



COMMITTEE ON WORLD FOOD SECURITY

Thirty-ninth Session

Rome, Italy, 15-20 October 2012

**INFORMATION
NOTE ON MONITORING CFS DECISIONS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Committee:

- 1) Acknowledges document CFS:2012/39/11 “Monitoring progress towards decisions and recommendations of the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) in its Thirty-Seventh Session”;
- 2) Endorses the findings and recommendations contained in this document related to the further development and clarification of CFS monitoring work, especially:
 - that CFS recommendations be actionable and targeted at specific stakeholders;
 - the need for CFS to respond to the CFS reform document’s call for an “innovative mechanism” to help countries and regions, as appropriate, to address the question of whether food security and nutrition objectives are being achieved;
 - that the Open Ended Working Group on Monitoring continue its work in 2013 as outlined in Para. 9 and report back to CFS at its 40th Session.

1. The CFS Reform document identified one of the roles of CFS as:

Promote accountability and share best practices at all levels

(ii) 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:2009/2 Rev.2, para6ii)

2. At its meeting on 20 January 2012, the Bureau established an Open-Ended Working Group on Monitoring (OEWG-Monitoring) to advise on how to respond to this request. In developing its terms of reference and scope of work, 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, such as the follow up to the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security (VGGT) and the Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition (GSF), as well as those that might result from ongoing work such as the consultation process to develop principles for responsible agricultural investments which enhance food security (rai);
- d) Assessing the effectiveness of the CFS reform in its inclusiveness and consensus building on governance of food and nutrition security at national, sub-regional and global levels, its evidence based approaches to tackling food security and nutrition challenges;

3. The OEWG-Monitoring worked jointly with the Open Ended Working Group on Programme of Work and Priorities (OEWG-PoW) that is developing the Multi-Year Programme of Work (MYPOW) and Results Based Framework (RBF) for CFS to address the broader scope of monitoring the effectiveness and impact of CFS. The issue of monitoring is very complex and a broad range of views emerged:

- That as CFS is not an implementing agent, its accountability is primarily at the level of its deliverables ie producing the VGGT and the GSF is a commitment that CFS itself can easily monitor;
- That CFS is not in the business of producing documents, but to ensure that these documents are accessible and the right support is made available to member countries in order to achieve policy coherence and a positive impact on food security and nutrition;
- That the impact of CFS activities, on global, regional, and national food security and nutrition should be assessed using a variety of innovative tools;
- That CFS should monitor the effectiveness of its reform and its work.

4. 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. Draft terms of reference of the OEWG-Monitoring were prepared on that basis.
5. Pending the finalization of the RBF, the OEWG-Monitoring developed a preliminary framework in order to track the decisions of the 38th Session consisting of a matrix of CFS decisions to be monitored, the various levels of implementation and possible mechanisms for monitoring, lead actors, potential partners and milestones.
6. In this context, a difficulty is presented by the fact that CFS decisions to date have often not been articulated in a manner that enables monitoring. The Bureau therefore recommends that CFS, in future, distinguishes between recommendations of a general nature and decisions whose implementation should be monitored. Furthermore, the latter group should be actionable and accompanied by a clear indication of which actors or groups of stakeholders are responsible for their implementation. For instance, the Rome Based Agencies, research centres, the international community (at global level), regional bodies, Member Countries, etc. It was also noted that a mechanism to ensure that all implementing agencies of CFS decisions are made aware of their roles should be drawn up immediately after the CFS Session to ensure that CFS decisions are implemented in a timely manner and that there is broader ownership of the implementation process within the three UN based organizations and the wider global community.
7. The OEWG-Monitoring also highlighted the need to build on lessons learned from previous monitoring efforts. The OEWG recalled that previous attempts that required country reporting to CFS, have produced uneven results due to a range of issues including the excessive reporting burden on governments, the inadequate capacity to complete the reports, data availability and an inadequate range of indicators to monitor food security and nutrition programmes (CFS:2008/3).
8. 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 that would be based on the input of a wide range of stakeholders, involve and benefit from existing frameworks and partners and be flexible enough to benefit both global level (CFS and other) as well as regional/national/local planning and reporting requirements. Alternative mechanisms suggested included peer reviews and periodic independent evaluations, the development of a core suite of indicators, and exploring linkages with and building on other global initiatives on monitoring food security and nutrition, such as MDGs and others in order to situate CFS monitoring activities in a global context .
9. The next steps would include encouraging the OEWG-Monitoring to continue addressing this complex but important stream of work; hold a workshop to review existing global, regional and country initiatives in monitoring food and nutrition security; identify innovative approaches, monitoring gaps and the possible collaboration amongst various actors and approaches; establishing a technical team to support the OEWG-Monitoring .
10. Committee's guidance is therefore sought regarding the range and scope of monitoring within CFS.