



COMMITTEE ON WORLD FOOD SECURITY

Forty-first Session

"Making a Difference in Food Security and Nutrition"

Rome, Italy, 13-18 October 2014

TOWARDS A FRAMEWORK FOR MONITORING CFS DECISIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Matters to be brought to the attention of the CFS

The Committee:

- a) Expresses its appreciation for the work of the Open Ended Working Group on Monitoring and highlights the important role of monitoring and evaluation in improving the effectiveness of the work of CFS;
- b) Acknowledges document CFS 2014/41/11 "Towards a framework for monitoring CFS decisions and recommendations". In particular, the Committee:
 - i) Endorses the Methodological Proposal in Annex 1 recognizing that it represents a first step towards the development of a framework for monitoring CFS decisions and recommendations taking into account previous work of the Committee;
 - ii) Requests the CFS Secretariat, in collaboration with the Open Ended Working Group on Monitoring, to conduct a baseline assessment of CFS effectiveness beginning with the implementation of an opinion survey of CFS stakeholders, as indicated in the Methodological Proposal in Annex 1, and to provide an update including a report of the baseline survey results to CFS 42;

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



m1074e

- iii) Requests the CFS Secretariat, in collaboration with the Open Ended Working Group on Monitoring, to complement the opinion survey of CFS stakeholders with the implementation of in-depth country level assessments on a voluntary basis, as described in the Methodological Proposal in Annex 1, subject to available resources;
- iv) Encourages CFS stakeholders to continue to share their experiences and best practices, and requests the Secretariat to explore and promote ways to organize events as indicated in paragraph 5 of this document, subject to available resources;
- v) Recommends that the OEWG continues its work building on the outcome of the baseline assessments, towards helping countries and regions, as appropriate, address the questions of whether objectives are being achieved and how food insecurity and malnutrition can be reduced more quickly and effectively. This will entail developing an innovative mechanism, including the definition of common indicators, to monitor progress towards these agreed upon objectives and actions taking into account lessons learned from previous CFS and other monitoring attempts. Comments by all CFS stakeholders will have to be taken into account and new mechanisms will build on existing structures (CFS: 2009/2 Rev.2, para 6 ii).

1. In the CFS Reform document, CFS Members agreed on the following three guiding principles: inclusiveness; strong linkages to the field to ensure the process is based on the reality on the ground; flexibility in implementation so that CFS can respond to a changing external environment and membership needs. (CFS: 2009/2 Rev.2, para 3). One of the roles identified in the CFS Reform document was to promote accountability and share best practices at all levels, where 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." (CFS: 2009/2 Rev.2, para 6 ii).

2. At CFS 40 in October 2013, the Committee acknowledged document CFS 2013/40/8 as good progress towards a CFS framework for monitoring CFS decisions and recommendations¹ and underlined the important role of CFS as a platform for stakeholders to regularly share experiences and practices on monitoring work in strategic areas at all levels (global, regional and national) and the need to use monitoring and evaluation (M&E) to improve the work of CFS, including the formulation of future CFS recommendations. One of the recommendations endorsed at CFS 40 was "... 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. Specifically, CFS 40 recommended carrying out a baseline survey to assess the current situation as the base of assessing progress."²

3. To respond to this request, the CFS Secretariat, with financial support from Germany and technical backing from the Technical Support Team (TST) on Monitoring, organized a technical consultative workshop to obtain inputs from experts and inform the design of a baseline survey. The workshop was held at FAO Headquarters in Rome on 14-15 April 2014³. Participants included technical experts on monitoring and evaluation of food security and nutrition issues, from CSO/NGOs, the private sector, UN and development agencies, as well as the CFS Secretariat and the TST. Working group and plenary discussions focused on the key elements to consider in the baseline survey, data collection methods and the survey sample.

¹ CFS 2013/40 REPORT - <http://www.fao.org/docrep/meeting/029/mi744e.pdf>

² CFS 2013/40 REPORT - <http://www.fao.org/docrep/meeting/029/mi744e.pdf>

³ The workshop report, in English only, is available at: CFS Technical Consultative Workshop Report 14-15 April 2014

4. Following this workshop the CFS Secretariat, in consultation with the Open-Ended Working Group (OEWG) on Monitoring, proceeded to develop the Methodological Proposal in Annex 1.
5. In addition to the Methodological Proposal in Annex 1, CFS stakeholders should continue to encourage events aimed at sharing experiences and best practices at all levels to inform on progress towards the application of CFS main outputs⁴. The CFS Secretariat, in collaboration with relevant stakeholders, should explore and promote ways to organize such events, which might take place during CFS Plenary Sessions and/or during other events relevant to food security and nutrition.
6. The Methodological Proposal should be considered as a first step towards assessing CFS effectiveness and, intended as an initial contribution to conceptualize and develop a framework for monitoring CFS decisions and recommendations⁵ and to the role of CFS to promote accountability and share best practices at all levels⁶.

⁴ CFS main outputs include the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security (VG-GT) and the Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition (GSF).

⁵ CFS 2013/40 REPORT - <http://www.fao.org/docrep/meeting/029/mi744e.pdf>

⁶ CFS:2009/2 Rev.2 Reform of the Committee on World Food Security - http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/cfs/Docs0910/ReformDoc/CFS_2009_2_Rev_2_E_K7197.pdf

ANNEX 1 METHODOLOGICAL PROPOSAL

I. Introduction

1. The approaches and methods proposed in this document should be considered as a first step towards conceptualizing and developing a broader M&E Framework for monitoring in the context of CFS. In particular, this proposal is intended as a contribution to the role of CFS in the field of M&E and, specifically, to the CFS role to promote accountability and share best practices at all levelsⁱ.
2. This proposal provides an overview of issues that should be considered, including:
 - the main criteria that should be considered in assessing the effectiveness of CFS (Section 1);
 - the overall assessment approach that is recommended and a preliminary set of “high level questions” to be answered through complementary assessment methods (Section 2);
 - the description of the assessment methods that should be considered for both the baseline and subsequent periodic assessments, including their scope and required resources (Section 3).

II. Effectiveness in the context of CFS

3. The foreseen baseline survey and periodic assessments, as conceptualized in the present document, should serve two primary and complementary purposes, namely:
 - to generate lessons learned from the global, regional and national levels that can help improve CFS effectiveness, and;
 - to assess the extent to which CFS promotes/influences improved policy frameworks on food security and nutrition (FSN) issues, at global, regional and national levels.
4. Based on the review of relevant M&E literatureⁱⁱ and on previous work of the OEWG on Programme of Work and Priorities (PWP)ⁱⁱⁱ, “CFS **effectiveness**” can be defined as ***the extent to which CFS Outcomes are achieved, or are expected to be achieved***. The present methodological proposal builds on this definition, which puts emphasis on the progressive achievement of the three expected Outcomes promoted by the Committee, as extracted from 2014-15 Multi-Year Programme of Work (MYPoW) document^{iv} and indicated in Table 1.
5. Emphasis should also be placed on CFS main Outputs. Those include the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security (VG-GT) and the Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition (GSF)^v. Focusing on CFS main Outputs is coherent with previous OEWG-Monitoring discussions and recommendations, which highlighted that CFS should not attempt to monitor all CFS endorsed decisions and recommendations.

Table 1: CFS Overall Objective and Expected Outcomes			
CFS Overall Objective	<i>Contribute to reducing hunger and malnutrition and enhancing food security and nutrition for all human beings</i>		
	↑	↑	↑
CFS Outcomes^{vi}	<i>Outcome A</i>	<i>Outcome B</i>	<i>Outcome C</i>
	<i>Enhanced global coordination on food security and nutrition questions</i>	<i>Improved policy convergence on key food security and nutrition issues</i>	<i>Strengthened national and regional food security and nutrition actions</i>

6. Given the proposed definition of CFS effectiveness, it is worth highlighting that there are particular challenges in addressing monitoring in the context of CFS in terms of conceptualizing and designing useful M&E activities and implementing them in a cost-effective manner. Those challenges are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2: Challenges faced when designing CFS effectiveness assessments	
1	CFS is not a project or programme and does not have an elaborated results framework with pre-identified and agreed upon performance indicators, targets, roles and responsibilities.
2	CFS is a consultative platform and an inter-governmental body ^{vii} that involves a multiplicity of actors, including Member States, UN bodies, CSOs, Private Sector, financial and philanthropic organizations and other stakeholders. This implies that CFS effectiveness in achieving its expected Outcomes depends on collective efforts and capacities of all concerned actors, at global, regional and national levels.
3	CFS decisions and recommendations and major outputs are not legally binding and their implementation is on a voluntary basis.
4	CFS Outcomes and Outputs are characterized by a high level of complexity given the multi-dimensionality of food security and nutrition, as well as the multiple levels (global, regional and national levels) that are considered.
5	Policy change is highly complex and not necessarily linear. Policy processes are shaped by a multitude of interacting forces and actors. The assessment of policy influencing work, in any setting, presents conceptual and technical challenges as it is difficult to establish causality (or attribution) between actions and desired outcomes. This makes it almost impossible to predict with confidence the likely consequences of a set of activities on policy ^{viii} .
	In the specific context of CFS, it is particularly difficult to determine the links between the promoted policy influencing actions (e.g.: CFS main outputs) and any change in global, regional and national policies affecting FSN.

7. In order to address the M&E challenges described in Table 2, developing a “theory of change”^{ix} for CFS would be helpful. Actually, the development of a theory of change is a commonly

used approach for guiding the M&E of policy influencing actions. The theory of change in the context of policy influencing work can be defined as a logical model of how the policy influencing activities are envisaged to result in the desired changes in policy or in people's lives. Policies consist of sets of processes^x and influencing policy improvements is mainly about: promoting attitudinal change of key stakeholders; encouraging commitments from states and other actors; securing procedural change; affecting policy content, and; influencing behaviour change in key stakeholders^{xi}.

8. In accordance with the above theory of change approach and with the specific purpose of conceptualizing the assessment of CFS effectiveness, it is proposed that CFS effectiveness is analysed by focusing on a set of comprehensive and complementary assessment criteria (or key drivers of success), which are presented in Table 3. A theory of change approach for CFS builds on the assumption that "good performance" under the proposed assessment criteria enables CFS to "effectively" progress towards its expected Outcomes.

Table 3: Proposed CFS effectiveness assessment criteria

CFS Outcomes	Assessment Criteria (key drivers of success)		Definitions (what the assessment criteria measure)
Outcome A Enhanced global coordination on food security and nutrition issues	1	Relevance of CFS	Extent to which the CFS platform is able to address relevant FSN priorities at global, regional and national levels
	2	Inclusiveness & Participation	Extent to which CFS includes and has active participation from all relevant stakeholders
	3	Coordination and Engagement	Extent to which CFS promotes global coordination on FSN and is engaging with relevant global and regional fora and initiatives
Outcome B Improved policy convergence on key food security and nutrition issues	4	Promotion of Policy Convergence	Extent to which CFS produces and promotes outputs (such as policy recommendations, strategies and guidelines) aligned with global, regional and national priorities
	5	Evidence-based Decision-Making	Extent to which CFS decisions and recommendations are based on evidence
	6	CFS Communication Strategy	Extent to which CFS effectively communicates awareness of CFS main outputs and raises awareness of FSN with decision-makers and other relevant stakeholders at all levels
Outcome C Strengthened national and regional food security and nutrition actions	7	CFS Responsiveness	Extent to which CFS facilitates effective support and advises in response to requests by regions and countries
	8	CFS Influence	Extent to which CFS is positively influencing policy processes and enhancement at regional and national levels through the delivery and promotion of its main outputs
	9	Capacity for Uptake	Extent to which CFS Members and other stakeholders have capacity to apply CFS main outputs at the regional and national levels

9. The assessment criteria proposed in Table 3 are based on the descriptions of the CFS expected Outcomes, taking into account the CFS vision statement and the nature of policy recommendations. Each assessment criterion is associated to a specific CFS expected Outcome but some of the proposed criteria may apply to more than one expected Outcome.

10. In general, the assessment of the criteria related to CFS Outcomes A and B (criteria 1 to 6) is mainly addressing the capacity of the CFS platform to promote consultative processes and deliver products aimed at enhancing attitudinal change of key stakeholders, encouraging commitments from states and other actors, and securing procedural change. Assessing the criteria associated to Outcome C is mainly referring to the analysis of the extent to which CFS is responding to requests and influencing policy processes, at regional and national levels, aimed at improving policy content and influencing behaviour change in key stakeholders.

III. Assessment approach

11. Given the challenges presented in Section 1 and in accordance with widely accepted M&E standards and good practices, this Methodological Proposal suggests that each of the assessment criteria outlined in Table 3 is associated with a set of “high level assessment questions”^{xii}. Those are expected to be addressed through the implementation of a baseline and subsequent periodic assessments. Provisional high level questions are outlined in Table 4 below.

Table 4: Assessment “high level questions”

Assessment Criteria	High level questions
1 Relevance of CFS	To what extent CFS decisions and recommendations are relevant to [and in alignment with] country priorities? Do CFS decisions, recommendations & policy recommendations adequately reflect emerging issues?
2 Inclusiveness & Participation	To what extent all relevant CFS stakeholders are included? To what extent CFS stakeholders actively participate and contribute to CFS processes?
3 Coordination and engagement	To what extent is CFS effectively engaged in promoting global coordination of FSN policies? To what extent is CFS engaging strategically and constructively in regional and global fora to ensure policy coherence of relevance to FSN? (e.g.: Post-2015, SCN, ICN2, G8/G20, CAADP, etc.)
4 Promotion of policy convergence	To what extent CFS main outputs promote policy coherence (horizontally and vertically), in terms of strategies, guidelines, principles, etc.? To what extent CFS main outputs are successfully capturing the inputs from all relevant stakeholders?
5 Evidence-based decision-making	To what extent CFS decisions and recommendations are evidence based? What is the degree of adequacy of mechanisms in place to support CFS evidence-based decision making?

6	CFS Communication strategy	To what extent CFS communication on decisions and main outputs is reaching appropriate stakeholders?
		To what extent CFS stakeholders are communicating CFS main outputs?
		To what extent issues and recommendations from national & regional levels are communicated to CFS?
7	CFS Responsiveness	To what extent CFS is responding to requests for advice from stakeholders?
		To which extent the requests to CFS from stakeholders are commensurate to CFS objectives and outcomes?
8	CFS Influence	Extent to which national, regional and other stakeholders' FSN plans reflect CFS recommendations and decisions.
		Extent to which countries have or are establishing multi-stakeholder platforms to address FSN issues.
9	Capacity for uptake	Extent to which CFS stakeholders' capacities are in place at regional and national levels to facilitate 'vertical policy coherence'?
		Extent to which CFS principles, decisions and policies are reflected/adopted in national and regional institutions?

12. Some approaches and methods are more suitable than others to gather the information needed to answer the preliminary high-level assessment questions outlined in Table 4. The degree of accuracy, reliability and usefulness of the information that can be obtained depends, to a large extent, on the assessment method that is adopted. Assessment methods are characterized by different levels of complexity and may require different resources for their adoption. For the specific purpose of conceptualizing and designing the baseline and subsequent periodic assessments, the selection of the appropriate assessment method mainly depends on: a) the “evaluability” of the elements to be assessed; b) the depth of the analysis to be conducted; c) the financial and human resources available.

13. Given the diversity and complexity of the issues addressed by the proposed assessment criteria, it is suggested that the high level assessment questions presented in Table 4 are addressed through the implementation of complementary assessment methods. In particular, the proposed assessment methods to consider for conducting the baseline and subsequent periodic assessment include the following:

- Opinion survey of CFS stakeholders;
- In-depth country level assessments in a selected sample of countries.

14. These two methods should be considered as complementary. Other additional approaches and assessment methods can also be considered, based on the interest and specific requests from CFS Members and stakeholders, as well as on the availability of resources for their design and implementation. Those could include the sharing of best practices at all levels – including at CFS plenary and inter-sessional events^{xiii}. Eventually, a full scope evaluation of CFS^{xiv} may be considered.

IV. Assessment methods and scope

15. Taking into account the type of information required and resource availability, it is proposed that the assessment of CFS effectiveness (both baseline and subsequent periodic assessments) is conducted through an opinion survey of CFS key informants and complemented by in-depth country level assessments. This Section provides details on the purpose, scope, implementation modalities and estimated cost of the proposed methods.

A. Opinion survey of CFS stakeholders

- **Purpose:** the “opinion survey of CFS stakeholders” is intended to provide a snapshot of the status of CFS effectiveness, with focus on each of the 9 criteria of CFS effectiveness presented in Table 3.
- **Scope:** the nature of the proposed survey is “qualitative”. Its implementation will consist in the collection, consolidation and reporting of opinions and perceptions to be expressed by key informants on the extent to which CFS is performing well under the defined “key drivers of success” (ref. Table 3). The survey will be focused on the “high level assessment questions” outlined in Table 4, which will be used to develop a detailed survey questionnaire that will be accessible “on-line” by a selected sample of CFS informants.
- **Data collection method:** the survey data will be collected using a structured questionnaire with multiple choice questions and statements, allowing respondents to indicate their opinions and perceptions. Questions and statements will be specifically referred to each of the 9 assessment criteria presented in Table 3 (about 5 questions per assessment criterion). For some of the questions, survey respondents will have the possibility to provide comments.
- **Sample:** the survey sample should include a geographically and gender balanced group of representatives of each CFS constituency. It is proposed that each CFS constituency identifies the key informants to be surveyed. A balance among CFS constituencies to be surveyed should be pursued. Ideally, between 3 to 5 informants for each CFS Member and between 3 to 5 for each Participant category per country should be surveyed.
- **Data processing and reporting:** the results of the survey will be reported to CFS with the intention to improve future work of the Committee. All information provided by the respondents will be treated as confidential. The information provided will not be traced to individual respondents nor will any interview outcome be presented as standalone findings. The collected data will be consolidated and reported using a scorecard approach. In particular, it is proposed that each of the 9 assessment criteria will be translated into a numerical scale (e.g., from 1 to 5, where 1 is highly unsatisfactory and 5 is highly satisfactory). Survey results will be consolidated and reported according to the following: 1) overall results; 2) by region; 3) by type of CFS constituency (i.e.: CFS Members and Participants).
- **Implementation modalities:** the survey will be a web-based online survey, taking advantage of open source/low cost platforms available in the market (i.e. Survey Monkey). The survey should be responded within one or two months from its launch on the web.
- **Estimated cost:** the estimated overall cost for the design and implementation of the opinion survey is about USD 90,000. That includes: the cost of the contract of an M&E consultant responsible for the survey design for 4 months (USD 40,000); translation costs (USD 10,000); survey implementation costs (USD 10,000, including consultancy contract cost and eventual procurement of web platform); survey reporting and dissemination (USD 30,000, including contract cost of M&E consultant for two months and miscellaneous).

B. In-depth country level assessments

- **Purpose^{xv}**: the “in-depth country level assessments” will be carried out in volunteer countries expressing interest to be fully engaged in the exercise aimed at producing a comprehensive and deep analysis of the effectiveness of CFS. The assessments complement the foreseen “opinion survey of CFS stakeholders” through country level analysis on the identification of the root causes of CFS effectiveness constraints and key drivers of success. Findings and lessons learned will help to enhance national processes and actions contributing to progress towards the achievement of CFS objective and outcomes. The identification of “best practices” will be emphasized, aiming at documenting successful models to be eventually replicated in other contexts.
- **Scope**: the country assessments will combine both quantitative and qualitative information. The analysis will focus on each of the 9 assessment criteria outlined in Table 3 (to be adjusted to national contexts), aiming at measuring country performance under the defined key drivers of success. Particular emphasis will be put on: criterion 1 (relevance of CFS with respect to national priorities and needs); criterion 4 (promotion of horizontal and vertical policy convergence within the countries object of the assessments); criterion 7 (CFS responsiveness in meeting the demands by the countries object of the assessments); criterion 8 (CFS influence in enhancing policy processes in the countries object of the assessments); criterion 9 (capacity for up-taking CFS frameworks, principles and decisions by the countries object of the assessments, with specific focus on the analysis of the extent to which the VG GT and the GSF have been/are being applied).
- **Data collection methods**: The information needed for the in-depth country level assessments will be obtained through the collection and analysis of both national primary and secondary information. This includes the gathering of opinions and perceptions of national stakeholders (i.e. “national opinion survey”) as well as the review of relevant national FSN policies, strategies, investments and other related actions (in particular, to assess the extent to which CFS promoted policy advice and guidelines have been/are being applied).
- **Sample**: With reference to the collection of primary information, the above mentioned “national opinion survey” should focus on the collection of opinions expressed by a balanced sample of key informants representing national CFS stakeholders, including: relevant government institutions (among others, the agriculture, health and education sectors); CSOs; private sector; UN agencies and other relevant public international organizations operating in the country; national and international NGOs operating in the country.
- **Data processing and reporting**: the country assessment reports will be drafted in accordance with the “Standards for Evaluation in the UN System”^{xvi}. The obtained primary and secondary information will be consolidated and presented in narrative reports, describing the results of the analysis on each of the 9 assessment criteria of CFS effectiveness.
- **Implementation modalities**: it is foreseen that the implementation of the in-depth country level assessments would require about 2 months of work per country, by a team of two independent international evaluators (one senior consultant supported by one junior consultant), experienced in the fields of FSN national and international policy processes and M&E. That would include: about 3 weeks of desk/home based preparatory work; about 3 weeks of field work (missions to sample countries); about two weeks for final report drafting. The implementation of the field work should be supported by the host governments, which should nominate focal point persons responsible to liaise with the evaluation team throughout the assessment exercise. Logistic support could be provided by FAO, WFP and IFAD where feasible. The preliminary findings of the assessments should be discussed with the host governments during the last days of the field work.
- **Estimated cost**: assessment design and implementation costs should be considered. The estimated cost for the design of the assessments is about USD 50,000. That includes: the contract cost of an M&E consultant for about 3 months (USD 30,000); translation costs (USD 10,000); cost for the validation of the assessment design by the CFS OEWG-

Monitoring (USD 10,000). The estimated cost for implementation of the assessments is about USD 50,000 per country. That includes: the cost of the contract of one senior consultant for 2 months (USD 20,000); contract cost of one junior consultant for 2 months (USD 10,000); travel costs and DSA for 2 persons for 3 weeks (USD 15,000); miscellaneous (USD 5,000).

16. Additional inputs to the proposed in-depth country level assessments are expected to be provided by existing M&E systems established by different institutions and actors, including national Governments, regional institutions, UN Agencies and Programmes, NGOs and others. For example, FAO (in the context of Strategic Objective 1) is already assessing national capacities and FSN policies, strategies and investment programmes in a sample of 40 countries in the world. WFP's Strategic Framework and M&E system also include government capacity assessment. In Africa, the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) has a Comprehensive M&E system in place. Complementarity with other actors needs further exploration.

17. The “depth of the analysis” of the two proposed assessment methods is very different. In particular, the implementation of the proposed opinion survey will provide a snapshot of main gaps, weaknesses and strengths of CFS, rapidly and at low cost. However, this method is not considered suitable to identify the root causes of those issues. It is for this reason that more in depth types of assessments focused on country level analysis should also be considered. The implementation of the in-depth country level assessments can be costly, depending on the number of countries to be considered and on the depth of the analysis to be conducted. Table 5 below summarizes some of the strengths and weaknesses of the two types of assessments of CFS effectiveness proposed in the present document.

Table 5: Strengths and weaknesses of proposed CFS effectiveness assessment methods

Assessment methods	Strengths	Weaknesses
1 Opinion survey of CFS stakeholders	<p>Low-cost for implementation (taking advantage of existing open source on-line survey administration platforms)</p> <p>Design costs can be covered through existing funds</p> <p>First results can be presented at CFS 42</p>	<p>The validity of the results depends on the quality and size of the reached sample of key informants</p> <p>The response rate can be low</p> <p>Not suitable to identify the root causes of CFS effectiveness issues</p>
2 In-depth country level assessments	<p>More suitable to identify the root causes of gaps, weaknesses, strengths and areas for improvement</p> <p>Complements the opinion survey by providing information extracted from official sources (such as official statistics, national FSN policies, etc.) and primary information collected at country level</p> <p>Inputs are available through existing M&E mechanisms (global, regional and national)</p> <p>Allows reviewing in depth stakeholder capacities to uptake CFS decisions and recommendations at national level</p>	<p>Depending on the number of countries to be considered and on the depth of the analysis, those assessments can be costly</p> <p>Resources (human and financial) for design and implementation need to be mobilized</p> <p>There are risk to duplicate M&E efforts of other actors</p> <p>The collection of relevant FSN secondary information supporting the assessments can be time consuming</p>

18. Based on the above considerations, it is proposed that CFS effectiveness baseline assessments, combining the described opinion survey and in-depth country level assessments”, are conducted during 2015 based on the availability of financial resources. Those should be replicated at regular intervals using the results of the baseline assessments for reviewing progress.

Endnotes

- i) Quote from the CFS: 2009/2 Rev.2 Reform of the committee on world food security final version -
http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/cfs/Docs0910/ReformDoc/CFS_2009_2_Rev_2_E_K7197.pdf.
- ii) The OECD “Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management” defines effectiveness as the extent to which the development interventions’ objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance. The OECD considers the “effectiveness” as one of the key evaluation criteria of development aid. Typically, the effectiveness of development aid is assessed in combination with the following complementary key evaluation criteria: Relevance; Efficiency; Sustainability; Impact. A significant number of institutions involved in international cooperation for development, including the UN, the EU and bilateral cooperation agencies, refer to the above OECD evaluation criteria to define their own approaches to monitoring and evaluation.
<http://www.oecd.org/development/peer-reviews/2754804.pdf>
- iii) The OEWG-PWP had previously discussed the linkages between the PWP work and a results-based framework approach to developing a monitoring system. Thus, this rationale is applied here to derive the working definition of ‘CFS effectiveness’ based on the three outcomes that have been used to guide the work of the Committee as elaborated in the MYPoWs. See CFS 2013/40/9 - CFS Multi-Year Programme of Work (MYPoW) 2014-2015; paras 58-60
<http://www.fao.org/docrep/meeting/029/MI036e.pdf>.
- iv) CFS Multi-Year Programme Of Work (MYPoW) 2014-2015
http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/cfs/Docs1213/PWP-Programme_of_Work_and_Priorities_/MI036_CFS2013_40_9_Rev1_formatted_en_COMPILED.pdf
- v) Two additional CFS main outputs, namely the CFS Principles for Responsible Investment in Agriculture and Food Systems (RAI) and the Agenda for Action for Addressing Food Insecurity in Protracted Crises (CFS A4A) are currently being negotiated.
- vi) With regards to CFS Outcome A, the 2014-15 MYPoW indicates that: the CFS role of global coordination is to provide an inclusive and evidence-based platform for discussion and coordination to strengthen collaborative action among governments, international and regional organizations, CSOs, the private sector and other relevant stakeholders, in a manner that is in alignment with country needs. This role is conducted mainly through discussions at the CFS Plenary session, including examination of food security and nutrition initiatives and frameworks, and inter-sessional activities that support the work of the Committee. The outcome considers not only coordination within CFS, but also the way CFS works with other important global and regional fora and initiatives. Coordination can also serve to encourage a more efficient use of resources and the identification of resource gaps. Under Outcome B, the CFS role in policy convergence is achieved through the formulation of policy recommendations, the development of international strategies and guidelines and other policy frameworks, based on best practices, lessons learnt, inputs from the national and regional levels and expert advice and opinions from different stakeholders. Policy convergence will include greater integration and coherence horizontally (among countries, organizations, stakeholders, etc.) as well as vertically (from local to global levels and vice versa). This outcome is further supported by the development of a CFS communication strategy that will aim to sensitize the decision-makers to the CFS recommendations and by the CFS Chair’s attendance to key fora.

With respect to Outcome C, the role of the CFS in facilitating support to national and regional food security and nutrition plans (i.e. policies, programmes, other actions, etc.) includes support/advice on development, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of plans to eliminate hunger and achieve food security and nutrition, based on the principles of participation, transparency and accountability. Progress on this outcome will also be a function of the responses provided by CFS to countries and regions and of the adoption of advice, tools, methods and frameworks that support coordinated responses resulting from CFS actions.

- vii) The CFS Reform document uses the terms “international and intergovernmental platform” referred to the CFS.
- viii) *A guide to monitoring and evaluating policy influence*, Harry Jones, Overseas Development Institute (ODI), 2011.
- ix) The United Nation Evaluation group (UNEG) defines the Theory of Change as “*a model that explains how an intervention is expected to lead to intended or observed impacts. The theory of change illustrates, generally in graphical form, the series of assumptions and links underpinning the presumed causal relationships between inputs, outputs, outcomes and impacts at various levels.*”
http://www.uneval.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc_id=22
- x) Knowledge Utilization and Public Policy Processes: A Literature Review, S. Neilson, International Development Research Centre (IDRC), 2001
- xi) *A guide to monitoring and evaluating policy influence*, Harry Jones, Overseas Development Institute (ODI), 2011.
- xii) The “high level assessment questions” refine the focus of the foreseen assessments by making more explicit the aspects to be considered when assessing CFS performance under the different assessment criteria. They are the general questions that the assessments will have to answer. A clear and concise set of the most relevant questions helps to guide the design of the assessments to be implemented, ensuring that they are focused, manageable, cost efficient and useful. Depending on the assessments data processing method that will have to be selected, the assessment questions can be converted into “indicators”.
- xiii) A possible model of such a type of approach is the CFS VG-GT event delivered in May 2014, during which experiences on the process of adoption of the VG-GT at national level have been shared by Guatemala, Philippines and Sierra Leone.
- xiv) In the future and based on the availability of resources, a full scope evaluation of the CFS could also be considered. That should cover the global, regional and national levels, involving multidisciplinary teams of experts for the collection and analysis of primary and secondary information.
- xv) The identification of the countries object of the assessment should be based on volunteer countries expressing interest to be fully engaged in the exercise. In order to consider the consolidated results of different country assessment as applicable to the CFS as a whole, a representative sample should include between 10% and 20% of the total number of CFS member countries, ensuring adequate regional and sub-regional balance. A smaller sample should not be considered as representative to determine the extent to which the CFS is globally and/or regionally effective. However and as already indicated, the conduction of such country level assessments is also aimed to generate learning to help the “assessed” countries to enhance processes and actions contributing to CFS objectives at national level. Therefore, the implementation of this type of assessment would be relevant even if limited to a small number of countries.
- xvi) United Nation Evaluation Group (UNEG).
http://www.uneval.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc_id=22