

Comments France – Implementation report of the CFS Evaluation

Co-facilitators' proposal – Zero Draft

We thank the co-facilitators for their work and the good proposal. We would like to raise the following points:

- Demand-driven: proposals to be made for the Advisory Group. We would like to remind the specificities of CFS which reports back not only to FAO but also to ECOSOC and which is open to all stakeholders. Thus the advisory role of this group to the Bureau, which has not only an administrative role, is of crucial importance.

- Prioritisation:
 - paragraph 18: France would like to make the following change *“CFS will not engage in more than one **major** policy convergence process at a time”*. The implications for HLPE have also to be detailed as it is essential that HLPE continues to produce one report each year.
 - Paragraph 19: A consultation of Member States should be added if needed before the CFS Plenary only on the most sensitive points in order to ease the decision-making during the Plenary. *“As a result, of pursuing suggested activities, **and their Member states as appropriate**, will finalise the MYPoW”*

- Uptake:
 - Paragraph 30: clarifications are needed on the sentence ‘Partnerships should be implemented’ as the meaning is confusing.
 - Paragraph 36: the sentences ‘CFS will promote accountability’ or ‘CFS will facilitate advice’ are too vague: who in CFS ? in which form advice will be given?

- Funding:
 - Paragraph 37: it should be clear that nothing prevents CFS Members for planning activities in the MYPoW even if resources are not provided. In this regard, we propose the following deletion: *“ The comprehensive planning phase for prioritizing CFS activities establishes that the decision on which activities to include in the CFS MYPoW will be made taking into account ~~resource availability and~~ workload.”*
 - Paragraph 38: the two last sentences seem to be quite identical and the text could be shortened.

- Table 1 of Recommendation 10:

France would like to add the following sentence in the box highlighted in red (see below): *“questionnaires to be produced by CFS Secretariat and to be filled by countries on their action concerning the implementation of CFS products. “*

		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"> Annual discussion on SOFI report (based on "monitoring" done by RBAs + WHO + UNICEF) 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) <i>(CFS Plenary Annual progress reports)</i> Self-assessment or <i>independent evaluation</i>¹³ on CFS effectiveness through: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Periodic opinion surveys¹⁴, complemented by, 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"> Annual VNRs¹⁷ and others, e.g. nutrition (based on "monitoring" done by countries supported by RBAs, UN system, others) 	<p>FuR use of CFS products in countries/regions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Biennial Global Thematic Events on major products and ad hoc events / side-events on policy recommendations¹⁸ 	<p>Recommend approaches to country/region monitoring FSN objectives¹⁹</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ToRs that can guide country-organized events to review CFS products²⁰