

World Food Programme Contribution

Recommendations 1 and 2

Implementation of the CFS Evaluation

I. Overall comments on the CFS roles

In line with what the RBAs jointly stated in the Evaluation meeting of 24 January, the six roles of CFS identified in the 2009 Reform Document to achieve CFS vision are not equal and were not designed equally at the time of the reform. The Reform Document (paragraph 6) clearly states that additional roles (i.e. 4, 5 and 6) would be gradually taken on by CFS in a second phase, thus creating a hierarchy amongst roles. Since the Reform, CFS has been performing and making progress on roles 1 and 2, which remain as its primary roles (the same applies to role 6, which however is to be considered as a task rather than a role).

It is also clear that roles 3, 4 and 5 are country-led and conditional to specific requests of countries, which have never materialized in the nearly 10 years since the reform.

Role 3 of the reformed CFS underlines Members' ownership of CFS action at regional and country levels. This is in accordance with the structure and nature of CFS as an inter-governmental body, the decision-making powers of which rest on Members only, as well as with the voluntary nature of its policy products. All other CFS stakeholders, including the RBAs, are to provide technical support to the Members' decisions taken in Rome. Similarly, at country level, the RBAs can only act in support of governments and in response to their specific requests. RBAs activities can only be in support to specific Member-led initiatives at country and regional levels.

Similarly, regarding role 5 (i.e. promote accountability and share best practices at all levels), the RBAs support the vision of monitoring outlined in the Evaluation report, and in particular: "detailed monitoring of policies, programmes and plans are the responsibility of national governments". In accordance with their voluntary nature, national governments are responsible for monitoring the use and application of CFS products at country level. CFS stakeholders should stand ready to contribute with technical support at the request of national governments.

CFS' approach to monitoring should consider resource availability, cost-effectiveness, added value and not duplicate existing monitoring mechanisms. As stated in the reform document, CFS should be promoting an accountability culture through activities in Rome, such as continuing to hold Global Thematic Events in Plenary, and organizing inter-sessional events to share lessons learned and best practices.

II. **Suggested changes to the three proposed strategic objectives for CFS as a Committee for the next MYPoW**

- **SO1 PLATFORM:** Use CFS' inclusive, evidence-based and solution-oriented platform for exchange to identify policy implications arising from ~~controversial, critical, urgent and emerging~~ issues on FSN;
- **SO2 POLICY:** Prioritize ~~critical, emerging and~~ urgent FSN issues for policy work, considering the needs and potential impact on people most affected by food insecurity and malnutrition (demand-driven approach), taking into account RBAs ~~technical advice and/support work~~;
- **SO3 UPTAKE:** Raise awareness and strengthen political commitment to use and apply CFS products at country and regional levels (adopting a cost effective approach), ~~within all CFS stakeholders' efforts to support the country-led implementation of the 2030 Agenda. within RBAs' collaboration under the UN Reform.~~

Overall comments on SOs 1 and 2

The CFS should limit its focus on urgent food security and nutrition issues. CFS should not deal with crises management. To the contrary, CFS' main focus should be on the root causes of food insecurity and malnutrition.

Overall comments on SO3

The rationale of mentioning the UN Reform is unclear, thus this reference is a cause of confusion. Not just the RBAs should be mentioned here: all CFS stakeholders should. The CFS products, by their nature, are voluntary and non-binding. Based on countries' priorities and initiatives, all CFS stakeholders are called to promote CFS products at national level. It remains upon Members to ultimately decide whether to use CFS products ("political commitment").

III. **Overall comments on the proposed results chain for CFS**

The proposed output "*Identification of policy implications from reviewing global progress and trends in FSN and experiences in applying FSN policies*" appears to be unclear thus would need to be taken out unless otherwise clarified.

With reference to point (iii) of Annex 2, WFP believes that the HLPE research work and reports are central to CFS processes. The HLPE should continue to provide the core scientific evidence-based analysis to the Committee.