

**UN Special Rapporteur's comments on CFS Evaluation background document of
January 24.2018**

Feb.5. 2018

i. Strengthen the strategic content of the MYPoW

- Document mainly focuses on SDGs 2 and 17. However, as discussed earlier in CFS agenda several of SDGs are relevant to eliminate hunger, ensuring food security and nutrition for all as well as implementing the progressive realization of the right to food.
- Also the document should be extended **to the 6 roles of the CFS, as they are indivisible and interconnected.**

It might be relevant that:

- **The SO1 Platform should highlight the CFS capacity” to make recommendations”, instead of limiting only as a “platform to identify policy implications”.** Also the **idea of a coordinated platform** should come up in the first sentence. These two points are critical and well recall the mandate of the CFS.
- **The SO2 Policy is a critical role** and CFS should invest more. This is where instruments such as the Right to Food Guidelines should be used to influence processes and create demand for further work on the right to food.
- **The SO3 Uptake:** Similarly, CFS has the crucial role of policy-guiding instruments to strengthen country commitments. There should also be included here the aspect of **“increasing capacity”**. This could come just after **raising awareness**. In order to raise awareness, the first step must be capacity building/increasing in order to have successful political commitment.
- In Annex 1, under Recommendation 2, I found the focus on **“impact on people most affected by food insecurity and malnutrition” is narrow**. Special mention to the **most vulnerable** should always be welcome. The most affected by food insecurity and malnutrition are not necessarily the most vulnerable who are historically excluded or marginalized, such as indigenous communities, peasants in remote places, sick, disabled and elderly people. There is food insecurity and malnutrition in absolute terms and in disaggregated terms. Human rights based approach will make sure that the latter is the criteria to follow. A simple FSN approach will not.
- **In Annex 2: Results chain.** It might be useful here specifically to include the use of voluntary policy guidance, the use of Guiding tools such as the RTFG should be emphasized.
- **Annex 3: Performance of the CFS.** Role 2 and 3 should offer the possibility to explicitly mention the RTFG (the VGGT are there already) and make sure that the CFS can provide country support (when it will provide any) through the RTFG in collaboration with the RBAs.

ii. Criteria for selecting MYPoW activities

CFS stakeholders are invited to propose new criteria or suggest how to improve existing ones (current criteria are listed in Annex 5 of the background document of 24 January evaluation meeting).

- The criteria suggested in Annex 5 are already pretty comprehensive and cover all the basis. However, in selecting MYPoW criteria to emphasize the importance of human rights based approach gives right to food is more visibility.
- Focusing on **limiting the responsibilities** based on **resources availability, and including “work loads” should not be included into criteria.**