



CFS Retreat
Doc No: Retreat/2018/03/19/05
19 March 2018

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROPOSED RESPONSE TO THE CFS EVALUATION RECOMMENDATION 10

1- Background

The CFS Evaluation recommended that “CFS should develop an overarching framework that spells out its role in various activities that it has grouped together as monitoring. A great deal of confusion has been created by the generic use of the term to cover different but interrelated functions. CFS should align its terminology and approach with that of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.”

The response to this recommendation was “taking into account previous discussions, decisions and experience gained, review the framework for monitoring in CFS, clarifying the roles of CFS at all levels.” ([Annex 1](#))

History of activities related to monitoring in CFS

Since the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) was set up in 1974 an essential part of its mandate has been to follow up and review global progress and country efforts in the fight against hunger and malnutrition. As a result, a wealth of decisions, documented discussions and reports exist that can offer important insights to help clarify the roles of CFS in monitoring at all levels.

To assist in implementing Action 10.1, relevant summaries from various CFS Plenary sessions are presented in [Annex 2](#) and decision extracts are presented in [Annex 4](#). They aim to provide an overview of the evolution of the mandate and expectations from CFS (before and after the reform in 2009), as well as the advancement of discussions on how to enable CFS to best deliver, “taking into account lessons learned from previous CFS (...) monitoring attempts¹”.

2- Implementation of the response to recommendation 10

Proposal: Progress from the objective of a CFS framework for “monitoring” to a framework for “promoting accountability and best practices” which includes monitoring-related activities², in the context of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

Elements of the proposal are supported by the following two considerations:

- 1) Many constraints were identified for a CFS “monitoring role”, particularly considering the understanding of “monitoring” (since CFS 36) as “Correspondences between actions and changes in food security [and nutrition] indicators compared to a baseline situation”; “Monitoring requires more time to establish the baseline data against which results obtained from actions and investments can be

¹ CFS Reform document, paragraph 6 (ii)

² Nota Bene: This proposal deals only with terminology and does not carry any budget implications, since it is based on already existing activities.

assessed and causal relationships established” (CFS 36, 2010, “Mapping food security actions at country level”, paragraph 7).

- Based on past experiences and plenary conclusions, reporting of country progress (WFS PoA; etc) to CFS (“CFS monitoring country progress”) was not found satisfactory³.
- CFS has agreed in the past that a rigid monitoring framework is not desirable and that “monitoring” activities in the context of CFS should focus “firstly on monitoring CFS decisions and recommendations and the effectiveness of CFS, and secondly on recommending monitoring approaches to countries”⁴.
- Recent activities aimed to carry forward the “monitoring of CFS decisions and recommendations” (GTE on VGGT, 2016, and CFS independent evaluation, 2017) concluded that, at this stage, monitoring was made difficult by the absence of a baseline and fixed measurements⁵.

Nevertheless, an essential part of the mandate of CFS, has been to review overall progress in the fight against hunger and malnutrition, promote accountability, share best practices, and facilitate country efforts to monitor their progress. While **going beyond the *stricto sensu* understanding of “monitoring”**, these activities, continuously held both in Plenary and in the intersessional period, are relevant to monitoring.

- 2) The efforts and activities of CFS aiming to promote accountability and share best practices should be contextualized to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

Role (v) of the Reform document on “promoting accountability and sharing of best practices at all levels” was agreed in part in the context of the Committee’s historical role to foster and document voluntary country reporting on their 1996 WFS Plan of Action commitments. Consideration should now be given to the use of internationally agreed targets and indicators related to food security, nutrition and sustainable agriculture, as well as to the follow-up and review architecture as set out in the 2030 Agenda. The activities should also include the activities developed since 2016 in the context of the Committee’s engagement to support country-led implementation of the 2030 Agenda and the UN Decade for Action on Nutrition (see [Annex 3](#)).

Conclusion

In summary, it is proposed for CFS to progress from the objective of a framework for “monitoring” to a framework for “promoting accountability and sharing of best practices”. This would take place in the context of supporting countries to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals and targets and other relevant global frameworks (e.g., ICN2 Framework for Action WHA declaration).

³ See annex 2, CFS 34 2008/3 *Follow-up to the World Food Summit: Report on the Progress in the Implementation of the Plan of Action*, Sections IV and V, and CFS 34 2008/6 *Proposals to strengthen the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) to meet new challenges*, Conclusions

⁴ CFS 40 2013/40/8 “Framework for monitoring CFS decisions and recommendations”

⁵ CFS 2016/43 Final report, paragraph 27 e) “The voluntary contributions received for the event are unlikely to show the full coverage of the use and application of the VGGT and do not provide a true baseline for future monitoring.”

Table 1: An overview of CFS activities aimed at promoting accountability and sharing best practices

Legend:

- **Activities undertaken by the Committee (as a Committee) – highlighted in bold**
- Activities undertaken / led by individual members / stakeholders of the Committee – underlined
- *On-going sessions in CFS – in italics*

		FSN situation and trends	CFS outcomes and effectiveness	Recommending approaches to monitoring
Incremental innovative mechanism	GLOBAL	<p>Follow-up and Review (FuR) of “the situation and trends in food insecurity in the world”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Annual discussion on SOFI report (based on “monitoring” done by RBAs + WHO + UNICEF)</i> • Periodic discussions based on HLPE Note on Critical and Emerging Issues 	<p>Periodic Assessment of CFS effectiveness¹² through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual tracking of CFS decisions (by CFS Secretariat) <p><i>(CFS Plenary Annual progress reports)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-assessment or <i>independent evaluation</i>¹³ on CFS effectiveness through: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- Periodic opinion surveys¹⁴, complemented by, 2- Voluntary In-depth country assessments¹⁵ 	<p>Facilitate country monitoring initiatives and sharing best practices</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual mapping Plenary discussions in CFS until 2012¹⁶, e.g. provide space in Plenary for countries/regions to share best practices on monitoring initiatives
	COUNTRY or REGION focused	<p>Follow-up and Review (FuR) of country/region FSN progress</p> <p>(in line with 2030 Agenda and other global framework targets and indicators, esp. SDGs and ICN2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Annual VNRs¹⁷ and others, e.g. nutrition) (based on “monitoring” done by countries supported by RBAs, UN system, others</i> 	<p>FuR use of CFS products in countries/regions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Biennial Global Thematic Events on major products and ad hoc events / side-events on policy recommendations¹⁸</i> 	<p>Recommend approaches to country/region monitoring FSN objectives¹⁹</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ToRs that can guide country-organized events to review CFS products²⁰</i>

3- A CFS framework for promoting accountability and best practices

Table 1 above provides an overview of “monitoring-related activities” in CFS. The existing and interconnected CFS activities aimed at reviewing progress and promoting accountability and sharing of lessons are articulated here in a proposed “framework for promoting accountability and sharing best practices”. This framework derives from the Committee’s historical mandate (to review overall food security and nutrition), as well as from conclusions from the CFS Open Ended Working Group on Monitoring’s work regarding the “monitoring function in the context of CFS”. It is also consistent with the 4 areas identified as requiring “monitoring” in the context of CFS as identified by the OEWG-Monitoring (2012).

The activities at all levels should be consistent with the five principles identified in the Global Strategic Framework (GSF, section 5.5.a)⁶ that apply to monitoring and accountability systems. This proposed framework represents an innovative approach/mechanism for CFS to deliver on role (v) of the Reform document on “**promoting accountability and sharing of best practices at all levels**” through:

- **Follow-up and review** of both global and country/region specific FSN situation, trends and progress and **sharing lessons**:
 - 1- Discussions on global FSN trends;
 - 2- Discussions on country FSN progress (VNRs, nutrition lesson-sharing) and sharing of lessons.
- **Assessing the effectiveness of CFS** and reviewing the use of its policy products:
 - 3- Sharing lessons on the use and application of CFS policy recommendations and decisions (GTE, ad hoc events)
 - 4- Assessment of CFS’ effectiveness (independent evaluation, opinion surveys, voluntary in-depth country assessments and tracking CFS decisions annual reports).
- **Recommend approaches to country/region monitoring FSN objectives** and promoting accountability:
 - 5- Offering guidance (ToRs) for national/regional events and an annual space at Plenary to share best practices on country/regional efforts towards achieving food security and nutrition objectives.

⁶ GSF, CHAPTER V, Section E “Monitoring and follow-up”

Table 1 Reference Footnotes

¹² CFS 2014/41/11 Towards a framework for monitoring CFS decisions and recommendations

¹³ CFS 2017/44/INF/23 Independent Evaluation of CFS

¹⁴ CFS 2015/42/10 Report on the findings of the CFS effectiveness survey

¹⁵ Country interviews were led in the context of the independent evaluation

¹⁶ CFS 2010/3 Mapping food security actions at country level; CFS 2011/7 Mapping food security and nutrition actions at country level; CFS 2012/39/10 Rev.1 Mapping food security and nutrition actions at country level

¹⁷ CFS 2016/43/INF/22 and CFS 2017/44/INF/15;

¹⁸ CFS 2017/44/1 Monitoring the implementation of CFS main policy products and other CFS policy recommendations

¹⁹ CFS 2013/40/8 para 5g. “Key characteristics of monitoring mechanisms should include: local ownership, rights-based, inclusiveness and multistakeholder participation, be grounded in multisectorial policy frameworks, ensure adequate country capacities and resources and include both quantitative and qualitative aspects.”

²⁰ CFS 2016/43/7 Terms of Reference to share experiences and good practices in applying CFS decisions and recommendations through organizing events at national, regional and global levels.

4- Guiding Questions

The proposed framework for promoting accountability and sharing best practices aims to support the strategic objectives of CFS under development towards achieving its vision (linked to response to Rec 1 and 2). In particular, it supports the strategic objectives of developing global policy messages arising from FSN developments, trends and issues through inclusive and evidence-based exchange for timely and coordinated action (SO1) and of fostering uptake of CFS policy convergence and coherence work on FSN at global level and in national and regional actions (SO3).

With reference to the proposed framework (Table 1), the following questions are expected to guide the discussion on the implementation of the response to the evaluation:

- Does the proposed table [“framework”?] adequately capture the range of existing CFS activities that are aimed at promoting accountability and sharing best practices?
 - Should some activities be revised or further developed/articulated?
- Are the roles (CFS as a Committee; individual CFS Members and stakeholders) for each activity clearly ascribed? If not, what could be added/amended?
- Can this table be considered adequate as a framework to guide future CFS activities to promote accountability and share best practices, in the context of SDGs and other global frameworks, recognizing CFS priorities and resource constraints?

Annex 1: Proposed response to Recommendation 10

As stated in the CFS 44 final report, monitoring has an important role in improving the effectiveness of the work of CFS. CFS recognizes the importance for stakeholders to have a common understanding of the CFS monitoring function, which is not presently the case. The five elements of the approach recommended by the evaluation team do not cover all monitoring activities that were previously endorsed by CFS, specifically country in-depth voluntary assessments and the incremental development of an innovative monitoring mechanism for CFS. The implementation of Recommendations 1 and 2, which are expected to clarify how CFS intends to achieve its vision, might influence what to monitor, how and by whom.

The approach to monitoring should consider resource availability, cost-effectiveness and CFS added value in monitoring. The approach should take advantage of possible synergies with other systems, including within RBAs, and not duplicate existing monitoring mechanisms acknowledging on-going reporting including for Agenda 2030 and ICN2.

CFS agrees with Points (i) and (ii) of the recommendation (i.e. conduct of periodic reviews to take stock of progress in implementing main CFS policy products and recommendations and the convening of events to share experiences and good practices), which are part of the monitoring approach endorsed by CFS 42. Global events are expected to contribute to raising awareness and understanding of CFS and CFS products, issues addressed in the response to Recommendations 7 and 11. Independent evaluations, mentioned under Point (iv), may be useful providing the scope of such evaluations is carefully defined as CFS products are implemented on a voluntary basis, and evaluations are subject to resource availability. Point (v) has been addressed in the 2017 Annual Report where detailed progress is monitored on implementing the decisions and recommendations of CFS 43 through the OEWDs and the Bureau and Advisory Group and Bureau meetings.

The regular conduct of a voluntary survey (Point (iii) of the recommendation) is considered cost effective, bringing important information at low cost, and is part of the monitoring approach endorsed at CFS 41. It is important to provide precise guidelines to stakeholders to help them answer questions meaningfully. The role of CFS in conducting voluntary in-depth country assessments and in helping countries and regions monitor progress towards agreed food security and nutrition objectives through the development of an innovative monitoring mechanism³ should be further discussed, considering:

- The conclusions of the Evaluation (detailed monitoring of national 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, and terms of reference for them were not agreed.
- Monitoring of trends and progress in achieving the food security and nutrition targets of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development is already carried out under “The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World” (SOFI) and the Regional Panoramas on Food Security and Nutrition. The Voluntary National Reviews (VNRs) on progress towards achieving the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, report on the implementation of national policies, programmes and plans related to food security, nutrition and sustainable agriculture in the

context of SDGs, and CFS has been providing space to discuss and learn about country progress through the VNRs since CFS 43.

Actions to be taken	Implementing body	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)
A10.1. Taking into account previous discussions, decisions and experience gained, review the framework for monitoring in CFS, clarifying the roles of CFS at all levels.	Bureau, after consultation with the Advisory Group	By June 2018	N

Annex 2: Overview of the history of Monitoring and related activities in CFS

To facilitate CFS Members and stakeholders' consideration of all relevant past CFS discussions and support a structured reflection going forward, Table 1 links CFS text extracts or summaries to 5 types of activities currently taking place in CFS⁷, in response to 4 areas identified as requiring "monitoring" in the context of CFS by the CFS Open Ended Working Group on Monitoring (2012)⁸:

1. Follow-up and review of FSN situation and global trends
2. Follow-up and review of FSN national situation & policies
3. Facilitating country-led monitoring efforts
4. Follow-up and review the use of CFS products
5. Assess CFS effectiveness

<p>- Since respectively 1974 and 1997: the Committee's mandate explicitly focused on Follow-up and Review (FuR) of policies concerning world food security and serving as a forum for the monitoring of the PoA implementation.</p> <p>Since 1995, national efforts and progress reports on the WFS PoA were complemented by Special Programmes for Food Security (SPFS) later evolving into National Programmes for Food Security (NPFS) and Regional Programmes for Food Security (RPFS), presented in CFS 32 (2006) and CFS 33 (2007).</p> <p>In 2008, "<i>Limitations on reporting process and suggestions for the way forward</i>" were discussed in the context of the "Follow-up of the World Food Summit: Report on Progress in the implementation of the Plan of Action" (CFS:2008/3). Reporting fatigue, inadequate capacity, rigid reporting templates, insufficient participation at various levels, amongst other factors, were identified as constraints to properly track progress on all the commitments⁹.</p> <p>"<i>Proposals to strengthen the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) to meet new challenges</i>" were tabled, which reaffirmed the assessment of the World Food Security and Nutrition Situation as "the centre piece of CFS", recommended that CFS expands the participations and improves the format/style/ process of WFS-PoA report. (CFS 2008:6)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. FSN situation and global trends 2. FSN national situation & policies 3. Facilitating country-led monitoring efforts
<p>In 2009, the Reform document spelled out 6 roles for CFS. Roles 3 and 5 gave some new elements on expectations from CFS</p> <p><i>Role 3: Support and advice to countries and regions. 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</i></p> <p><i>Role 5: Promote accountability and share best practices at all levels.(...) The CFS should help countries and regions, as appropriate, address the questions of whether objectives are being</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. FSN national situation & policies 4. CFS products 3. Facilitate monitoring efforts <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. FSN situation and global trends 2. FSN national situation & policies

⁷ Also see annex 1 (for a full overview)

⁸ See below (CFS 39) "Note on monitoring CFS decisions and recommendations"

⁹ See Annex 2 list of identified constraints

<p><i>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.</i></p>	<p>3. Facilitating monitoring efforts 4. CFS products</p>
<p>In 2009-2011, CFS focused its discussions and efforts on “ways to improve monitoring and reporting on food security activities at national and regional levels”.</p> <p>In this perspective, FAO developed a work programme which included the development of software tools; capacity building; presenting lessons learned; and the development of a mapping tool for country level FSN actions.</p> <p>From 2009 to 2011, Mapping Food Security Actions at Country Level became a standing item in CFS sessions.</p>	<p>3. Facilitate monitoring efforts (by supporting and discussing FSN country action mapping)</p>
<p>In 2011, work in CFS started to develop a Results-based Framework (including outcomes and indicators) designed to help the committee align its future activities, and provide a basis for tracking progress made.</p>	<p>5. CFS effectiveness</p>
<p>In 2012 (CFS 39), an “Information Note on monitoring CFS decisions and recommendations” produced by the newly set-up OEWG-monitoring identified 4 areas requiring monitoring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) FSN situation and trends (and states that this is done by development and research agencies such as with SOFI) b) Take stock of FSN actions and initiatives (based on mapping efforts for FSN actions by FAO and others) c) Implementation of CFS decisions and recommendations d) Assessing the effectiveness of the reform <p>It was agreed that the OEWG-monitoring mandate would focus on monitoring and assessing the implementation of the CFS decisions and recommendations in the context of the Results Based Framework (RBF).</p> <p>The last discussion on mapping FSN actions took place in 2012.</p>	<p>1. FSN situation and global trends</p> <p>2. FSN national situation & policies & 3. Facilitate monitoring efforts</p> <p>4. CFS products</p> <p>5. CFS effectiveness</p> <hr/> <p>4. CFS products & 5. CFS effectiveness</p> <hr/> <p>3. Facilitate monitoring efforts</p>
<p>In 2013 (CFS 40), a Framework for monitoring CFS decisions and recommendations defined “the monitoring function in the context of CFS”:</p> <p>1- Monitor CFS decisions and recommendations in order to assess its effectiveness</p> <p>2- Recommending approaches to monitoring by Member Countries</p> <p>Its recommendations called for a number of activities linked to determining CFS effectiveness; sharing monitoring experiences and recommending monitoring approaches to countries; a focus on monitoring and presenting lessons on uptake of CFS products; periodic assessments to assess policy development and coherence and the effectiveness of CFS, with useful guidance provided in the GSF. (Chapter V section E “Monitoring and Follow-up”).</p>	<p>4. CFS products & 5. CFS effectiveness</p> <p>3. Facilitate monitoring efforts</p> <hr/> <p>5. CFS effectiveness</p> <p>3. Facilitate monitoring efforts</p> <p>4. CFS products</p> <p>2. FSN national situation & policies</p>
<p>From 2014 (CFS 41), discussions focussed on monitoring/assessing CFS effectiveness: a methodological approach was developed suggesting 2 pillars: opinion surveys, and in-depth voluntary country assessments. The findings of the</p>	<p>5. CFS effectiveness</p>

<p>opinion survey were presented in 2015 (CFS 42), and an independent evaluation was also launched, which relied on global interviews and 5 in-depth country assessments.</p>	
<p>In 2016 (CFS 43), Terms of Reference were adopted to share experiences and good practices in applying CFS decisions and recommendations through organizing events at national, regional and global levels.</p> <p>These events aimed to monitor progress in implementing CFS products, and draw lessons for the effectiveness of CFS. Following up on CFS 43 discussions, CFS 44 established a distinct process to share experiences and take stock of the uptake of CFS products depending on their nature, and agrees a calendar for the next 6 years.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4. CFS products 3. Facilitate monitoring efforts 5. CFS effectiveness

Annex 3: “Aligning terminology and approach with that of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development¹⁰”

The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development was adopted in 2015 by 193 countries following an inclusive process.

- With this new framework developed through a global inclusive process, countries unanimously committed to 17 new **goals** and a number of **targets and indicators**, many of which are related to food security, nutrition and sustainable agriculture (SDG2 and others).
- With the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, all countries also committed to providing for “systematic **follow-up and review**” *“at the national, regional and global levels, of the progress made in implementing the Goals and targets over the coming years”* (2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, Declaration, para 47). Countries committed to building a “robust, voluntary, effective, participatory, transparent and integrated follow-up and review framework” that makes “a vital contribution to implementation and help countries maximize and track progress”. (paragraph 72)

The 2030 Agenda includes provisions for follow-up and review at national, regional and global levels (paragraphs 72-91).

Follow-up and review processes at all levels are guided by principles such as (paragraph 74): “country-led”, “open, inclusive and participatory”, “people-centered, gender-sensitive respect human rights have a particular focus on those furthest left behind”, building “on existing platforms and processes”, “rigorous and based on evidence”, and “benefit from the active support of the UN system”.

Global level reviews of progress are overseen in the High Level Political Forum (HLPF), whose mandate is to review global progress, facilitate sharing of experiences “including success, challenges and lessons learned”¹¹, provide political guidance and promote system-wide coherence and coordination of sustainable development policies, by including relevant UN entities as well as other stakeholders.

Global level progress reviews will be informed by an annual report by the Secretary-General (paragraph 83). They will include Voluntary Nations Reviews (paragraph 84), **thematic progress reviews supported by reviews ECOSOC commissions and other intergovernmental bodies**¹² (paragraph 85), as well as systematic review of the Means of Implementation (paragraph 86).

- In 2016, CFS agreed, with the document “CFS engagement in enhancing the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable development¹³” on how it will engage to support country-led implementation of the

¹⁰ Consistent with the strategy “CFS engagement in advancing the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development”, and especially paragraphs 4 and 5

¹¹ 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, paragraph 82

¹² Such as CFS, as explicitly mentioned in the UN Secretary-General’s report “Critical milestones towards coherent, efficient and inclusive follow-up and review at global level”

¹³ CFS 2016/43/6 CFS Engagement in Advancing the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (Including Draft Decision)

2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and national achievement of the SDGs in accordance with its mandate.

In the context of the Committee's overall coordination role, this includes a number of activities to review global progress; review country policies and share good practices in the context of the SDGs; and develop guidance towards better policy coherence and convergence. In addition, the Committee will regularly engage with and support global thematic progress reviews in the High Level Political Forum (HLPF).

Annex 4: Detailed history of Monitoring and related activities in CFS

Below are extracts or summaries from various CFS Plenary sessions to support discussions in the context of the implementation of the response. By providing an overview of the evolution of the mandate and expectations from CFS over time (before and especially after the reform), as well as the advancement of discussions on how to enable CFS to best deliver on the mandate/roles it was ascribed, this compilation aims to allow CFS Members and stakeholders to “take into account lessons learned from previous CFS¹⁴” (rather than “reinvent the wheel”) when implementing the response to recommendation 10.

[Pre-reform CFS mandate: November 1997 \(Amendments to rule XXXIII of the General Rules of the Organization as adopted by the 29th session of the FAO Conference\)](#)
[Rule XXXIII Committee on World Food Security](#)

6. The Committee shall serve as a forum in the United Nations system for **review and follow-up of policies** concerning world food security, including food production, sustainable use of the natural resource base for food security, nutrition, physical and economic access to food and other food security related aspects of poverty eradication, the implications of food trade for world food security and other related matters and shall in particular:

- (a) **examine major problems and issues** affecting the world food situation and the steps being proposed or taken to resolve them by Governments and relevant international organizations, bearing in mind the need for the adoption of an integrated approach towards their solution;
- (b) **examine the implications for world food security of other relevant factors**, including the situation relating to the supply and demand of basic food stuffs and food aid requirements and trends, the state of stocks in exporting and importing countries and issues relating to physical and economic access to food and other food security related aspects of poverty eradication; and
- (c) **recommend such** action as may be appropriate to promote the goal of world food security.

7. The Committee shall serve as the forum in the UN system for the **monitoring of the implementation of the Plan of Action** adopted by the World Food Summit in accordance with the relevant commitment of the Summit.

[CFS 33 2007/3 Status and lessons learned from Special, National and Regional Programmes for Food Security and Other Relevant FAO Food Security Programmes](#)

Report on implementation of SPFS (1998-2004), NPFS and RPSF (2001 onward), with FAO support, and on their contribution to achieving WFS and MDG1 targets.

Conclusion and recommendation:

- CFS to offer platform for member countries to share with each other their experiences with NPFS. NPFS monitoring reports to supplement information contained in national reports on implementation of WFS PoA and provide solid basis for future CFS reviews.
- CFS to include standing item until 2015 on “lessons learned from national and regional programs for Food Security” and feeds into Conference and Regional Conferences.

¹⁴ CFS Reform document, paragraph 6 (ii)

CFS 33 2007/Inf.9 Report on the Development of Food Insecurity and Vulnerability Information and Management System (FIVIMS)¹⁵

- Reports progress on the development by FAO (in collaboration with other partners) of global information systems (including IPC and SOFI) and FAO support to country-level information and analysis systems to monitor progress.
- Work underway to regularly monitor the impact of NPFS on food security, review progress and recommend strategic adjustments in NPFS implementation.

CFS 34 2008/3 Follow-up to the World Food Summit: Report on the Progress in the Implementation of the Plan of Action

Section IV: “Limitations on reporting process and suggestions for the way forward”

- Members do not report regularly and the reports vary greatly in timeliness, size and scope (coordinated and multisectorial response challenging; inadequate capacity to complete the reports; reporting fatigue expressed; desire to discuss issues at regional level; little use being made of indicators, and SOFI provides best available global information; adequate modalities to ensure multistakeholder participation in monitoring process at national, regional and international levels have not been put in place; countries provide details only on significant changes, not for every commitment, which doesn't allow for tracking progress on all commitments)

Section V “Suggestions to improve and streamline the overall monitoring and reporting process”

Suggestions for FAO/CFS Secretariat: enhance easily accessible database; coincide CFS sessions with SOFI (and other reports) release; review impact of any changes in reporting to CFS on obligations within the wider UN system.

CFS 34 2008/6 Proposals to strengthen the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) to meet new challenges

V. Conclusions:

(...)

- *Maintain the Assessment of the World Food Security and Nutrition Situation as the centre piece of CFS (but focus its scope on an important FSN issue;*
- *Expand meaningful participation of other actors in this assessment;*
- *Explore suggestions to improve the format/style/process of the WFS-PoA report) (para 38, d, e and f)*

CFS 35 2009/2 Rev.2 CFS Reform

5. The roles of the CFS will be:

¹⁵ FIVIMS is an interagency programme, established following WFS to help develop/strengthen global and country information systems (measurement and analysis; information management and use; collaborations monitoring progress towards hunger targets).

i) Coordination at global level. Provide a platform for discussion and coordination to strengthen collaborative action among governments, regional organizations, international organizations and agencies, NGOs, CSOs, 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.

(...)

iii) Support and advice to countries and regions. 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, the 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.

6. In Phase II, CFS will gradually take on additional roles such as

(...)

ii) Promote accountability and sharing best practices at all levels. 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 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 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 35 2009/Inf.8 Monitoring Food Security Activities at national level: methodological Progress and illustrative methods](#)

"One pending item for CFS 34 is to improve reporting on the implementation of the WFS PoA through the CFS. How to monitor and report on progress towards eliminating hunger and food insecurity is an underlying issue of considerable importance for the CFS reform. Various attempts have been made, using a variety of formats, but with only modest success. At the 35th session the issue of monitoring will be examined within the context of the overall reform". (para2)

Presentation of FAO efforts to improve country monitoring : development of a software tool (FS-ATMIS); national capacity building; lessons learned from NPFS.

Implications for CFS

"The work in progress covers most of the issues that CFS will need to address when considering ways to improve monitoring and reporting on food security activities at national and regional levels". (para 4)

CFS 36 2010/3 Mapping Food Security Actions at Country Level

- Made necessary by commitments at WFS (2009) to 5 Rome principles, in particular “invest in results based programmes and partnerships”.
- Tool presented in support of role iii) of the reform. Profiling actions and charting linkages with resources, institutions, beneficiaries. Different from, but related to, monitoring¹⁶ (para 7)
- Potential Uses of mapping tool: identify FSN policies and programmes; ensure they are better integrated and aligned with national priorities; linked to monitoring and evaluation actions; facilitate the exchange of information with regional bodies and CFS Plenary about successes and challenges.
- Committee endorsed a general process to further develop and implement a mapping tool for in-country use with guiding principles for the process: country-driven, building on existing institutions and adding value to existing work. This process included review of existing tools and a technical workshop to consider and discuss findings.

CFS 37 2011/7 Mapping Food Security and Nutrition Actions at country level

Review and workshop identified considerations to be taken into account when implementing or creating mapping systems (government driven, multistakeholder; apply existing FSN information layers and standard analytical methods; new FSN interventions should be aligned; roles and responsibilities should be defined; good use of technology; national systems with strong linkages to regional and global systems.

It further identified good practices in FSN action mapping.

It formulated recommendations for CFS regarding FSN action mapping:

- A- Providing technical support to interested countries (done by the FSN Action Mapping Taskteam – CFS requested to promote FSN action mapping among Members and facilitate exchange of experiences; CFS requested to organize a follow-up meeting to track progress of implementation of FS action mapping in countries.
- B- Data management and analysis for FSN action mapping (FAO to lead harmonization of data efforts in collaboration with others to understand what constitute FSN actions and strive towards compatibility of various systems.
- C- Operations, resources and contextual requirements (Members encouraged to resource FSN action mapping and include as part of national development monitoring efforts; to establish partnerships, and monitor progress, supported by development partners)

CFS 37 2011/10 - Results-based Framework for CFS

- Based on the CFS reform document, identified an overall goal of CFS, 3 outcomes (coordination – policy convergence – support to country and region-driven FSN plans) and indicators for each.

¹⁶ Definition monitoring: “Correspondence between actions and changes in food security [and nutrition] indicators compared to a baseline situation.”

- Designed to help the Committee align its future activities and provide a basis for tracking progress made (for example against its MYPoW).

CFS 39 2012/39/9 Information Note on monitoring CFS decisions and recommendations

OEWG Monitoring established by CFS Bureau in January 2012 to respond to CFS role “promote accountability and share best practices at all levels” (role 5)

The OEWG-Monitoring identified the following areas that require monitoring:

- a) The situation and trends in food insecurity in the world. This is being carried out by development and research agencies using a variety of indicators, notably FAO in its annual publication "The State of Food Insecurity in the World" (SOFI) that reports to CFS on trends in undernourishment;
- b) Taking stock of actions and initiatives addressing food security and nutrition. The Mapping Actions for FSN (MAFSAN) among others is designed to address this (CFS: 2010/3 Mapping Food Security Actions at Country Level);
- c) The implementation of CFS decisions and recommendations, (...)
- d) Assessing the effectiveness of the CFS reform in its inclusiveness and consensus building on governance (...);

“The OEWG-Monitoring agreed that its mandate was primarily to propose a framework and processes for monitoring and assessing implementation of the decisions and recommendations taken by CFS within the context of the RBF, once finalized.”

(...)

“The OEWG recalled that previous attempts that required country reporting to CFS have produced uneven results due to a range of issues (...)”

Further work is needed to develop concrete proposals and achieve consensus on how to go forward with monitoring in CFS. In particular, on how to respond to the reform document’s call for an “innovative mechanism” for monitoring accountability based on the inputs of a wide range of stakeholders; involve and benefit existing partners; benefit both global and national reporting requirements. Alternative mechanisms suggest peer reviews and periodic independent evaluations; the development of a core suite of indicators; exploring linkages with and building on other global initiatives on monitoring FSN (...) in order to situate CFS in a global context”.

CFS 39 2012/39/10 Rev.1 Mapping Food Security and Nutrition Actions at Country Level

Regional Conferences presented with outcomes of CFS discussions on FSN action mapping and highlighted *“need to focus on partnerships and finding linkages between existing systems rather than promoting one integrated system”*

Technical consultative workshop on harmonization within actions mapping systems and strengthening links with National Information Systems (2012)

Endorsed recommendations:

- Identify ways to improve harmonization of methods and tools and streamlining of FSN actions mapping with other FSN systems.
- CFS FSN Action Mapping Taskteam to develop workplan to agree on common variables, standards, and data exchange protocol for FSN actions mapping; promote these; continue strengthening collaboration and harmonization of FSN mapping.
- Encourages the RBAs and others (including expanded TTT) to assist in the development and implementation of above workplan based on available resources.

Expand taskteam (towards setting and maintaining global standards for FSN mapping?)

[CFS 40 2013/40/8 A framework for monitoring CFS decision and recommendations](#)

“The monitoring function in the context of CFS is firstly about how to monitor CFS decisions and recommendations, to determine how well it he Committee is meeting its overall objective of contributing to the improvement of FSN at various levels.

Secondly, it’s about recommending approaches to monitoring by Member Counties, sub-regional and global bodies in order to promote more accountability and improvement in addressing FSN programme delivery.”

Recommendations:

- a) Monitoring is important and further discussions needed to determine CFS effectiveness and recommend monitoring approaches to countries
- b) CFS Communication Strategy represents crucial step for the monitoring process
- c) & d) Wide range of CFS decisions and recommendations imply different kinds of actions (CFS products/final outcomes; CFS policy recommendations; process-related recommendations) and CFS should focus on its products.
- e) CFS should continue providing a platform for CFS stakeholders to share experiences on monitoring work; regular opportunities should be provided to present case studies on application of CFS products.
- f) Improve formulation of CFS products (Roles & Responsibilities)
- g) Monitoring mechanisms should build on existing mechanisms at all levels and in line with CFS principles
- h) A rigid framework for monitoring CFS decisions and recommendations should be avoided. The development of a light survey instrument followed by periodic assessments a valid option.
- i) Periodic assessments of CFS (every 4-5 years) to assess the state of policy development and coherence from stakeholders and the effectiveness of CFS – implies need for a baseline survey.
- j) GSF provides essential elements for policy and programme monitoring and guidance for county-level actions.

[CFS 41 2014/41/11 Towards a framework for monitoring CFS decisions and recommendations](#)

Provides a methodology to monitor/assess CFS effectiveness (based on RBF outcomes: coordination; policy convergence; national and regional FSN actions), with assessment criteria for each and suggested 2 pillars: opinion survey of CFS stakeholders, and in-depth country level assessments in a selected sample of countries.

CFS 42 2015/42/10 Towards a framework for monitoring CFS decisions and recommendations – Report on the Findings of the CFS effectiveness survey

CFS 43 2016/43/7 Terms of Reference to share experiences and good practices in applying CFS decisions and recommendations through organizing events at national, regional and global levels.

Events to:

- 1- Foster adoption of CFS products;
- 2- Monitor progress (qualitatively and quantitatively) in implementing CFS products at national, regional, global levels;
- 3- Draw lessons to improve relevance and effectiveness of CFS;
- 4- Increase awareness on CFS products

Recommends an approach and principles (based on CFS 40 2013/40/8)

“The framework for monitoring the implementation of CFS products (what? How? How often?) will be established by countries as part of their own mechanism for monitoring and reporting progress towards their stated FSN objectives.” (paragraph 7)

Suggest the organization of Global Thematic Events in CFS Plenary.

CFS 44 2017/44/11 Monitoring the implementation of CFS main policy products and other CFS policy recommendations

- Establishes a distinct process to share experiences and take stock” of the uptake of main CFS policy products (GTE) and other policy recommendations (ad hoc events)
- Agrees calendar for GTEs in CFS 45 (VG RtF), CFS 47 (FFA) and CFS 49 (RAI).