



## Monitoring progress towards decisions and recommendations (Working Group 4)

### - Background -

The successful implementation of the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests (hereafter: Guidelines) must be embedded in activities to monitor and evaluate those efforts. In other words: monitoring and evaluation is an inherent part of implementation. It enables all stakeholders – from governments to civil society to multilateral bodies - to ensure coherence with the Guidelines, assess the concrete impact of implementation efforts, identify possible shortcomings and adjust implementation efforts if needed. Working Group 4 will discuss concrete recommendations for states, the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) and other actors on how such monitoring and evaluation activities could be shaped and supported.

### - Key aspects for monitoring and evaluation -

The Guidelines themselves already set the frame for monitoring and evaluation activities at different levels and set out six key criteria for such activities. Monitoring and evaluation should thus be ***inclusive, participatory, gender sensitive, implementable, cost-effective and sustainable*** (Guideline 26.2). These criteria as well as the key objective of the Guidelines “to improve governance of tenure of land, fisheries and forests [...] for the benefit of all, with an emphasis on vulnerable and marginalized people, with the goals of food security and progressive realization of the right to adequate food” (Guideline 1.1) should guide the discussion on concrete steps towards monitoring and evaluation.

### - First steps have been taken -

The CFS as well as national governments and civil society already have taken first steps in this direction. CFS 39 called for an “innovative mechanism” to monitor progress in the implementation of CFS related decisions and recommendations, including the Guidelines. In line with this decision, the Monitoring Open-Ended Working Group (OEWG) proposed that in October 2013 CFS 40 should include a report on the implementation of the Guidelines as well as examples/updates of existing and innovative monitoring mechanisms at country and regional level. National governments have requested support to implement the Guidelines, including action for monitoring implementation. Civil society organisations have undertaken first efforts to monitor implementation activities of their governments.

### - Three pillars for discussion -

The recommendations by the Working Group should be as focused as possible. Thus the Working Group will discuss three specific and very relevant aspects of monitoring and evaluation.



First, the Working Group will discuss the role of the CFS. As the most inclusive international and intergovernmental platform, the CFS will have a special role to play in monitoring and evaluation. This is also because the CFS adopted the Guidelines. The Guidelines already set out some aspects of the role of the CFS, including the secretariat and the advisory groups. It should be a global forum “where all relevant actors learn from each other’s experiences, and assess progress toward the implementation of these Guidelines and their relevance, effectiveness and impact.” But how can this role be specified and where is the debate today?

Second, we do not start at zero. There are already relevant activities on global, regional and national level that are worth taking a closer look at and synergies with a Guidelines monitoring could be identified. In this context the Working Group will discuss the role of existing human rights monitoring mechanisms, the Land Governance Assessment Framework and the regional African Land Policy Initiative. This look for synergies is also a matter of policy coherence.

Third, exemplified by Myanmar, the national level will be discussed. The Guidelines state clearly that “States are encouraged to set up **multi-stakeholder platforms** and frameworks [...] or use such existing platforms and frameworks [...] to monitor and evaluate the implementation in their jurisdictions; and to evaluate the impact on improved governance of tenure of land, fisheries and forests, and on improving food security and the progressive realization of the right to adequate food”. How could such a national monitoring process look like? Which role could civil society play and how could such a process be supported by the FAO and others?

#### - Recommendations for action -

Apart from exchanging experience between multiple stakeholders (governments, NGOs, social movements, multilateral institutions and others) the main aim of Working Group 4 is to elaborate concrete recommendations for action to initiate, support and/ or adjust monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of the Guidelines. Based on the three pillars discussed, working questions towards recommendations are the following:

- (1) Which role could CFS play in monitoring and evaluating the implementation of the Guidelines? Which concrete proposals for an innovative monitoring mechanism could be supported? Which new proposals can be discussed at the CFS Monitoring Open Ended Working Group? Which resources and processes are needed to make it happen?
- (2) Can we identify concrete synergies with existing processes and instruments? How could those synergies be linked to national and global (CFS) monitoring activities? How could they inform those activities? What could be possible next steps to make this happen? Who could be addressed/ requested?
- (3) For the national level, which concrete proposals for the setting up of multi-stakeholder-platforms should be made? What could be guiding terms of reference for such platforms? How could the government and civil society in their distinct role contribute to an effective monitoring by these platforms? How could this be supported by FAO and others?