



Evaluation of CFS Reform

Evaluation of CFS Reform

Inception Report (Final)

31 August 2016

Table of Contents

Acronyms and Abbreviations	4
Summary	5
1 Introduction	6
1.1 Purpose of evaluation.....	6
1.2 Background and context.....	6
1.3 Scope of the evaluation	8
2 Evaluation methodology and approach.....	10
2.1 Overview.....	10
2.2 Evaluation criteria and evaluation questions	10
2.3 Scoping mission	12
2.4 Evaluation activities	12
2.5 Limitations and mitigation strategies	15
3 Managing the evaluation.....	16
3.1 Evaluation team.....	16
3.2 Quality assurance.....	16
3.3 Role of CFS and stakeholders.....	16
3.4 Independence of evaluation	17
3.5 Timetable for the evaluation	17
3.6 Evaluation report	19
3.7 Evaluation budget.....	20
Annex A: Evaluation matrix	22
Annex B: Profile of Evaluation Team	25
Annex C: List of documents consulted	28
Annex D: List of institutions and stakeholders consulted	30
Annex E: List of potential countries for visit	34

List of tables

Table 1: Six Roles of CFS 7

Table 2: Sample of countries for visits 14

Table 3: Potential interviewees at country level..... 14

Table 4: Evaluation Timetable 18

Table 5: Indicative outline of evaluation report..... 19

Table 6: Evaluation budget..... 20

Acronyms and Abbreviations

CFS	Committee on World Food Security
CSM	International Food Security and Nutrition Civil Society Mechanism
ECOSOC	United Nations Economic and Social Council
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FSN	Food Security and Nutrition
GSF	Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition
HLPE	High Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition
ICN2	Second International Conference on Nutrition
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
M&E	Monitoring & Evaluation
MYPoW	Multi Year Programme of Work
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
OECD/DAC	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development's (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC)
OEWG	Open-Ended Working Group
PSM	Private Sector Mechanism of the Committee on World Food Security
RAI	Responsible Agricultural Investment
RBAs	Rome-Based Agencies (i.e. FAO, IFAD and WFP)
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
SUN	Scaling Up Nutrition
UNSCN	United Nations Standing Committee on Nutrition
VGGT	Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security
WFP	World Food Programme of the United Nations
WHA	World Health Assembly
WHO	World Health Organization

Summary

The Bureau of the World Committee on Food Security (CFS) commissioned an independent evaluation of the CFS Reforms that were approved in 2009. This inception report follows on from the scoping mission conducted from 26 May to 3 June 2016. The report is in essence the 'road map' for conducting the evaluation. It sets out the methodology for conducting the evaluation, including the key questions for the evaluation, describes the data collection methods and sources of data, and provides an indicative timetable for conducting the evaluation. It also shows an updated budget estimate for the evaluation. The draft inception report was circulated to members of the CFS Bureau and Advisory Group, and discussed with them on 22 July 2016. In updating the inception report, the Evaluation Team took into consideration the comments received during the discussion, as well as the written comments that followed.

1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of evaluation

1. The Committee on World Food Security (CFS) commissioned an independent evaluation of the effectiveness of the CFS reforms that were initiated in 2009. The CFS is an intergovernmental Committee in the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), with a mandate to serve as a global forum for review and follow-up on food security policies. In October 2013 at its Fortieth Session, the Committee endorsed the recommendation 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. At the same session, the Committee decided that an evaluation of the progress of the reforms should be conducted including progress made towards the overall objective of the CFS and its three outcomes.

2. The purpose of the evaluation as set out in the Concept Note endorsed by the Bureau of the CFS is to:

- a) Produce evidence regarding whether CFS, as a multi stakeholder forum, is achieving the vision outlined in the Reform Documents and its expected outcomes;
- b) Assess the extent to which CFS is performing its roles outlined in the Reform Document, efficiently and effectively, and if so, with what impact;
- c) Review the working arrangements, including the multi-year programme of work of CFS in order to assess how the decision-making processes and planning may be impacting effectiveness;
- d) Propose forward-looking recommendations to enable CFS to respond effectively to the emerging food security and nutrition challenges, to further strengthen its comparative advantages, and to enhance its leadership role in improving global food security and nutrition; and
- e) Generate learning regarding multi-stakeholder collaboration, to which the CFS represents a possible model to be replicated.

1.2 Background and context

3. The Committee on World Food Security (CFS) was established as an intergovernmental body in 1974, to serve as a committee for review and follow up on food security policies. It reports to the United Nations General Assembly through the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), and to the FAO Conference.

4. In 2009, the CFS embarked on a process of reform following a review of the institution. The impetus for the reform came from concerns about rising food prices in 2007-2008, the global financial and economic crisis in 2008-2009, and increasing variability of climate and extreme weather that negatively impacted on livelihoods. These crises once again brought to the fore, the high levels of structural poverty and hunger around the world. The second set of drivers for the reforms came from concerns about the effectiveness of the CFS in responding to these challenges.

5. The reform crafted a vision for the CFS: *“ The CFS is and remains an intergovernmental Committee in FAO. The reformed CFS, as a central component of the evolving Global Partnership for Agriculture, Food Security and Nutrition, will constitute the foremost inclusive international and*

intergovernmental platform for a broad range of committed stakeholders to work together in a coordinated manner and in support of country-led processes, towards the elimination of hunger and ensuring food security and nutrition for all human beings. The CFS will strive for a world free from hunger where countries implement voluntary guidelines for the progressive realization of the right to adequate food in the context of national food security.”¹

6. The Members of the CFS agreed to three key guiding principles for the reform, namely: **inclusiveness**; **strong linkages to the field** to ensure that the reform process is based on the reality of what happens on the ground; and **flexibility in implementation** to enable the CFS to be responsive to changes in the external environment and needs of its Members. CFS Members also agreed that the reforms would be implemented in two phases, with the CFS gradually taking on additional roles in Phase II.² In Phase I, the CFS’s roles were to be: Coordination at the global level; Policy convergence; and Support; and advice to countries and regions. The reforms included a number of changes to the structures and process of the CFS to align it with the vision and enhance its overall effectiveness. The two phases of the reforms are captured in the Table 1.

Table 1: Six Roles of CFS

Roles: Phase I	Additional roles: Phase II
<i>Coordination at global level.</i> Provide a platform for discussion and coordination to strengthen collaborative action among governments, regional organizations, international organizations and agencies, NGOs, CSOs, food producers’ organizations, private sector organizations, philanthropic organizations and other relevant stakeholders, in a manner that is in alignment with each country’s specific context and needs.	<i>Coordination at national and regional levels.</i> Serve as a platform to promote greater coordination and alignment of actions in the field, encourage more efficient use of resources and identify resource gaps. As the reform progresses, the CFS will build, as appropriate, on the coordination work of the United Nations High Level Task Force (HLTF). One guiding principle to support this role will be to build on and strengthen existing structures and linkages with key partners at all levels.....
<i>Policy convergence.</i> Promote greater policy convergence and coordination, including through the development of international strategies and voluntary guidelines on food security and nutrition on the basis of best practices, lessons learned from local experiences, inputs received from the national and regional levels, and expert advice and opinions from different stakeholders.	<i>Promote accountability and share best practice at all levels.</i> One of the main functions of the CFS has been to monitor actively the implementation of the 1996 World Food Summit Plan of Action (WFS-PoA). Although countries are taking measures to address food insecurity, the specific programmes, as they are presented, do not necessarily help to report quantitatively on progress towards realizing the WFS-PoA objectives. 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 more effectively. This will entail developing

¹ CFS, Reform of the Committee on World Food Security, Thirty-fifth Session, Rome, October 2009, CFS:2009/2 Rev.2, p.2

² CFS, Reform of the Committee on World Food Security, Thirty-fifth Session, Rome, October 2009, CFS:2009/2 Rev.2, p.2-3

	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.
<i>Support and advice to countries and regions. At country and/or region request, facilitate support and/or advice in the development, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of their nationally and regionally owned plans of action for the elimination of hunger, achievement of food security and the practical application of the “Voluntary Guidelines for the Right to Food” that shall be based on the principles of participation, transparency and accountability.</i>	<i>Develop a Global Strategic Framework for food security and nutrition in order to improve coordination, and guide synchronized action by a wide range of stakeholders. The Global Strategic Framework will be flexible so that it can be adjusted as priorities change. It will build upon existing frameworks such as the UN’s Comprehensive Framework for Action (CFA), the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP), and the Voluntary Guidelines to Support the Realization of the Right to Adequate Food in the Context of National Food Security.</i>

7. The CFS currently comprises Members, participants, and observers reflecting one of the key reform objectives of ensuring that the voices of all relevant stakeholders are heard. Members of FAO, WFP, IFAD and non-member states of FAO that are Member states of the United Nations may be **Members** of the CFS. **Participants** include representatives of UN agencies that have a specific mandate in the field of food security and nutrition; civil society organizations; international agricultural research systems; international and regional financial institutions; and representatives from private sector associations and private foundations. Participants are actively involved in the work of the CFS, participate in the Plenary and inter-sessional activities through the Advisory Group established by the CFS Bureau. **Observers** are organizations or bodies invited to observe entire sessions or specific agenda items of the Committee or its Bureau. Organizations or bodies may apply for observer status to participate regularly or for specific issues.

8. The CFS has a permanent Secretariat with staff from the Rome-Based Agencies, and headed by a Secretary. Located in Rome, the role of the CFS Secretariat is to support the work of the Plenary, the Bureau, the Advisory Group, the High Level Panel of Experts, and the ad hoc Open-Ended Working Groups of the CFS³.

1.3 Scope of the evaluation

9. The evaluation covers the period 2009 to 2015, and the expectation is that it should be a comprehensive evaluation. All CFS bodies including: the CFS Plenary, the Bureau, the Advisory Group, the High Level Panel of Experts (HLPE) and the HLPE Secretariat, and the Joint CFS Secretariat, will contribute with their key views and evidence to the evaluation. Other ad hoc bodies, for example, the Open Ended Working Groups of the CFS will also contribute to the evaluation process. Looking beyond the CFS, the evaluation will solicit the views of stakeholders at country, regional and global levels.

10. The evaluation will cover the **six roles** of the CFS as outlined in the reform document. It should be borne in mind that these roles have been implemented progressively. The Multi Year Programme of Work (MYPoW 2014-2015) adopted by the CFS at its 40th session in October 2013, articulated the overall objective and outcomes of the CFS as reflected below. These Outcomes are

³ For CFS structure and background see <http://www.fao.org/cfs/cfs-home/about/structure/en/>

based on the six roles of the CFS as set out in the CFS Reform Document, and as confirmed in the 2016-2017 MYPoW, these three outcomes do not replace the agreed language approved by CFS in 2009. The evaluation will assess the extent to which these outcomes contribute to achieving the mandate and overall objective of the Committee.

Overall Objective	<i>Contribute to reducing hunger and malnutrition and enhancing food security and nutrition for all human beings⁴</i>
Outcome A	Enhanced global coordination on food security and nutrition questions
Outcome B	Improved policy convergence on key food security and nutrition issues
Outcome C	Strengthened national and regional food security and nutrition actions

11. The Evaluation Concept Note elaborates the following areas to be addressed in the evaluation, with emphasis on the multi-stakeholder approach and evidence-based decision-making of CFS:

Objectives and mandate	To assess the extent to which CFS is fulfilling its mandate, how efficient it is in doing so, and how the six roles outlined in the 2009 reform document have been implemented
Working arrangements	To assess the current process and structure of CFS decision-making and work-streams, their sustainability, taking into account financial arrangements and reliance on RBAs, and the contribution to CFS's ability to meet its mandate
Inclusiveness and participation	To determine how effective CFS is at being inclusive, assessing the quality of the participation and the diversity of voices represented
Relevance	To assess the extent to which CFS addresses relevant FSN priorities at global, regional and national levels in a timely manner
Promotion of Policy Convergence	To assess the effectiveness of CFS in promoting policy coherence horizontally (among countries, organizations, stakeholders, etc., and vertically (from local to global levels and vice versa)
Coordination and engagement	To identify how CFS could improve coordination and establish strategic linkages with relevant actors and institutions, especially at regional and national levels
Evidence-base	To assess the extent to which CFS decisions and recommendations are based on actual occurrences, and how effectively the High Level Panel of Experts reports are serving their intended purpose
Communication strategy	To identify ways to increase CFS outreach, in particular, focusing on enhancing the awareness of CFS products and multi-stakeholder models at the regional and national levels
Delivery	To assess if CFS is delivering efficiently, taking full account of the views of CFS members and other key stakeholders on the products and services they require and receive, on their quality, their relevance and potential impact
Utilisation of CFS products	To assess what factors are contributing or hindering the utilisation of CFS products and services, particularly at the regional and national levels

⁴ CFS Multi-Year Programme of Work for 2016-2017, Forty-Second Session, 12-15 October 2015

12. While the evaluation reflects on past performance, examining CFS's strengths and weaknesses and its comparative advantages, it is also required to be forward-looking. The evaluation is expected to emphasize recommendations that will assist CFS in better responding to future challenges in the global environment, including new and emerging FSN issues and needs, positioning CFS to build on its strengths and comparative advantages.

2 Evaluation methodology and approach

2.1 Overview

13. The main aim of the evaluation is to determine whether the reforms that have been introduced, together with the previously existing mechanisms, are the most appropriate to accomplish the Overall Objective and Outcomes of the CFS to address relevant food security and nutrition priorities at global, regional and national levels. The Evaluation will emphasize the effectiveness and coordination among all CFS structures, namely: the Bureau, The Secretariat, the Regional Groups, the High Level Panel of Experts (HLPE), the Open ended Working Groups, the Civil Society Mechanism, the Private Sector Mechanism, as well the Rome Based Agencies (FAO, IFAD, WFP), other UN agencies, and national partners.⁵

14. The evaluation will adopt a mixed methods approach and follows a series of pre-determined steps to collect qualitative and quantitative data including: a) A scoping mission to the CFS Headquarters in Rome; b) Desk review of relevant CFS documents; c) Interviews of key informants and focus group sessions; d) use of survey data; and e) fieldwork including selective country visits. The analysis of the data and information collected will be reflected in the report of the evaluation.

15. The evaluation is required to comply with UNEG Standards and Norms for Evaluation, and so must be credible, based on evidence. This is an independent evaluation and the Evaluation Team has the flexibility to define the details of the evaluation. The Evaluation Team will adopt a consultative approach within the parameters of independence, as it is important that the CFS Bureau has ownership of the evaluation and uses the results of the evaluation.

2.2 Evaluation criteria and evaluation questions

16. The evaluation will use the criteria of **relevance**, **efficiency** and **effectiveness** defined by the OECD-DAC⁶: *Relevance*: The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners' and donors' policies. *Efficiency*: A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results. *Effectiveness*: The extent to which the development intervention's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance. The evaluation will also be guided by the OECD-DAC evaluation principles of impartiality and

⁵ For CFS structure, collaboration and activities see <http://www.fao.org/cfs/cfs-home/activities/en/>

⁶ OECD. Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management. 2010. The evaluation criteria are derived from the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) from: Glossary of Key Terms In Evaluation and Results Based Management. Available at: <http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/2754804.pdf>.

independence, credibility and usefulness of evaluations⁷. The Evaluation Team places an emphasis on the usefulness of the evaluation, through formulating findings that are relevant to the CFS Bureau and stakeholders.

17. To facilitate the evaluation, the evaluation aim and purposes, and key evaluation questions are organised into a conceptual framework as shown below. A set of sub-questions, to serve as data collection points, is shown in the evaluation matrix in Annex A.

<p>Aim of evaluation: <i>The main aim of the evaluation is to determine whether the reforms that have been put in place, together with previously existing mechanisms, are the most appropriate to accomplish the Overall Objective and Outcomes of the CFS to address relevant food security and nutrition priorities at global, regional and national levels.</i></p>	
Purpose	Key evaluation questions
<p>Purpose 1: To verify that the reform led to the intended outcomes</p> <p>This covers relevance and effectiveness: <i>did the reforms work?</i></p>	<p>1.1 To what extent has the reformed CFS enhanced global coordination of food security and nutrition questions?</p> <p>1.2 To what extent has the reformed CFS improved policy convergence on key food security and nutrition issues?</p> <p>1.3 To what extent has the reformed CFS strengthened national and regional food security and nutrition actions?</p>
<p>Purpose 2: To describe the elements & processes of the reforms that are contributing to the outcomes</p> <p>Note: This covers relevance, effectiveness and efficiency: <i>how is the reformed CFS functioning?</i></p>	<p>2.1 To what extent do the six roles, working arrangements, management systems, and structures contribute to the outcomes?</p> <p>2.2 To what extent do strategies, tools, products, and recommendations contribute to the outcomes?</p> <p>2.3 To what extent are the stakeholder platforms, interactions, structures contribute to the outcomes?</p> <p>2.4 What unexpected outcomes & dynamics have emerged from the new roles and structures?</p>
<p>Purpose 3: To generate lessons on the multi-stakeholder collaboration model (for possible replication of the platform model among member agencies)</p> <p>Note: This covers effectiveness and efficiency with regards to collaboration; <i>is the collaboration approach worth replicating?</i></p>	<p>3.1 To what extent has the multi-stakeholder platform engaged a diversity of voices in policy-making?</p> <p>3.2 To what extent are gender and youth interests, as well as the interests of indigenous peoples and marginalised populations integrated?</p> <p>3.3 What are the assumptions, factors, and conditions necessary for the platform to function effectively?</p>

⁷ OECD-DAC, Principles for Evaluation of Development Effectiveness, 1991

18. The CFS does not have a Results Framework that specifies the outputs and indicators. However, the nature of the work of the CFS involves complicated and complex processes of policy-making at the global level and with uncertain outcomes. For this reason the Evaluation Team will seek to make explicit the **'Theory of Change'** underlying the work of the CFS. A theory of change, put simply, is a process of defining the pathways to achieving the longer-term goal or ultimate outcome of a programme or intervention. The theory of change will assist the Evaluation Team in contextualising the activities and outputs of the CFS and analysing the data collected on these. It will also assist readers of the evaluation report in assimilating the results of the evaluation.

2.3 Scoping mission

19. The Evaluation Manager conducted a scoping mission to the Headquarters of the Rome-Based Agencies (RBAs) from 26 May to 3 June 2016. The specific objective of the mission was to meet the CFS Bureau Members, the structures of the CFS, and the Rome-Based Agencies (RBAs) to obtain information on the following:

- (i) Their role and functions in the CFS;
- (ii) Their views on specific issues they wanted the evaluation to focus on;
- (iii) Any information (documents, reports, etc.) that they thought might be of value to the evaluation team; and
- (iv) Suggestions for key informants for the evaluation

20. The Evaluation Manager met with the CFS Chair, Amira Gornass; Former CFS Chairperson: Gerda Verburg; Former CFS Chair: Yaya Olanarin; Kostas Stamoulis (on behalf of Director-General); CFS Secretariat – Secretary and Secretariat staff; HLPE Chair and Vice-Chair (Skype) and Secretariat; Bureau Members/Regional Groups: All regional groups; Chairs of 6 Open-Ended Working Groups; Civil Society Mechanism Secretariat; World Farmers' Organization; Private Sector Mechanism (Skype discussion); Evaluation offices of FAO, IFAD and WFP; Programme officials from FAO, IFAD and WFP (including those involved in the CFS Advisory Group); High Level Task Force: David Nabarro (telephone discussion); Representative from the UN Standing Committee on Nutrition; and Dr Branca, Director: Nutrition, WHO (telephone discussion). The full list of persons consulted during the scoping mission is shown in Annex D.

21. The informal debriefing session held at the end of the scoping mission gave an overview of the key issues raised by key informants, for exploration in the evaluation.

2.4 Evaluation activities

22. The evaluation will draw on qualitative and quantitative information from a range of sources. As the subject matter of the evaluation is in the area of institutional reform and policy development at the intergovernmental level, the emphasis will be on qualitative information.

Document review

23. The Evaluation Team will review a large number of documents and reports, published and unpublished. Some of the key documents to be reviewed include the proceedings and reports of the CFS Plenary, reports of the HLPE, MYPoW documents, and other reports that emanate from the CFS structures. Special attention will be given to reviewing the various products of the CFS, for example, the Voluntary Guidelines on Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land (VGGT). The Evaluation Team will review documents from sources other than the CFS, for example, strategy and programme documents of the Rome-Based Agencies, and past evaluations conducted on the work and structures

of the CFS and related topics. An electronic document repository has been established for all Evaluation Team members to access and to upload additional documents.

Key informant interviews and Small Group discussions

24. The semi-structured interviews of key informants will be a major source of information for the Evaluation Team. Key informants will be identified through a “snow-ball chain” approach of contacts and references from various sources. A detailed mapping of stakeholders will be prepared. Most of the interviews will be face-to-face at headquarters in Rome, and in the sample of countries selected for field visits. The Evaluation Team will conduct the remaining interviews by Skype or telephone. The information collected through the interviews will be confidential and only for use by the Evaluation Team. Nonetheless, informed consent will be sought from the interviewees to reproduce statements or parts of the interview. No information will be disclosed that will enable it to be traced back to the source.

25. Interview protocols/guides will be developed for the interviews to ensure consistency in application across the Evaluation Team. The interview guides will be based on the main evaluation questions. Different categories of stakeholders will have questions that are specific to them, in addition to a set of common questions for all stakeholders. Interviewers will have the flexibility to include supplementary questions or skip questions, depending on the interviewee. On average, an interview is expected to last 60-90 minutes. Interviews may be recorded, subject to the informed consent of the interviewee. On the completion of each interview, the Evaluation Team member will be required to prepare notes on the interview, based on an agreed template. This will facilitate the analysis of the interview data at a later stage. Sensitive interviewing (Patton 2003) informal and conversational is a central strategy to collect meaningful data. There are several key components to take into account such as sensitive listening and questioning, judging responses, recording interviews sessions (when permission is granted) and finally conducting a self-critical review.

26. The Evaluation Team will also use small group discussions or focus group discussions, where appropriate. These discussions are particularly useful as a means of soliciting diverse views within stakeholder groups. This method of data collection tends to be also helpful to interpret the meaning generated along with other tools for data collection.

Survey

27. The CFS conducted an effectiveness survey in 2015 with assessment criteria that are pertinent to the evaluation: Relevance of CFS; Inclusiveness and Participation; Coordination and Engagement; Promotion of Policy Convergence; Evidence-based decision-making; CFS Communication Strategy; CFS Responsiveness; CFS Influence; and Capacity for uptake. As the survey is recent and covers most aspects of relevance to the evaluation, the team proposes to use the raw data of the survey and summarise the emerging findings. This information can be presented to key stakeholders to confirm assumption and/or to find divergent aspects or points of view that will help to further analyse and interpret the findings.

Country visits

28. There are 137 Members of the CFS from 7 regions. The Evaluation Concept Note requires the team to conduct 5 missions, visiting at least one CFS Member Country per selected region and to give

priority to countries where regional or sub-regional institutions/entities addressing food security and nutrition are based. From the discussions during the scoping mission and reviewing the available documents, the Evaluation Team decided that visiting at least one country in each of the 7 CFS regions would provide a wider range of perspectives. A list of countries considered is shown in Annex E. From this list, the Evaluation Team identified a sample of countries in Table 2, based on the following criteria:

- (i) Presence of one or more RBAs
- (ii) FSN Status of the country
- (iii) Use/application of CFS products
- (iv) Total value of RBA portfolio in country
- (v) Estimated cost of the mission

Table 2: Sample of countries for visits

Region	Country
Africa	Senegal, Uganda
Asia	Philippines
Europe	France
Latin America & Caribbean	Panama, Trinidad & Tobago
Near East	Jordan
North America	United States of America
South West Pacific	Fiji

29. Table 3 shows the potential interviewees at country level. All efforts would be made to include stakeholders who have been directly involved in the policy process in any given country. Where appropriate, group discussions will be conducted. In order to keep within the available budget, all interviews and group discussions will be held in the capitals of the selected countries.

Table 3: Potential interviewees at country level

Category	Potential interviewees
Government	Office of Prime Minister/President, Ministries of Agriculture, Forestry, Fisheries, Foreign Affairs, Health, Trade & Industry, Commerce, Women's Ministry or Office
United Nations	Resident Coordinator, Country offices of FAO, WFP, IFAD, WHO, other UN agencies resident in country
Civil society	Civil society organizations involved in Food Security & Nutrition, including the constituencies of the CSM
Academia and Research Centres	Universities, National Agricultural Research Institutions (NARS), CGIAR
Private Sector	Business enterprises, Industry and other private-public partnerships (PPP), cooperatives, farmer/producer organisations.

Development cooperation partners	Bi-lateral and multi-lateral development cooperation partners at country level (e.g. World Bank, EU, regional banks, bilateral donors)
----------------------------------	--

Data analysis

30. In reviewing the various documents that include reports and literature, the Evaluation Team will identify themes, guided by the main evaluation questions and sub-questions. The document review will also serve as a source of triangulation of data from other sources, namely, the semi-structured interviews and country visits.

31. The qualitative data collected through semi-structured interviews will be fed into a matrix that will allow identification of common themes and divergent ones. The matrix will convey the information collected through the questionnaires by group of stakeholders and the CFS various bodies. The Evaluation Team will also use case stories/studies that illustrate '*moments of truth*'; in the form of an actual change in policy with connection to CSF products, services, or advice. This information would help illustrate different stages facilitating the creation of categories and sub-categories to make data analysis manageable. Vignettes can be also utilized to make categories more explicit and illustrative.

32. The Evaluation Team will analyse the raw data from the 2015 Effectiveness Survey, running different analyses of both the quantitative and qualitative data. The intention is not to duplicate what already exists, but rather to drill deeper into those aspects that are most pertinent to the evaluation.

33. Validity will be pursued at all levels, and the triangulation of the information collected through various methodological tools. The data analysis done by each team member will be subjected to scrutiny by the rest of the team. The Evaluation Team will also convene a session with the Bureau and selected stakeholders to test the emerging findings.

2.5 Limitations and mitigation strategies

34. The recruitment of the Evaluation Team, including the Evaluation Manager took longer than originally envisaged in the Evaluation Concept Note. To minimise further delays, the Evaluation Manager undertook the scoping mission prior to the recruitment of the other members of the Evaluation Team. The Evaluation Team members therefore do not have the benefit of the exposure to the CFS structures and Rome-Based Agencies and the issues discussed during the scoping mission. Every effort will be made to orientate the team to the work of the CFS and the issues raised during the scoping mission.

35. Time is a constraint that will have to be considered. As many individuals at headquarters will be away from mid-July to end August, interviews at headquarters will have to be conducted between mid-September to mid-October. Time, as well as the budget will place a limitation on the number of countries that can be visited. The Evaluation Team will visit at least 7 countries (one per region). As there is considerable diversity amongst countries for the same region, it will be difficult to identify a country that is representative of a particular region. The Evaluation Team will use the opportunity presented by the CFS October Plenary to interview delegates attending the Plenary, should they be available. This will provide the team with perspectives from those countries that could not be visited.

36. There has been a considerable delay in starting the evaluation. The Evaluation Concept Note envisaged that the Evaluation Manager and the Quality Assurance Advisor would be appointed by end

November 2015 and that the final evaluation report submitted by end November 2016. These appointments however, were only made in May 2016 and June 2016, respectively. Further delays were experienced in recruiting the remaining team members. It is not feasible to complete the evaluation by the original end-date and still ensure a quality product. The timeframe for the evaluation has therefore been extended. While the Evaluation Team will work to ensure that the evaluation is completed within the revised timeframe, it is contingent on the cooperation and support from the CFS Bureau, Advisory Group, CFS Secretariat, and the Rome-Based Agencies.

3 Managing the evaluation

3.1 Evaluation team

37. A team of five, seasoned programme evaluators includes the Evaluation Manager, the Quality Assurance Advisor, the Evaluation Team Leader, Thematic Experts in areas of Nutrition and Public Policy and a Research Assistant. The main areas of expertise include knowledge of evaluation and implementation procedures (assessment, data collection and analysis), nutrition and food security, public policy and private sector engagement, high-level expertise and experience in food systems value chains; gender and empowerment issues that pertain to food security. The team profile is shown in Annex B.

3.2 Quality assurance

38. The following are built into the evaluation process to assure the quality of the evaluation process and the evaluation reports:

- (i) A Quality Assurance Adviser has been appointed to review the inception report, data collection instruments, data analysis, the draft report and the final report. The Quality Assurance Adviser is a credentialed evaluator with experience in evaluating complex development programmes.
- (ii) Where appropriate, the Evaluation Team will consult the Evaluation Offices of the Rome-Based Agencies on methodological issues without undermining the independence of the evaluation.
- (iii) The Evaluation Team will share its initial impressions and observations with the Bureau and selected stakeholders to avoid surprises in the final report.
- (iv) The draft evaluation report will be circulated to the Bureau and selected stakeholders for comments, emphasising the importance of receiving their timely feedback on the future use of the findings and recommendations. Comments on which would be the top priority recommendations, and the conditions or steps/procedures that need to be flagged to ensure that recommendations are on the relevant meeting agendas for example, will be sought to improve the utilisation of the evaluation. All comments will be logged and considered. As this is an independent evaluation, the Evaluation Team will make the final decision on the contents of the report.

3.3 Role of CFS and stakeholders

39. The **CFS Bureau** is the commissioning body of the evaluation. The Evaluation Manager reports to the CFS Bureau and is required to provide periodic updates to the Bureau and the Advisory Group. The CFS Bureau is responsible for preparing the response to the findings of the evaluation, following consultation with the Advisory Group, and with the support of the CFS Secretariat.

40. The **CFS Secretariat** is responsible for providing administrative and logistic support for the evaluation, and for facilitating the Evaluation Team's access to relevant documents and individuals. The Evaluation Team will also approach other structures of the CFS and **CFS stakeholders** to identify relevant information and contacts for the evaluation.

41. The **Offices of Evaluation of the Rome-Based Agencies** supported the CFS Bureau in developing the Terms of Reference of the Evaluation Manager and the Quality Assurance Advisor, and also advised on their recruitment. These offices will provide advice to the Evaluation Manager in addressing issues pertaining to the independence of the evaluation.

42. The **Rome-Based Agencies**, through their representatives on the CFS Advisory Board, will also be approached to facilitate the Evaluation Team's access to documents and country/regional offices that have been identified for country missions.

3.4 Independence of evaluation

43. The CFS Bureau determined that the evaluation be an **independent** one, meaning that the Evaluation Team should be impartial and free from undue pressure throughout the evaluation process. Independence is necessary for the credibility of the evaluation. UNEG's Norm 4: Independence requires evaluators to have complete freedom to design, conduct, and report on the evaluation without fear or favour, and to report directly to the organisation's governing body.⁸ In keeping with UNEG's Norms, the Evaluation Team has taken the following measures to ensure independence of the evaluation:

- (i) The Evaluation Team has full discretion in the design of the evaluation. While it takes on board comments and suggestions from the Bureau and Advisory Group, and the evaluation offices of the RBAs, the final decision on the design of the evaluation rests with the Evaluation Team.
- (ii) The Evaluation Team has the authority to communicate directly with key informants and stakeholders. The Chair of the CFS has issued a letter of introduction to facilitate the communication with key informants and stakeholders. The RBAs similarly will facilitate the initial contact between the Evaluation Team and their offices at headquarters, regional and country levels.
- (iii) The Evaluation Team has set up a separate electronic repository and email facility, so that the evaluation documents and communication is independent of the CFS Secretariat.
- (iv) The Evaluation Team reports directly to the Chair and the Bureau of the CFS. It will route documents via the Secretariat as the unit responsible for the distribution of documents for the Bureau and other CFS structures. The role of the Secretariat is to distribute the documents and not to review or approve the documents.

3.5 Timetable for the evaluation

44. Table 4 shows the timetable for the evaluation, with the key deliverables and dates. The timetable has been revised following comments from the Bureau and Advisory Group on the draft

⁸ United Nations Evaluation Group, Norms and Standards for Evaluation, June 2016, www.unevaluation.org/document/download/2601

inception report. The timetable was revised to accommodate delays in the appointment of the Evaluation Team, and the long lead-time required to arrange the missions to the sample of countries.

It should be noted that the last country mission must be completed by 18 November 2016 to provide sufficient time for thorough data analysis. It is therefore imperative the CFS Members of the selected countries and the country offices of the RBAs provide the Evaluation Team with all the support required for completing the country missions within the timeframe set out in this inception report.

Table 4: Evaluation Timetable

Deliverable/Activity	Time Frame
Inception mission conducted by Evaluation Manager	25 May-3 June 2016
Recruitment of Evaluation Team	June/July 2016
Inception report quality assured and consulted with CFS Bureau and Advisory Group	End July 2016
Updated inception report submitted to CFS Bureau and Advisory Group	End August 2016
Conduct document review	July/August 2016
Data collection (skype/telephone interviews, country missions)	September 2016
Mission to Rome for data collection and attendance at CFS Plenary Report progress to CFS Plenary	10-23 October 2016 21 October 2016
Data collection continued (skype/telephone interviews, country missions)	24 October to 18 November 2016
Complete data analysis	21 – 25 November 2016
Workshop with Bureau and Advisory Group on preliminary findings and areas of recommendation	29 November 2016
Prepare first draft report and submit to Quality Assurance Advisor	December/mid January 2017
First draft report submitted to Bureau and Advisory Group and major stakeholders for comment	31 January 2017
Second draft submitted to Bureau and Advisory Group for comment	28 February 2017
Final evaluation report quality assured and submitted to CFS Bureau for translation	31 March 2017

3.6 Evaluation report

45. The final evaluation report will be a maximum of 30 pages excluding the annexes. It will include an executive summary that will serve as a stand-alone document. Prior to preparing the report, the Evaluation Team will convene a workshop with the Bureau and key stakeholders to share emerging findings and areas of recommendation. The Evaluation Team will circulate a brief paper on these emerging findings, to serve as the basis for the workshop discussion. The comments from the workshop will be incorporated into the draft report. The first draft report will be quality assured and submitted to the Bureau and Advisory Group, as well as major stakeholders that have provided information. The draft will be revised and the second draft will be submitted to the Bureau and Advisory Group for comment. Once all comments have been considered, the report will be finalised and submitted to the Bureau for translation. **Due to budgetary constraints, only the final report will be translated into the CFS languages.**

46. A brief description of the contents of the evaluation report is shown in Table 5. This is an indicative description that will be refined as the data collection and analysis proceed.

Table 5: Indicative outline of evaluation report

Section of report	Description
Executive Summary	This section provides a summary of the evaluation purpose, methodology, key findings, conclusions and recommendations.
1. Introduction	Provides the background and purpose of the evaluation, the methodology and approach used in the evaluation.
2. CFS and its context	This section discusses the global context of Food Security & Nutrition and locates the CFS within this context. It is largely descriptive but includes analytical information. The areas to be covered include, for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - State of FSN (issues, data) - Brief history of CFS and its reform - Current roles and structures of CFS - CFS in the global architecture for FSN
3. Key Findings	The findings of the evaluation will be discussed at two levels. First, findings will be presented in response to the key evaluation questions. The findings will then be consolidated around the evaluation criteria of effectiveness, relevance, and efficiency.
4. Conclusions and Recommendations	<p><i>Conclusions:</i> Conclusions will seek to draw the implications of findings for the CFS. The report will also highlight lessons learned.</p> <p><i>Recommendations:</i> Recommendations will be few, essential and prioritised. They will focus on strategic issues and where appropriate, operational issues. They will not be overly prescriptive, but will contain sufficient detail to facilitate their operationalisation.</p>
Annexes	Annexes will be kept to a minimum for cost-effectiveness. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annex A: Terms of reference for evaluation Annex B: Documents consulted

	Annex C: Persons/institutions consulted
	Annex D: Information from Effectiveness Survey and country cases

3.7 Evaluation budget

47. The estimated cost for the evaluation as set out in the Evaluation Concept Note was USD450,305, including project service costs. However, the final available budget for the evaluation is USD413,000, including project service costs. The evaluation budget was revised to align with the reduction in the available budget as shown in Table 6. The following should be noted:

- a) The budget makes provision for missions to 9 countries. However, as travel costs fluctuate, it may be necessary to reduce the number of countries visited. The Evaluation Team will however aim to visit at least one country per CFS region to ensure that all regions are included.
- b) The translation cost is based on a report of 70 pages including the annexes, to be translated into CFS official languages, and remains the same as the amount stated in the Evaluation Concept Note. The budget is sufficient to cover the translation of the final report only.

Table 6: Evaluation budget

Original Budget		Current estimate	
Evaluation Team – Evaluation Manager – Evaluation Team Leader – Thematic Experts X 2 – Quality Assurance Advisor – Research Assistant	210 000	Evaluation Team - Evaluation Manager - Evaluation Team Leader - Thematic Experts X 2 - Quality Assurance Advisor - Research Assistant	180 792
Travel/DSAs – Evaluation Manager and Team Leader (3 missions to Rome) – Thematic Experts (5 missions to selected countries/regions)	81 000	Travel/DSAs - Evaluation Manager (3 missions to Rome including inception mission) - Team Leader (2 missions to Rome) - 1 Thematic Expert (2 missions to Rome) - Country/region missions by team (1 team member per mission) X 9 countries	79 676
Translation costs	107 500	Translation costs	107 500
Total	398 500	Total	367 968
Project Service Costs (13%)	51 805	Project Service Costs (13%)	45 032
Grand Total	450 305	Grand Total	413 000

Annex A: Evaluation matrix

The main aim of the evaluation is to determine whether the reforms that have been put in place – together with previously existing mechanisms - are the most appropriate to accomplish the Overall Objective and Outcomes of the CFS to address relevant food security and nutrition priorities at global, regional and national levels.

The evaluation will use the criteria of **relevance, efficiency, effectiveness**, also taking into account **sustainability and impact**

PURPOSE 1: to verify that the reform led to the intended outcomes

Note: This covers **Relevance** and **Effectiveness**: *Did the reforms work?*

Key Evaluation Questions	Evidence needed	Sources	Data collection
1.1 To what extent has the reformed CFS <i>enhanced global coordination of food security and nutrition questions?</i>	Coordination examples within the CFS realm, but its partners, by member governments Narratives about how the coordination may have contributed reformed CFS strategies /actions /products	Reports on coordination Key stakeholders involved in coordination	Theory of Change diagrams (using a gradient of outcomes as in Outcome Mapping) Most significant change stories
1.2 To what extent has the reformed CFS <i>improved policy convergence on key food security and nutrition issues?</i>	Policy convergence examples; variations; linkages to CFS strategies/ actions/products	Reports on convergence Key stakeholders involved in convergence	Documentation review Interviews
1.3 To what extent has the reformed CFS <i>strengthened national and regional food security and nutrition actions?</i>	Examples of national and regional actions; linkages to CFS strategies / actions/ products	Reports on actions Key stakeholders implementing the actions	Focus groups

Possible data collection questions:

- To what extent is the CFS fulfilling its mandate set out in the 2009 reforms?
- How relevant is the mandate of the reformed CFS in the current context?
- To what extent does the CFS address relevant FSN priorities at the global, regional and national levels?

- How effective has the CFS been in promoting policy convergence and coherence in FSN, horizontally (among countries, organisations, stakeholders, etc.) and vertically (from local level to global level)?

PURPOSE 2: To describe the elements and processes of the reforms that contribute to the outcomes

Note: This covers **relevance and effectiveness**: *How is the reformed CFS functioning?*

Key Evaluation Questions	Evidence needed	Sources	Data collection
2.1 To what extent do the six roles, working arrangements, management systems, and structures contribute to the outcomes?	Summary of original vs. reformed (6) roles, systems, structures and procedures Theory of change linking these to the outcomes (assumptions and conditions necessary)	Administrators in lead agencies Stakeholders representing the different groups, committees, etc. 2015 Survey findings	Theory of Change diagrams (using a gradient of outcomes as in Outcome Mapping) Most significant change stories
2.2 To what extent do strategies, tools, products, recommendations contribute to the outcomes?	Summary of main tools, products, publications, strategies. Theory of change linking these to the outcomes (assumptions and conditions necessary)	As above	Documentation review Interviews
2.3 To what extent do the stakeholder platforms, interactions, and structures contribute to the outcomes?	Summary of the platforms. As above with emphasis on platforms and interaction events/practices	As above	Focus groups Narratives explaining select 2015 Survey findings
2.4 What unexpected outcomes & dynamics have emerged from the six roles and structures?	Narratives about emergent changes that were not foreseen	As above	

Possible data collection questions:

- How effective is the CFS in each of its six roles? What achievements are evident in each of these roles? What constraints are there in performing these roles effectively?
- How relevant are the CFS's strategies, policy products and recommendations in addressing Food Security & Nutrition Priorities at global, regional and national levels?

- To what extent are the products (guidelines, tools, knowledge products, recommendations) used as evidence to inform policies, programmes and strategies of, for example, Member States, the UN system, civil society, and the private sector?
- To what extent are the reports of the HLPE used to inform policy-making in Food Security & Nutrition?
- How efficient and effective is CFS in communicating its products at the global, regional and national levels to diverse stakeholders?
- How efficient and effective are the organization and management of the CFS?

PURPOSE 3: To generate lessons on multi-stakeholder collaboration model (for possible replication of the platform model among member agencies)

Note: This covers **effectiveness and efficiency** with regards to collaboration: *Is the collaboration approach worth replicating?*

Key Evaluation Questions	Evidence needed	Sources	Data collection
3.1 To what extent has the multi-stakeholder platform engaged a diversity of voices in policy-making?	List of stakeholders before the reforms, and now; Comments from the stakeholders on the extent to which their voice is heard (or who has been excluded)	Stakeholders that can be interviewed Documentation (stakeholder analyses)	Documentation review Interviews
3.2 To what extent are gender and youth interests, as well as the interests of indigenous peoples and marginalised populations integrated?	As above.	As above	Focus groups Most significant change stories
3.3 What are the assumptions, factors, and conditions necessary for the platform to function?	Narratives by stakeholders based on sample events, processes	As above	

Possible data collection questions:

- How effective is the CFS as a multi-stakeholder platform in providing inclusive participation and a diversity of voices in policy-making on matters of Food Security & Nutrition?
- How has the CFS incorporated gender equality and empowerment of women in its work?
- To what extent does the CFS consider youth in its agenda?
- To what extent does the CFS reflect the interests of indigenous peoples and marginalised groups in its agenda?

Annex B: Profile of Evaluation Team

Evaluation Manager: *Angela Bester, Master of Business Administration, University of Technology, Sydney, Australia; Master of Art (Sociology), University of New South Wales, Australia; Bachelor of Social Science (Honours), University of Cape Town, South Africa*

Angela is a public sector expert who has worked in the public sector in South Africa and Australia for over 20 years. Her public service career began in Australia where she spent many years in the NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics & Research and in the NSW Premier's Department. During this period Angela developed skills in research, evaluation and conducting program and strategic reviews. Angela has since served as Director-General of the National Department of Social Development and Director-General of the Public Service Commission (South Africa); and Governance Adviser for Department for International Development (DFID). Between 2006 and 2011, Angela was a Director at Deloitte & Touché (Southern Africa) where she led major public sector consulting assignments. She has since established herself as an independent consultant.

Angela has managed and conducted evaluations for the South African Government and the United Nations, as well as for international development agencies. Examples of her work include the Review of Independent System-Wide Evaluation in the United Nations system; Evaluation of UNDP Global Programme IV; Evaluation of UNDP Regional Programme for Africa; and UNDP Country Evaluations in Nepal and Ghana. Angela has a good knowledge of Swaziland and conducted the Mid-Term Evaluation of the Swaziland UNDAF 2011-2015, and also supported the Swaziland United Nations Country Team with the development of the UNDAF 2016-2020.

Evaluation Team Leader: *Patricia Biermayr-Jenzano, PhD, Master of Science, Agricultural Extension and Social Anthropology; Cornell University; Agricultural Engineer, Buenos Aires, Argentina*

Dr. Patricia Biermayr-Jenzano is a social scientist and gender specialist who has conducted Program evaluation, ethnographic research and gender analysis in relation to the feminization of agriculture in Latin America, Africa and Southeast Asia. She holds a PhD/MS in Adult Education (Agricultural Extension) and Social Anthropology (Gender) from Cornell University, NY and an Agricultural Engineering degree from Buenos Aires, Argentina. She has conducted evaluation tasks for the FAO Office of Evaluation (OED) and the Regional Office in Santiago, Chile, performing as a Team Leader for the Country Program Evaluation of Trinidad and Tobago, Guyana and the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States and Barbados. She conducted gender analysis of value chains for the International Center of Agriculture in the Dry Areas (ICARDA) based in Jordan, analysed gender and health impacts of GMOs adoption for the Program of Biosafety Systems (PBS) at the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) and other CGIAR Centers. Her research and applied work has deep roots in Qualitative and Participatory Action Research, theory and practice while she has been heavily involved mainstreaming gender in agriculture and conservation efforts.

Earlier, Patricia worked as a Regional Program Coordinator for FAO based in San Jose, Costa Rica and as the Program Leader of the Participatory Research and Gender Analysis Program at the International Center for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT) in Cali, Colombia. In the USA, she worked for Cornell University and studied how ethnicity, race and gender determine ways in which women and Indigenous Peoples conserve biodiversity and natural resources. She has also performed as a Population-Environment Fellow at the University of Michigan, Center for Population Studies. Currently, she is an independent consultant for the FAO, IFAD and the UN System and a Visiting Adjunct Professor at the Center for Latin America Studies and the Women and Gender Studies Program at Georgetown University in Washington DC.

Thematic Expert (Public Policy): *Ronald M. Gordon: PhD-Food and Resource Economics, University of Florida; MS-International Agricultural Development, University of California: Davis; MBA- University of Massachusetts-Amherst; MS- Food Science – University of Massachusetts: Amherst.*

Dr. Ronald M. Gordon is a food and resource economist with comprehensive economic and analytical skills as well as an extensive experience, suitable for contribution to improving the policy and institutional environment for food security enhancement, economic development, agriculture and trade within the Americas, the Caribbean, and developing countries globally.

The scope of his experience encompasses in-depth knowledge and understanding of public policy development and implementation processes, anchored upon decades of experience in the Caribbean that afforded him insight into the challenges of governmental and inter-governmental arrangements. He has also benefitted from strong interfacing with agricultural communities in Latin America and Asia as well as interactions with international and national agencies, civil society bodies and private sector associations, on issues pertaining to agricultural policy formulation and implementation. More recently, in 2015, he participated as a Volunteer collaborating with the Secretariat of Social Works of the First Lady (SOSEP) on the enhancement of Rural Enterprise Development focused on Improving the Productivity, Competitiveness and Market Access of Micro, Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises (MSMEs) in Guatemala, the majority of which were female owned.

Dr. Gordon's publications include: *Governance Beyond the State: Non-State actors and food systems*, In John Ingram, et al., eds. Food Security and Global Environmental Change. (2010) Earthscan, London, UK, with Schilpzand, R., et al; *Policy responses to GEC impacts on food availability and affordability in the Caribbean Community*, in Environmental Science & Policy, (2009) Volume 12 (4):529-541, with Trotman et al; and *Socioeconomic Determinants of Infant and Childhood Mortality in Haiti*, in Journal of Eastern Caribbean Studies. (2009) Volume 34 (1):1-19.

His other relevant project experience included: An Analysis of the U.S. Market for Organic and Fair Trade Bananas from the Dominican Republic (D.R.); The Enhancement of Food Security in the Caribbean through Increased Domestic Supply and Consumption of Domestically Produced Food; and The Conduct of a multi-country study that recommended targeted policies and strategies for the enhancement of food security in the Caribbean through the increased domestic supply and consumption of domestically produced food. This involved analyses of: consumer demand, production and marketing issues, and institutional and support arrangements.

Thematic Expert (Nutrition): *Meenakshi Fernandes, PhD, Pardee RAND Graduate School, USA; B.A. Economics, University of Chicago.*

Meenakshi (Meena) Fernandes is a researcher with a specialisation in food and nutrition policy. Since 2014, Meenakshi Fernandes has been a Senior Research Advisor for the Partnership for Child Development, based at Imperial College London. In her role she undertakes research to promote the design of effective and efficient nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive interventions that leverage schools as a platform primarily in countries in sub-Saharan Africa. Between 2012 and 2014, she was a Senior Consultant at the UN World Food Programme, based in Rome, Italy, where she provided strategic inputs into the Revised School Feeding Policy and was the writer for the organization's Annual Performance Report in 2014. From 2010 to 2012, she was a Senior Analyst at Abt Associates, based in Cambridge, MA (USA), where she worked on several rigorous evaluations of nutrition programs in the United States. Her work is reflected in a strong track record of publications in peer-reviewed journals.

Quality Assurance Advisor: *Ricardo Ramirez, PhD, University of Guelph, Canada; Master of Adult Education, St Francis Xavier University, Canada; B.Sc. Agriculture, Crop Science, University of Guelph, Canada*

For the past 18 years, Ricardo Ramirez has been registered as an independent researcher and consultant. He collaborates with other consulting teams in Ontario and internationally. He was Associate Professor in Capacity Development and Extension for two years with the School of Environmental Design and Rural Development, University of Guelph, Canada; and remains as Adjunct Professor. From 1995-97 he was the Manager of the Information and Communication Unit of ILEIA, a Netherlands-based international sustainable agriculture think-tank. From 1989 to 1995 he was a Project Officer with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN in Rome developing the communication strategies for food and agricultural programs worldwide. Between 1982 and 1989 he worked in the field with non-governmental organizations in Latin America and the Caribbean in subsistence agriculture, rural development and training projects. Ricardo Ramirez is a Credentialed Evaluator (Canadian Evaluation Association).

Research Assistant: - *Cherin Hoon, B.A Economics, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore*

Cherin Hoon has worked for the Singapore government for the past 8 years in policy and planning portfolios. From 2010-2016, she was a Senior Executive Manager with the Agri-Food and Veterinary Authority of Singapore, specializing in policy and international relations work in food security. She was Singapore's focal point for FAO, APEC Policy Partnership on Food Security and G20. Between 2008 and 2010, she was a Manager with the Ministry of Manpower of Singapore, specializing in business intelligence, policy, planning and legislation. From 2007 – 2008, she was a Research Assistant with the Nanyang Technological University of Singapore and co-published a paper on the Value of Statistical Life of Singaporeans.

Annex C: List of documents consulted

- CFS.** 2009. *Reform of the Committee on World Food Security*. Rome.
- CFS.** 2013. *CFS Multi-Year Programme of Work (MYPoW) for 2014 - 2015*. Rome.
- CFS.** 2013. *Report of the Fortieth Session of the Committee on World Food Security*. Rome.
- CFS.** 2014. *Report of the Forty-first Session of the Committee on World Food Security*. Rome.
- CFS.** 2015. *CFS Multi-Year Programme of Work (MYPoW) for 2016 - 2017*. Rome.
- CFS.** 2015. *Concept Note for Evaluation of the Effectiveness of CFS Reform*. CFS Bureau and Advisory Group Meeting 24 November 2016. Rome.
- CFS.** 2015. *Following Progress on Decisions and Recommendation of CFS*. Rome.
- CFS.** 2015. *Report of the Forty-second Session of the Committee on World Food Security*. Rome.
- CFS.** 2015. *Report on the findings of the CFS Effectiveness Survey*. Rome.
- CFS.** 2016. *Background Note on the Open-Ended Working Group on Monitoring*. Rome.
- CFS.** 2016. *CFS Approach to Policy Convergence*. CFS Bureau and Advisory Group Meeting, 31 March 2016. Rome.
- CFS.** 2016. *Draft Decision Box for Monitoring: Terms of Reference to share experiences and good practices in applying CFS decisions and recommendations through organizing events at national, regional and global levels*. Open-Ended Working Group on Monitoring Meeting #2. Rome.
- CFS.** 2016. *Draft Terms of Reference to share experiences and good practices in applying CFS decisions and recommendations through organizing events at national, regional and global levels*. Open-Ended Working Group on Monitoring Meeting #2. Rome.
- CFS.** 2016. *Farmers' Contribution to the Committee on World Food Security*. CFS Bureau and Advisory Group Meeting, 31 March 2016. Rome.
- CFS.** 2016. *Information Note on the experiences and good practices in the use and application of the VGGT*. Rome.
- CFS High-Level Panel of Experts.** 2015. *Info Note on the High-Level Panel of Experts for Food Security and Nutrition (HLPE) of the Committee on World Food Security (CFS)*. Rome.
- CFS High-Level Panel of Experts.** 2015. *Summaries and Recommendations of HLPE reports 1-9*. Rome.
- CFS High-Level Panel of Experts.** 2016. *HLPE impacts (2010 – 2015)*. 13th Meeting of the HLPE Steering Committee. USA.
- CFS High-Level Panel of Experts.** 2016. *Note to the Trust Fund Oversight Committee on HLPE impacts: Update for the year 2015*. Support to the establishment and functioning of the HLPE (HLPE Trust Fund). USA.
- FAO.** 2014. *Independent Review of FAO Governance reforms*. Rome.
- FAO.** 2016. *Evaluations in FAO*. Rome.
- FAO & WHO.** 2014. *Framework for Action*. Second International Conference on Nutrition. Rome.

FAO & WHO. 2014. *Rome Declaration on Nutrition*. Second International Conference on Nutrition. Rome.

FAO (2014) Policy Paper, Food Security and Nutrition in Small Island Developing States (SIDS).

FAO Programme Committee 116 session (November 2014): PC116/5 - Indicative Rolling Work Plan of Strategic and Programme Evaluation 2015-17. Sourced at: <http://www.fao.org/3/a-ml978e.pdf>.

FAO (2013) Policy on Gender Equality Attaining Food Security Goals in Agriculture and Rural Development.

FAO Office of Evaluation (OED) (2012) Evaluation of FAO's Role and Work in Food and Agriculture Policy.

FAO. The State of Food and Agriculture 2010-2011, Women in Agriculture, Closing the Gender Gap in Development (2011), Rome, Italy. Retrieved from <http://www.fao.org/docrep/013/i2050e/i2050e.pdf>

FAO. SOFA Team. Gender Differences in assets. Rome, Italy. (2011) Retrieved from www.fao.org/economic/esa

FAO Office of Evaluation. (2012) Evaluation of FAO's Role and Work in Food and Agriculture Policy.

FAO (2013) Policy on Gender Equality Attaining Food Security Goals in Agriculture and Rural Development.

International Agri-Food Network. 2015. *Private Sector Mechanism Position Paper on Strengthening CFS Reform Outcomes*.

International Food Security and Nutrition Civil Society Mechanism. 2015. *Civil Society Statements to CFS 42*.

International Food Security and Nutrition Civil Society Mechanism. 2015. *CSM Annual Report*.

Patton, Michael Quinn. 2003. *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.

Schiavoni, C. & Mulvany, P. 2014. *Evaluation of the CSM, Civil Society Mechanism for relations with the CFS*.

UNGA. 2016. *United Nations Decade of Action on Nutrition (2016-2025)*. New York City.

United Nation Evaluation Group (2011) Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation-Towards UNEG Guidance. New York: UNEG

United Nations Evaluation Group (2016). Norms and Standards for Evaluation. New York: UNEG

United Nations Secretary General's High-Level Task Force on World Food Security (HLPE) (2012). Food security and climate change. A Report by the High Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition of the Committee on World Food Security. Committee on World Food Security, Rome.

World Bank, 2011, World Development Report 2012. Gender Equality and Development (Washington DC).

WFP. 2015. *Annual Evaluation Report 2014*. Rome.

Annex D: List of institutions and stakeholders consulted

CFS Chairs present and past

Gornass Amira, CFS Chair (current)

Verburg Gerda, CFS Chair (2013 – 2015)

Olaniran Olaitan Y.A., CFS Chair (2011 – 2013)

Bureau & Regional Groups

Abdul Razak Ayazi, Alternate Permanent Representative, Agriculture Attaché, Afghanistan

Arnesson-Ciotti Margareta, Permanent Representative, Sweden

Bradani David, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission of Italy

Carranza Jose Antonio, Permanent Representative, Ecuador

Cohen April, Political/Economic Section Chief, Alternate Permanent Representative, USA

De Santis Lorenzo, Multilateral Policy Officer, United Kingdom

Ding Lin, First Secretary, Alternate Permanent Representative, China

Germonprez Liselot, Attache, Permanent Representative, Belgian

Halley des Fontaines Segolene, Agricultural Counsellor, Permanent Representative, France

Hooper Matthew, Deputy Permanent Representative to FAO, New Zealand

Kubota Osamu, Minister Counsellor, Deputy Permanent Representative, Japan

Mellenthin Oliver, Permanent Representative, Federal Republic of Germany

Mme Mi Nguyen, Deputy Permanent Representative, Canada

Moarani Nazarono, Permanent Representative, Argentina

Mohamad Nazrain bin Nordin, Second Secretary (Agriculture Affairs), Alternate Permanent Representative, Malaysia

Myat Kaung, Second Secretary, Alternate Permanent Representative

Nasskau Liz, Permanent Representative, United Kingdom

Navarrete Rosemary, Adviser (Agriculture), Australia

Okiru Grace, Ambassador, Uganda

Ortega Lilian, Deputy Permanent Representative, Switzerland

Rajamaki Tanja, Permanent Representative, Finland

Salim Azulita, Permanent Representative, Malaysia

San Aye Aye, Counsellor, Alternate Permanent Representative, Myanmar

Tansini Fernanda Mansur, Alternate Permanent Representative, Brazil

Trochim Jirapha Inthisang, First Secretary, Alternate Permanent Representative

Umeda Takaaki, First Secretary, Alternate Permanent Representative, Japan

Weberova Zora, Alternate Permanent Representative, Slovak Republic

Wiangwang Narumon, Counsellor (Agriculture), Deputy Permanent Representative

Xie Jian Min, Counsellor, Deputy Permanent Representative, China

Open-Ended Working Groups (OEWGs)

El-Taweel Khaled, Chair of OEWG on Nutrition

Gebremedhin Anna, Chair of OEWG on Connecting Smallholders to Markets

Md. Mafizur Rahman, Chair of OEWG on Multi-Year Programme of Work

Olthof Willem, Chair of OEWG on Sustainable Development Goals

Sabiiti Robert, Chair of OEWG on Monitoring

Tansini Fernanda Mansur, Chair of OEWG on Global Strategic Framework

CFS Participants and Observers

Anderson Robynne, Coordinator, Private Sector Mechanism

Bianchi Luca, Finance and Admin Officer, Civil Society Mechanism

Capolongo Laura, Junior Policy Officer, World Farmers' Organization

Maisano Teresa, Programme and Communications Officer, Civil Society Mechanism

Marzano de Marinis Marco, Secretary General, World Farmers' Organization

Oenema Stineke, Coordinator, UN Standing Committee on Nutrition

Volpe Luisa, Policy Officer, World Farmers' Organization

Woldpold-Bosien Martin, Coordinator, Civil Society Mechanism

High-Level Panel of Experts

Caron Patrick, HLPE Chair

Kalafatic Carol, HLPE Vice-Chair

Pingault Nathanael, Coordinator for High-Level Panel of Experts

CFS Secretariat

Cirulli Chiara, Programme Officer

Colonnelli Emilio, Food Security Officer

Fulton Deborah, CFS Secretary

Gherardelli Alessandra, CFS Social Media Presence

Hemonin Ophelie, Food Security Officer

Isoldi Fabio, Assistant to CFS Chair

Jamal Siva, Liaison Officer

Mathur Shantanu, Manager, UN RBA Partnerships

Orebi Sylvia, Clerk Typist

Salter Cordelia, Senior Technical Officer

Trine Francoise, Senior Food Security Officer

Rome-Based Agencies

Belli Luisa, Project Evaluation Coordinator, Office of Evaluation, FAO

Dowlatchahi, Mina, Deputy Director, Office of Strategy, Planning and Resource Management

Igarashi Masahiro, Director, Office of Evaluation, FAO

McGuire Mark, Senior Programme Coordinator, Strategic Programme 1 - Food Security and Nutrition, FAO

Munro-Faure Paul, Deputy Director, Partnerships, Advocacy and Capacity Development Division, FAO

Rapsomanikis, George, Senior Economist, Trade and Markets Division, FAO

Stamoulis Kostas, Assistant Director-General a.i Economic and Social Development Department, FAO, and CFS Secretary (2007 - 2014)

Tarazona Carlos, Office of Evaluation, FAO

Audinet Jean-Philippe, CFS Alternate Advisory Group Member, IFAD

Mathur Shantanu, Manager, UN RBA Partnerships Office of the Associate Vice-President Programme Management Department, IFAD

Prato Bettina, CFS Advisory Group Member, IFAD

Burrows Sally, Senior Evaluation Officer, Office of Evaluation, WFP

Omamo Steven Were, Food Systems Coordinator and Deputy Director (OSZ), Policy & Programme Division, WFP

Tamamura Mihoko, Director, Rome-based Agencies and Committee on World Food Security, WFP

Other UN bodies/Individuals

Nabarro David, High –Level Task Force on World Food Security and UN Secretary-General’s Special Adviser on the 2030 Agenda

Branca Francesco, Director Nutrition, WHO and Acting Executive Secretary of UNSNC (2015)

Wustefeld Marzella, Technical Officer, Office of the Director, Department of Nutrition for Health and Development, WHO

Annex E: List of potential countries for visit

Country	Selection Criteria for Missions					
	(i) Region Represented	(ii) Presence of RBAs	(iii) Progress towards achieving food security: FSN status* (%)	(iv) Use & application of CFS products **	(v) Cost of mission	(vi) Total value of RBAs' project portfolio (million USD)
Ethiopia	Africa	✓	32.1	✓	1904	>2587
Ghana		✓	<5	✓	4252	340.67
Morocco		✓	<5	-	3000	-
Mozambique		✓	25.3	✓	2316	453.4
Senegal		✓	10.0	✓	2324	428.01
Sudan		✓	not stated	✓	2116	1011.38
Uganda		✓	25.5	✓	2528	831.9
United Republic of Tanzania		✓	32.1	✓	1550	680.9
Zambia		✓	47.8	✓	3010	237.1
Cambodia		Asia	✓	14.2	✓	6722
India	✓		15.2	✓	5970	954.1
Malaysia	✓		<5	-	5250	-
Pakistan	✓		22.0	✓	5586	>1336.6
Philippines	✓		13.5	✓	6348	331
Thailand	✓		7.4	✓	5478	-
Denmark	Europe	✓	<5	✓	2946	-
France		✓	<5	✓	2890	-
Germany		✓	<5	✓	2542	-

Italy		✓	<5	✓	2506	-
Spain		✓	<5	✓	2378	-
Argentina	Latin America & the Caribbean	✓	<5	✓	3332	116.3
Brazil		✓	<5	✓	2156	259.7
Colombia		✓	8.8	✓	1476	136.9
Ecuador		✓	10.9	✓	2086	155.8
Guatemala		✓	15.6	✓	1668	191.6
Panama		✓	9.5	✓	2076	80.7
Trinidad and Tobago		✓	7.4	-	2598	-
Jordan		Near East	✓	<5	-	5348
Qatar	✓		not stated	-	6008	-
United States of America	North America	✓	<5	-	1000	-
Fiji	South West Pacific	✓	<5	-	7146	6.1
New Zealand		-	<5	-	8132	-

*Source/<http://www.fao.org/hunger/en>

**Information only available for VGGT