Improved policy convergence on key food security and nutrition issues
<b>1.12.1.1.1.1.44 Outcome C</b>	1.12.1.1.1.1.45 Strengthened national and regional food security and nutrition actions

### PURPOSE 1: to verify that the reform led to the intended outcomes

Note: This covers **Relevance** and **Effectiveness**: *Did the reforms work?*

Key Evaluation Questions	Evidence needed	Sources	Data collection
1.1 To what extent has the reformed CFS <i>enhanced global coordination of food security and nutrition questions?</i>	Coordination examples within the CFS realm, but its partners, by member governments  Narratives about how the coordination may have contributed reformed CFS strategies /actions /products	Reports on coordination  Key stakeholders involved in coordination	Theory of Change diagrams (using a gradient of outcomes as in Outcome Mapping)  Most significant change stories  Documentation review
1.2 To what extent has the reformed CFS <i>improved policy convergence on key food security and nutrition issues?</i>	Policy convergence examples; variations; linkages to CFS strategies/ actions/products	Reports on convergence  Key stakeholders involved in convergence	Interviews

<p>1.3 To what extent has the reformed CFS <i>strengthened national and regional food security and nutrition actions?</i></p>	<p>Examples of national and regional actions; linkages to CFS strategies / actions/ products</p>	<p>Reports on actions  Key stakeholders implementing the actions</p>	<p>Focus groups</p>
---	--	--	---------------------

*Possible data collection questions:*

- How effective has the CFS been in promoting policy coherence in Food Security & Nutrition, horizontally (among countries) and vertically (from local level to global level)?
- How relevant is the mandate of the reformed CFS in the current context?
- To what extent is the CFS fulfilling its mandate and roles set out in the 2009 reforms?

**PURPOSE 2: To describe the elements & processes of the reforms that are contributing to the outcomes**

Note: This covers **relevance and effectiveness:** *How is the reformed CFS functioning?*

Key Evaluation Questions	Evidence needed	Sources	Data collection
<p>2.1 To what extent are the new <b>roles, working arrangements, management systems, and structures</b> associated with the outcomes?</p>	<p>Summary of original vs. reformed roles, systems, structures and procedures  Theory of change linking these to the outcomes (assumptions and conditions necessary)</p>	<p>Administrators in lead agencies  Stakeholders representing the different groups, committees, etc.  2015 Survey findings</p>	<p>Theory of Change diagrams (using a gradient of outcomes as in Outcome Mapping)  Most significant change stories</p>
<p>2.2 To what extent are <b>new strategies, tools, products, recommendations</b> associated with the outcomes?</p>	<p>Summary of main tools, products, publications, strategies.  Theory of change linking these to the outcomes (assumptions and conditions necessary)</p>	<p>As above</p>	<p>Documentation review  Interviews  Focus groups</p>
<p>2.3 To what extent are the <b>stakeholder platforms, interactions, structures</b> associated</p>	<p>Summary of the platforms. As above with emphasis on platforms and interaction</p>	<p>As above</p>	<p>Narratives explaining select 2015 Survey findings</p>

with the outcomes?	events/practices		
2.4 What <b>unexpected outcomes &amp; dynamics</b> have emerged from the new roles and structures?	Narratives about emergent changes that were not foreseen	As above	

*Possible data collection questions:*

- How relevant are the CFS’s strategies, policy products and recommendations in addressing Food Security & Nutrition Priorities at global, regional and national levels?
- To what extent are the products (guidelines, tools, knowledge products) used as evidence to inform policies, programmes and strategies of, for example, Member States, the UN system, civil society, and the private sector?
- To what extent are the reports of the HLPE used to inform policy-making in Food Security & Nutrition?
- How efficient and effective are the organization and management of the CFS?

**PURPOSE 3: To generate lessons on multi-stakeholder collaboration model** (for possible replication of the platform model among member agencies)

Note: This covers **effectiveness and efficiency** with regards to collaboration: *Is the collaboration approach worth replicating?*

Key Evaluation Questions	Evidence needed	Sources	Data collection
3.1 To what extent has the multi-stakeholder platform engaged a <b>diversity of voices</b> in policy-making?	List of stakeholders before the reforms, and now;  Comments from the stakeholders on the extent to which their voice is heard (or who has been excluded)	Stakeholders that can be interviewed  Documentation (stakeholder analyses)	Documentation review  Interviews
3.2 To what extent are <b>gender and youth interests integrated</b> ?	As above.	As above	Focus groups
3.3 What are the <b>assumptions, factors, and conditions</b> necessary for the platform to function?	Narratives by stakeholders based on sample events, processes	As above	Most significant change stories

*Possible data collection questions:*

- How effective is the CFS as a multi-stakeholder platform in providing inclusive participation and a diversity of voices in policy-making on matters of Food Security & Nutrition?
- How has the CFS incorporated gender equality and empowerment of women in its work?
- To what extent does the CFS consider youth in its agenda?

**Table 5: Interviewees and type of interview**

Category of interviewees	Semi-structured face-to-face interviews	Skype or telephone interviews	Semi-structured interviews / focus groups during country visits
CFS Chair past and present	X		
CFS Bureau Members and Regional Groups	X		
CFS Advisory Group Members	X		
CFS OEWG	X		
CFS Secretariat	X		
CSM Secretariat and member organizations	X	X	X
PSM Secretariat and member organizations		X	X
World Farmer Organization and member organizations	X		X
HLPE		X	
HLPE Secretariat	X		
HLTF		X	
FAO HQ	X		
WFP HQ	X		
IFAD HQ	X		
WHO HQ		X	
UNSCN	X		
Other UN agencies HQ		X	
Country offices (FAO, WFP, IFAD)			X
Ministries of Agriculture			X
Other relevant national ministries			X
Regional institutions		X	
IFIs		X	
Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research	X		

### Sampling Rationale

The criteria of selectivity adopted will emphasize “purposeful and critical” case sampling. Critical cases are those that for some reason are particularly interesting or important and have something special to offer regarding the topic of research. However, to be able to work with a representative group of people in each of the above categories, key informants play a

primary role. A key informant is a person who can offer very specific clues or observations within a certain population. Similar and divergent views collected from groups of partners – mentioned above- will be shared, discussed and analysed. Furthermore, those cases that differed consistently from the average will be taken into special account and also analysed.

**Annex B: Brief profile of evaluation team**

**Team Leader:** *Angela Bester, Master of Business Administration, University of Technology, Sydney, Australia; Master of Art (Sociology), University of New South Wales, Australia; Bachelor of Social Science (Honours), University of Cape Town, South Africa*

Angela is a public sector expert who has worked in the public sector in South Africa and Australia for over 20 years. Her public service career began in Australia where she spent many years in the NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics & Research and in the NSW Premier's Department. During this period Angela developed skills in research, evaluation and conducting program and strategic reviews. Angela has since served as Director-General of the National Department of Social Development and Director-General of the Public Service Commission (South Africa); and Governance Adviser for Department for International Development (DFID). Between 2006 and 2011, Angela was a Director at Deloitte & Touché (Southern Africa) where she led major public sector consulting assignments. She has since established herself as an independent consultant.

Angela has managed and conducted evaluations for the South African Government and the United Nations, as well as for international development agencies. Examples of her work include the Review of Independent System-Wide Evaluation in the United Nations system; Evaluation of UNDP Global Programme IV; Evaluation of UNDP Regional Programme for Africa; and UNDP Country Evaluations in Nepal and Ghana. Angela has a good knowledge of Swaziland and conducted the Mid-Term Evaluation of the Swaziland UNDAF 2011-2015, and also supported the Swaziland United Nations Country Team with the development of the UNDAF 2016-2020.

**Evaluation Team Leader:** *Patricia Biermayr-Jenzano, PhD, Master of Science, Agricultural Extension and Social Anthropology; Cornell University; Agricultural Engineer, Buenos Aires, Argentina*

Dr. Patricia Biermayr-Jenzano is a social scientist and gender specialist who has conducted Program evaluation, ethnographic research and gender analysis in relation to the feminization of agriculture in Latin America, Africa and Southeast Asia. She holds a PhD/MS in Adult Education (Agricultural Extension) and Social Anthropology (Gender) from Cornell University, NY and an Agricultural Engineering degree from Buenos Aires, Argentina. She has conducted evaluation tasks for the FAO Office of Evaluation (OED) and the Regional Office in Santiago, Chile, performing as a Team Leader for the Country Program Evaluation of Trinidad and Tobago, Guyana and the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States and Barbados. She conducted gender analysis of value chains for the International Center of Agriculture in the Dry Areas (ICARDA) based in Jordan, analysed gender and health impacts of GMOs adoption for the Program of Biosafety Systems (PBS) at the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) and other CGIAR Centers. Her research and applied work has deep roots in Qualitative and Participatory Action Research, theory and practice while she has been heavily involved mainstreaming gender in agriculture and conservation efforts.

Earlier, Patricia worked as a Regional Program Coordinator for FAO based in San Jose, Costa Rica and as the Program Leader of the Participatory Research and Gender Analysis Program at the International Center for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT) in Cali, Colombia. In the USA, she worked for Cornell University and studied how ethnicity, race and gender

determine ways in which women and Indigenous Peoples conserve biodiversity and natural resources. She has also performed as a Population-Environment Fellow at the University of Michigan, Center for Population Studies. Currently, she is an independent consultant for the FAO, IFAD and the UN System and a Visiting Adjunct Professor at the Center for Latin America Studies and the Women and Gender Studies Program at Georgetown University in Washington DC.

**Quality Assurance Advisor:** *Ricardo Ramirez, PhD, University of Guelph, Canada; Master of Adult Education, St Francis Xavier University, Canada; B.Sc. Agriculture, Crop Science, University of Guelph, Canada*

For the past 18 years, Ricardo Ramirez has been registered as an independent researcher and consultant. He collaborates with other consulting teams in Ontario and internationally. He was Associate Professor in Capacity Development and Extension for two years with the School of Environmental Design and Rural Development, University of Guelph, Canada; and remains as Adjunct Professor. From 1995-97 he was the Manager of the Information and Communication Unit of ILEIA, a Netherlands-based international sustainable agriculture think-tank. From 1989 to 1995 he was a Project Officer with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN in Rome developing the communication strategies for food and agricultural programs worldwide. Between 1982 and 1989 he worked in the field with non-governmental organizations in Latin America and the Caribbean in subsistence agriculture, rural development and training projects. Ricardo Ramirez is a Credentialed Evaluator (Canadian Evaluation Association).

**Research Assistant:** - *Cherin Hoon, B.A Economics, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore*

Cherin Hoon has worked for the Singapore government for the past 8 years in policy and planning portfolios. From 2010-2016, she was a Senior Executive Manager with the Agri-Food and Veterinary Authority of Singapore, specializing in policy and international relations work in food security. She was Singapore's focal point for FAO, APEC Policy Partnership on Food Security and G20. Between 2008 and 2010, she was a Manager with the Ministry of Manpower of Singapore, specializing in business intelligence, policy, planning and legislation. From 2007 – 2008, she was a Research Assistant with the Nanyang Technological University of Singapore and co-published a paper on the Value of Statistical Life of Singaporeans.

**Thematic Expert (Nutrition):** Recruitment in progress

**Thematic Expert (Public Policy):** Recruitment in progress

**Annex C: List of documents reviewed**

**CFS.** 2009. *Reform of the Committee on World Food Security*. Rome.

**CFS.** 2013. *CFS Multi-Year Programme of Work (MYPoW) for 2014 - 2015*. Rome.

**CFS.** 2013. *Report of the Fortieth Session of the Committee on World Food Security*. Rome.

**CFS.** 2014. *Report of the Forty-first Session of the Committee on World Food Security*. Rome.

**CFS.** 2015. *CFS Multi-Year Programme of Work (MYPoW) for 2016 - 2017*. Rome.

**CFS.** 2015. *Concept Note for Evaluation of the Effectiveness of CFS Reform*. CFS Bureau and Advisory Group Meeting 24 November 2016. Rome.

**CFS.** 2015. *Following Progress on Decisions and Recommendation of CFS*. Rome.

**CFS.** 2015. *Report of the Forty-second Session of the Committee on World Food Security*. Rome.

**CFS.** 2015. *Report on the findings of the CFS Effectiveness Survey*. Rome.

**CFS.** 2016. *Background Note on the Open-Ended Working Group on Monitoring*. Rome.

**CFS.** 2016. *CFS Approach to Policy Convergence*. CFS Bureau and Advisory Group Meeting, 31 March 2016. Rome.

**CFS.** 2016. *Draft Decision Box for Monitoring: Terms of Reference to share experiences and good practices in applying CFS decisions and recommendations through organizing events at national, regional and global levels*. Open-Ended Working Group on Monitoring Meeting #2. Rome.

**CFS.** 2016. *Draft Terms of Reference to share experiences and good practices in applying CFS decisions and recommendations through organizing events at national, regional and global levels*. Open-Ended Working Group on Monitoring Meeting #2. Rome.

**CFS.** 2016. *Farmers' Contribution to the Committee on World Food Security*. CFS Bureau and Advisory Group Meeting, 31 March 2016. Rome.

**CFS.** 2016. *Information Note on the experiences and good practices in the use and application of the VGGT*. Rome.

**CFS High-Level Panel of Experts.** 2015. *Info Note on the High-Level Panel of Experts for Food Security and Nutrition (HLPE) of the Committee on World Food Security (CFS)*. Rome.

**CFS High-Level Panel of Experts.** 2015. *Summaries and Recommendations of HLPE reports 1-9*. Rome.

**CFS High-Level Panel of Experts.** 2016. *HLPE impacts (2010 – 2015)*. 13<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the HLPE Steering Committee. USA.

**CFS High-Level Panel of Experts.** 2016. *Note to the Trust Fund Oversight Committee on HLPE impacts: Update for the year 2015.* Support to the establishment and functioning of the HLPE (HLPE Trust Fund). USA.

**FAO.** 2014. *Independent Review of FAO Governance reforms.* Rome.

**FAO.** 2016. *Evaluations in FAO.* Rome.

**FAO & WHO.** 2014. *Framework for Action.* Second International Conference on Nutrition. Rome.

**FAO & WHO.** 2014. *Rome Declaration on Nutrition.* Second International Conference on Nutrition. Rome.

**FAO** (2014) Policy Paper, Food Security and Nutrition in Small Island Developing States (SIDS).

**FAO** Programme Committee 116 session (November 2014): PC116/5 - Indicative Rolling Work Plan of Strategic and Programme Evaluation 2015-17. Sourced at: <http://www.fao.org/3/a-ml978e.pdf>.

**FAO** (2013) Policy on Gender Equality Attaining Food Security Goals in Agriculture and Rural Development.

**FAO Office of Evaluation** (OED) (2012) Evaluation of FAO's Role and Work in Food and Agriculture Policy.

**FAO.** The State of Food and Agriculture 2010-2011, Women in Agriculture, Closing the Gender Gap in Development (2011), Rome, Italy. Retrieved from <http://www.fao.org/docrep/013/i2050e/i2050e.pdf>

**FAO.** SOFA Team. Gender Differences in assets. Rome, Italy. (2011) Retrieved from [www.fao.org/economic/esa](http://www.fao.org/economic/esa)

**FAO** Office of Evaluation. (2012) Evaluation of FAO's Role and Work in Food and Agriculture Policy.

**FAO** (2013) Policy on Gender Equality Attaining Food Security Goals in Agriculture and Rural Development.

**International Agri-Food Network.** 2015. *Private Sector Mechanism Position Paper on Strengthening CFS Reform Outcomes.*

**International Food Security and Nutrition Civil Society Mechanism.** 2015. *Civil Society Statements to CFS 42.*

**International Food Security and Nutrition Civil Society Mechanism.** 2015. *CSM Annual Report.*

*Patton, Michael Quinn.* 2003. *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.*

**Schiavoni, C. & Mulvany, P.** 2014. *Evaluation of the CSM, Civil Society Mechanism for relations with the CFS.*

**UNGA.** 2016. *United Nations Decade of Action on Nutrition (2016-2025).* New York City.

**United Nation Evaluation Group (UNEG)** (2011) Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation-Towards UNEG Guidance.

**United Nations Secretary General's High-Level Task Force on World Food Security (HLPE)** (2012). Food security and climate change. A Report by the High Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition of the Committee on World Food Security. Committee on World Food Security, Rome.

**World Bank,** 2011, World Development Report 2012. Gender Equality and Development (Washington DC).

**WFP.** 2015. *Annual Evaluation Report 2014.* Rome.

## **Annex D: List of institutions and stakeholders consulted**

### CFS Chairs present and past

**Gornass Amira**, CFS Chair (current)

**Verburg Gerda**, CFS Chair (2013 – 2015)

**Olaniran Olaitan Y.A**, CFS Chair (2011 – 2013)

### Bureau & Regional Groups

**Abdul Razak Ayazi**, Alternate Permanent Representative, Agriculture Attaché, Afghanistan

**Arnesson-Ciotti Margareta**, Permanent Representative, Sweden

**Bradani David**, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission of Italy

**Carranza Jose Antonio**, Permanent Representative, Ecuador

**Cohen April**, Political/Economic Section Chief, Alternate Permanent Representative, USA

**De Santis Lorenzo**, Multilateral Policy Officer, United Kingdom

**Ding Lin**, First Secretary, Alternate Permanent Representative, China

**Germonprez Liselot**, Attache, Permanent Representative, Belgian

**Halley des Fontaines Segolene**, Agricultural Counsellor, Permanent Representative, France

**Hooper Matthew**, Deputy Permanent Representative to FAO, New Zealand

**Kubota Osamu**, Minister Counsellor, Deputy Permanent Representative, Japan

**Mellenthin Oliver**, Permanent Representative, Federal Republic of Germany

**Mme Mi Nguyen**, Deputy Permanent Representative, Canada

**Moarani Nazarono**, Permanent Representative, Argentina

**Mohamad Nazrain bin Nordin**, Second Secretary (Agriculture Affairs), Alternate Permanent Representative, Malaysia

**Myat Kaung**, Second Secretary, Alternate Permanent Representative

**Nasskau Liz**, Permanent Representative, United Kingdom

**Navarrete Rosemary**, Adviser (Agriculture), Australia

**Okiru Grace**, Ambassador, Uganda

**Ortega Lilian**, Deputy Permanent Representative, Switzerland

**Rajamaki Tanja**, Permanent Representative, Finland

**Salim Azulita**, Permanent Representative, Malaysia

**San Aye Aye**, Counsellor, Alternate Permanent Representative, Myanmar

**Tansini Fernanda Mansur**, Alternate Permanent Representative, Brazil

**Trochim Jirapha Inthisang**, First Secretary, Alternate Permanent Representative

**Umeda Takaaki**, First Secretary, Alternate Permanent Representative, Japan

**Weberova Zora**, Alternate Permanent Representative, Slovak Republic

**Wiangwang Narumon**, Counsellor (Agriculture), Deputy Permanent Representative

**Xie Jian Min**, Counsellor, Deputy Permanent Representative, China

Open-Ended Working Groups (OEWGs)

**El-Taweel Khaled**, Chair of OEWG on Nutrition

**Gebremedhin Anna**, Chair of OEWG on Connecting Smallholders to Markets

**Md. Mafizur Rahman**, Chair of OEWG on Multi-Year Programme of Work

**Olthof Willem**, Chair of OEWG on Sustainable Development Goals

**Sabiiti Robert**, Chair of OEWG on Monitoring

**Tansini Fernanda Mansur**, Chair of OEWG on Global Strategic Framework

CFS Participants/Observers

**Anderson Robynne**, Coordinator, Private Sector Mechanism

**Bianchi Luca**, Finance and Admin Officer, Civil Society Mechanism

**Capolongo Laura**, Junior Policy Officer, World Farmers' Organization

**Maisano Teresa**, Programme and Communications Officer, Civil Society Mechanism

**Marzano de Marinis Marco**, Secretary General, World Farmers' Organization

**Oenema Stineke**, Coordinator, UN Standing Committee on Nutrition

**Volpe Luisa**, Policy Officer, World Farmers' Organization

**Woldpold-Bosien Martin**, Coordinator, Civil Society Mechanism

High-Level Panel of Experts

**Caron Patrick**, HLPE Chair

**Kalafatic Carol**, HLPE Vice-Chair

**Pingault Nathanael**, Coordinator for High-Level Panel of Experts

CFS Secretariat

**Cirulli Chiara**, Programme Officer

**Colonnelli Emilio**, Food Security Officer

**Fulton Deborah**, CFS Secretary

**Gherardelli Alessandra**, CFS Social Media Presence

**Hemonin Ophelie**, Food Security Officer

**Isoldi Fabio**, Assistant to CFS Chair

**Jamal Siva**, Liaison Officer

**Mathur Shantanu**, Manager, UN RBA Partnerships

**Orebi Sylvia**, Clerk Typist

**Salter Cordelia**, Senior Technical Officer

**Trine Francoise**, Senior Food Security Officer

Rome-Based Agencies

**Belli Luisa**, Project Evaluation Coordinator, Office of Evaluation, FAO

**Igarashi Masahiro**, Director, Office of Evaluation, FAO

**McGuire Mark**, Senior Programme Coordinator, Strategic Programme 1 - Food Security and Nutrition, FAO

**Munro-Faure Paul**, Deputy Director, Partnerships, Advocacy and Capacity Development Division, FAO

**Stamoulis Kostas**, Assistant Director-General a.i Economic and Social Development Department, FAO, and CFS Secretary (2007 - 2014)

**Tarazona Carlos**, Office of Evaluation, FAO

**Audinet Jean-Philippe**, CFS Alternate Advisory Group Member, IFAD

**Mathur Shantanu**, Manager, UN RBA Partnerships Office of the Associate Vice-President Programme Management Department, IFAD

**Prato Bettina**, CFS Advisory Group Member, IFAD

**Burrows Sally**, Senior Evaluation Officer, Office of Evaluation, WFP

**Omamo Steven Were**, Food Systems Coordinator and Deputy Director (OSZ), Policy & Programme Division, WFP

**Tamamura Mihoko**, Director, Rome-based Agencies and Committee on World Food Security, WFP

Other UN bodies/Individuals

**Nabarro David**, High –Level Task Force on World Food Security and UN Secretary-General’s Special Adviser on the 2030 Agenda

**Branca Francesco**, Director Nutrition, WHO and Acting Executive Secretary of UNSNC (2015)

**Wustefeld Marzella**, Technical Officer, Office of the Director, Department of Nutrition for Health and Development, WHO

Country	Region	FSN status* (%)	FAO		WFP		IFAD		Project or country evaluations by any of the RBAs in the past 3 years (2014-2016)	Used and applied VGGT
			No. of Projects	Total \$ value of project portfolio (million USD)	No. of Programmes	Total \$ value of programme portfolio (million USD)	No. of Projects	Total \$ value of project portfolio (USD)		
Ethiopia	Africa	32.1	> 100	> 55	6	2044	17	488	5 (1 FAO, 2 WFP, 2 IFAD)	Yes
Ghana		<5	10	9.97	1	59.2	17	271.5	2 (1 FAO, 1 WFP)	Yes
Morocco		<5	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 (FAO)	No
Mozambique		25.3	25	39.1	2	170.4	12	243.9	5 (1 FAO, 2 WFP, 2 IFAD)	Yes
Senegal		10.0	202	117.83	2	130.1	15	180.08	5 (1 FAO, 2 WFP, 2 IFAD)	Yes
Sudan		not stated	20	32.08	1	693.2	20	286.1	3 (2 FAO, 1 WFP)	Yes
Uganda		25.5	>20	80	3	366.2	16	385.7	4 (2 FAO, 2 WFP)	Yes
United Republic of Tanzania		32.1	-	-	2	250.8	16	430.1	5 (2 FAO, 1 WFP, 2 IFAD)	Yes
Zambia		47.8	-	-	1	33.5	14	203.6	4 (2 FAO, 1 WFP, 1 IFAD)	Yes
Cambodia	Asia	14.2	11	18	1	191.5	8	143.3	1 (WFP)	Yes
India		15.2	7	not stated	1	25.5	27	928.6	2 (IFAD)	Yes
Malaysia		<5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No
Pakistan		22.0	not stated	>293	1	438.8	26	604.8	2 (1 FAO, 1 WFP)	Yes
Philippines		13.5	4	13.4	1	74	15	243.7	3 (1 WFP, 2 IFAD)	Yes
Thailand		7.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes
Denmark		Europe	<5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
France	<5		-	-	-	-	-	-	1 (FAO)	Yes
Germany	<5		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes
Italy	<5		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes
Spain	<5		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes
Argentina	Latin America & the Caribbean	<5	>70	not stated	-	-	7	116.3	-	Yes
Brazil		<5	-	-	-	-	11	259.7	2 (1 FAO, 1 IFAD)	Yes
Colombia		8.8	32	not stated	2	62.4	4	74.5	1 (FAO)	Yes
Ecuador		10.9	12	not stated	6	46.2	9	109.6	2 (1 WFP, 1 IFAD)	Yes
Guatemala		15.6	9	not stated	3	76.9	8	114.7	4 (1 FAO, 2 WFP, 1 IFAD)	Yes
Panama		9.5	5	not stated	-	-	8	80.7	-	Yes
Trinidad and Tobago		7.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No
Jordan	Near East	<5	-	-	3	1081.4	8	82.7	1 (IFAD)	No
Qatar		not stated	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No
United States of America	North America	<5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No
Fiji	South West Pacific	<5	-	-	-	-	1	6.1	-	No
New Zealand	Pacific	<5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No

\*Source: <http://www.fao.org/hunger/en>

## Annex E: Long list of potential countries for field work