

### US input to Recommendation 10 Response (Monitoring):

- Paragraph 5 refers to monitoring as a “core function of CFS”. However, we don’t find any reference of this specific language in the Reform document (CFS 2009/2 Rev.2, par 6ii). While the United States deems monitoring an important element of any national food security policy framework, we don’t consider this function a core competence for the committee.

CFS 2009/2 Rev.2, par 6ii:

ii) Promote accountability and share best practices at all levels. 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 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.

- The United States would like to underline the voluntary nature of the monitoring exercise. Since the Reform was adopted in 2009, no country in-depth assessment has been undertaken. This should give a clear signal to CFS stakeholders that investing in the development an incremental monitoring mechanism (including the definition of common indicators) should not be a priority at the moment. As noted in paragraph 6, “the approach to monitoring should consider resource availability, cost-effectiveness and CFS added value in monitoring”. Given the current budget constraints, we don’t think CFS should invest resources in the review of the framework (Document CFS 2013/40/8) for monitoring CFS decisions and in national level monitoring.
- As noted in paragraph 7 of the response, recommendation 10 (ii) and (iii) appear to be very relevant when it comes to the CFS monitoring work. The United States would like to reiterate the crucial role of Global Thematic Events (GTEs), which now serve the monitoring function for CFS policy guidelines and recommendations. CFS can continue to serve as a useful platform for countries to share and promote best practices related to monitoring and evaluation for food security and nutrition. While we encourage the voluntary efforts of those members who are willing to share their national experiences in monitoring food security and nutrition programs and their experience using CFS products and recommendations, the development of an incremental monitoring mechanism for CFS should not be a priority.