



COMMITTEE ON WORLD FOOD SECURITY

Thirty-sixth Session

Rome, 11-14 and 16 October 2010

**GLOBAL STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK FOR
FOOD SECURITY AND NUTRITION
A CONCEPT NOTE**

Table of Contents

MATTERS TO BE BROUGHT TO THE ATTENTION OF CFS	Page 1
I. INTRODUCTION	Paragraphs 1 - 7
II. WHY A STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK?	8 - 11
III. PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES	12 - 13
IV. VALUE ADDED	14 - 19
A. PRIORITIZATION	15
B. PARTNERSHIP AND COORDINATION	16 - 17
C. ACCOUNTABILITY AND OWNERSHIP	18
D. RISK OF NOT HAVING A GSF	19
V. THE WAY FORWARD	20 - 23
A. PRINCIPLES TO GUIDE THE ELABORATION OF THE GSF	20
B. PROCESS	21 - 23

This document is printed in limited numbers to minimize the environmental impact of FAO's processes and contribute to climate neutrality. Delegates and observers are kindly requested to bring their copies to meetings and to avoid asking for additional copies. Most CFS meeting documents are available on the Internet at www.fao.org/cfs. Delegates will be given an electronic copy of all documents on registration.

The Committee is invited to:

Endorse that a consultative process led by the CFS Secretariat in close collaboration with the Bureau, Advisory Group and HLPE be undertaken to develop and agree to a Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition (GSF) by October 2012.

I. INTRODUCTION

1. In spite of the recognized importance of ensuring food security¹ for all, global food and nutrition security has deteriorated and continues to represent a serious challenge for a large part of the world's population. Today more than 1 billion people suffer from chronic hunger, which is alarming and unacceptably high.
2. There is no time to lose to rectify this situation. Greater efforts have to be made in order to address the underlying causes of hunger and to strengthen coherence and convergence among policies and programmes of countries, donors and other stakeholders. Duplications and gaps at all levels in the governance of food security and nutrition need to be addressed for the system to function as a coherent whole.
3. How to address this issue has been the topic of a number of forums including G8, G20, UN General Assembly, the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) and the World Summit on Food Security in 2009. In response to the global food crisis, in 2008 the UN Secretary General convened a taskforce composed of senior officials of the UN system and Bretton Woods institutions to assist the chronically hungry and the poor people of the world.
4. In November 2009, the heads of state and government convened at the World Summit on Food Security declared that the increasing level of hunger and poverty.... "is an unacceptable blight on the lives, livelihoods and dignity of one-sixth of the world's population....we must collectively accelerate steps to revert this trend and to set the world on a path to achieving the progressive realization of the right to adequate food in the context of national food security....it is essential to enhance global governance building on existing institutions and foreseeing effective partnerships"².
5. Among the initiatives to strengthen coordination and partnerships to combat hunger and food and nutrition insecurity, the most recent and promising is the reform of the Committee on World Food Security (CFS). This reform aims to enable the CFS to "... fully play its vital role in the area of food security and nutrition, including international coordination"³. Furthermore, it was

¹ Food security exists when all people, at all times, have physical, social and economic access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food to meet their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life.

² Paragraphs 2 and 3, Declaration of the World Summit on Food Security, Rome, 16-18 November 2009.

³ Paragraph 2 of the CFS reform document.

agreed that “CFS will gradually take on additional roles such as, ...develop a Global Strategic Framework for food security and nutrition”⁴.

6. Simply put, collective experience over the past decades has shown that in spite of good intentions and considerable allocations of money, time, energy and political support, achievements in the fight against hunger and malnutrition have not met stated goals and objectives. At the same time, one of the primary causes of this failure can be ascribed to stakeholders working in isolation without a common platform to provide agreed yet flexible, forward thinking and participatory guidance towards coordinated and synchronized actions.

7. In light of global concerns about the unacceptably high levels of hunger and numerous efforts by many stakeholders to reverse this trend, this concept note proposes the basic elements of a process to develop a framework designed to help guide and synchronize policies and actions towards improving food security and nutrition for all.

II. WHY A STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK?

8. In order to provide a clear answer to this question, it is necessary to understand what is meant by a strategic framework and what would be its added value. A strategic framework is generally understood to include concepts such as: inclusive and forward thinking, vision and intentions; a summary of actions (global to local) needed to reach a desired goal incorporating different perspectives; a description of an organization, corporate culture, business, or technology in the future.

9. It can thus be argued that a committee such as the CFS, which brings together a wide range of organizations, programmes, taskforces and countries at different stages of development, working towards a common shared goal in a complex environment, needs such a framework to enable it to be forward thinking and visualize its future responsibilities and actions from different perspectives.

10. Stakeholders need to feel that they are part of something bigger than themselves. At the same time they need clear direction to know what “bigger thing” they are part of to willingly adjust themselves to the agreed direction. This coincides with the CFS reform document which recommends the...“creation of a framework to improve coordination and guide synchronized action by a wide range of stakeholders”⁵.

11. In developing such a framework it is useful to emphasize that:

- The GSF should serve to harmonize, facilitate and organize the work of the CFS in its newly identified roles
- As recommended in the CFS reform document, the GSF would be elaborated taking into account 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 Progressive Realization of the Right to Adequate Food in the Context of National Food Security. The International Assessment of Agricultural knowledge, Science and Technology for Development (IAASTD), Scaling Up Nutrition and other relevant documents will also be considered. The Five Rome Principles for Sustainable Food Security, and the definition of food security, already agreed among nations, would serve as additional reference material

⁴ Paragraph 6 of the CFS reform document.

⁵ Paragraph 6 of the CFS reform document.

- Finally, and most importantly, the GSF will be developed through a comprehensive, participatory and transparent process including all CFS stakeholders and relevant UN bodies, other international organizations, international finance institutions, private philanthropic foundations, and private sector associations. The elaboration process will be led by the CFS Secretariat in close collaboration with the Bureau, Advisory Group and High Level Panel of Experts (HLPE). The GSF will be adopted by the CFS Plenary to ensure ownership by all.

III. PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

12. The overall purpose of the GSF is to provide a dynamic instrument to enhance the role of the CFS as a platform to improve cooperation, catalyze coordinated action and provide guidance towards effective and synergized partnerships in support of global, regional and country-led plans and processes designed to prevent future food crises, eliminate hunger and ensure food security and nutrition for all human beings.

13. More specifically, the GSF is expected to help the CFS:

- Improve coordination and synchronized actions among all stakeholders based on comparative advantages and partnerships
- Strengthen coherence and convergence among policies and programmes of countries, donors and other stakeholders
- Add value through a harmonized process of demand driven (country-led) activities with scientific inputs from the network of professional expertise and knowledge (HLPE) and field experience (joint secretariat) by identifying focus areas, encouraging best practices, preventing duplication and overlapping, and filling the response gap
- Catalyze country level capacity building
- Strengthen CFS as a platform for communication and information exchange
- Create an atmosphere of trust, shared responsibility and mutually reinforcing incentives among all stakeholders.

IV. VALUE ADDED

14. In simple, practical terms, it is anticipated that the GSF will increase the effectiveness and impact of a more inclusive and participatory CFS. Independent evaluations of the three Rome based agencies point to a number of key areas in which a GSF could contribute considerable added value. These include:

- Prioritization
- Partnership and coordination
- Accountability and ownership.

A. PRIORITIZATION

15. The GSF will help guide the work of the HLPE thereby assisting CFS to decide on priority areas and helping all stakeholders review their strategic objectives. By allocating resources to priority areas requiring attention, more will be achieved with a given level of human and financial resources.

B. PARTNERSHIP AND COORDINATION

16. Fruitful partnerships rely on sound information, sincere intention, transparency and, in some cases, change of mentality which are often difficult to achieve. A GSF is expected to strengthen partnerships by encouraging CFS stakeholders to systematically share simple, concise, evidence-based information on:

- i) what they have done
- ii) achievements and success stories
- iii) challenges and difficulties
- iv) proposed solutions, plans and anticipated progress.

Such information would help the CFS identify:

- a) Best practices and success stories (to be adapted by others)
- b) Areas of overlap and duplication among all stakeholders (to be avoided)
- c) Difficulties and bottlenecks (to be diminished or removed)
- d) New areas for partnership and give and take (to be encouraged).

17. Even though providing such information would be voluntary, most stakeholders are expected to participate willingly as the final output will be submitted to the governing bodies of the Rome based agencies and to the UNGA through ECOSOC. Furthermore, at country level, a GSF would encourage coordinated action among the different ministries, department, agencies, or organizations traditionally responsible for different aspects of food security thereby promoting a multi-sectoral approach to realizing food security.

C. ACCOUNTABILITY AND OWNERSHIP

18. The type of information sharing outlined in the previous section would help not only to prepare and update a GSF, but would also help regions, countries and other stakeholders evaluate the progress of their respective efforts towards food and nutrition security, an essential step towards self-accountability and ownership.

D. RISK OF NOT HAVING A GSF

19. There would be at least three major risks in the absence of a strategic framework:

- Organizations and stakeholders continue working in isolation thereby failing to take advantage of synergies resulting from synchronized actions
- While a number of strategic frameworks exists that are related to some aspects of food security, there is currently no, comprehensive, broadly consulted, internationally agreed framework which provides guidance to country led processes to tackle food insecurity issues. The lack of ownership and political support resulting from this leads to overlaps and duplication on the one hand and to gaps on the other
- The danger that the CFS agenda would become overloaded and dispersed and attempt to undertake too much with limited resources. A GSF would help focus the work of the Committee, both in terms of contributions from stake holders as well as outcomes.

V. THE WAY FORWARD

A. PRINCIPLES TO GUIDE THE ELABORATION OF THE GSF

20. The following guiding principles could facilitate drafting, discussing and endorsing the GSF:

- The elaboration of the GSF should include a broad participatory process that will strive to “ensure the voices of all relevant stakeholders – particularly those most affected by food insecurity – are heard”⁶
- The GSF will be voluntary and thus will not constitute a mandatory requirement
- The GSF will be approved by CFS member states but will be endorsed by all stake holders. Neither approval nor endorsement will be binding; they will rather constitute an acknowledgement that the document is a sound framework to improve convergence and synchronized action in food security and nutrition governance
- The GSF will supplement other international frameworks for food security, each one of which has been created in response to a specific aim and context;
- The GSF will be a high profile, living document updated periodically by the CFS Plenary taking into account the most relevant, emerging issues affecting food security and nutrition
- The GSF will not address financing, but may recognize financial needs and point to ways of overcoming financial gaps
- The GSF should provide an information and policy base which can be used by governments and institutions as suited to local needs and circumstances
- The structure and content of the GSF should be consistent with the vision, roles and guiding principles as defined in the CFS reform document. The framework should be flexible to adapt to emerging priority issues.

B. PROCESS

21. Ownership and broad participation are emphasized in the reform document and the process of developing a GSF should follow these guidelines to the maximum possible extent. A two step process is proposed, pending CFS approval to proceed.

22. Step one would focus on obtaining written contributions from key stakeholders to establish country-led principles and to strengthen ownership by those who are trusted with the implementation of the final product. Contributions from the HLPE and other organizations, such as relevant UN bodies, other international organizations, international finance institutions, private philanthropic foundations, and private sector associations to identify key elements will be a valuable input to the process.

23. Step two would consolidate inputs from step one in a document to be reviewed and commented on in a process led by the Secretariat in close collaboration with the Bureau, Advisory Group and HLPE, with a view to be adopted by CFS Plenary in 2012. This would give a GSF the necessary political backing and legitimacy in addition to validating its technical content. As indicated in the following table, each step is envisaged to take approximately one year.

⁶ Paragraph 7 of CFS Reform Document

Endorse the process to prepare a GSF.	CFS Plenary, October 2010
Obtain written comments from Member States and Participants through the CFS Bureau and Advisory Group on purpose, added value, basic principles and process of elaboration as well as structure and content for GSF. Identify the most important focus areas in the fight against hunger and malnutrition with particular inputs from HLPE.	November-December 2010
Based on the above, CFS Secretariat produces a zero draft of the GSF.	January-February 2011
Conduct a consultation process led by the CFS Secretariat in close collaboration with the Bureau, Advisory Group and HLPE to produce written comments on the zero draft of the GSF. All relevant UN bodies, other international organizations, international finance institutions, private philanthropic foundations, and private sector associations will be consulted.	March-May 2011
The consultation process leads to the elaboration of draft one by the CFS Secretariat and is forwarded to the CFS Member States and other stakeholders.	June 2011
Draft One, together with a process to adopt the GSF, is presented and debated in the CFS Plenary.	October 2011
Based on the results of plenary debates, draft two of the framework will be prepared by the CFS Secretariat	January 2012
The resulting draft two is reviewed in an intergovernmental negotiation process with the participation of other stakeholders, leading to a finally agreed document.	February-October 2012

Global strategic framework for food security and nutrition

A Concept Note for Reflection

DRAFT

IMPORTANT NOTE: This document should not be viewed as a finished proposal. It is a “provocation” document to put concrete issues on the table and spur reflection and debate among members of the CFS Bureau and Advisory Group. Your suggestions with respect to any proposal herein are welcome.

CONTENT OF THIS DOCUMENT:

The CFS Reform Document cites, as one of the roles of the CFS (para. 6, iii):

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 Progressive Realization of the Right to Adequate Food in the Context of National Food Security.

This proposals in this document, to be discussed by members of the CFS Bureau and Advisory Group in WGIII and other settings, will concentrate in outlining a mandate and process for the elaboration of a Global Strategic Framework (GSF), as per the reform document, and in so doing will try to give answers to the following issues: a) purpose, areas of content and basic structure of the GSF; b) principles that should orient its elaboration and use; c) describing a process to prepare the GSF, including schedule, consultation process and role of different actors. The answers to the three issues above should make clear, among other things, what would be the linkages of the GSF with existing frameworks.

In the end section, the added values of the GSF are discussed, both for the CFS itself, for the international community and in the face of other existing international frameworks related to food security.

I. Purpose, Areas of Content and Basic Structure of the GSF

The task of defining the purpose, areas of content and structure of the GSF would benefit from a review of the existing frameworks mentioned as basis by the CFS Reform Document: the CFA, the CAADP and the Voluntary Guidelines to Support the Progressive Realization of the the Right to Adequate Food in the Context of National Food Security (VGRtF). While the list doesn't seem to be exhaustive, it is indicative of the intentions the Membership had for the GSF.

OBS: The CAADP actually consists of four different frameworks, one for each of the four “pillars” of the program.

Purpose and goals:

The CFA, the four CAADP frameworks and the VGRtF have a similar purpose: guide and offer options, and in so doing try to promote the advancement of their respective goals. The CFA and the CAADP frameworks target an intended audience of country governments, as well as actions by other major stakeholders, particularly intergovernmental organizations, the pri-

vate sector, farmers organizations, civil-society organizations, and the development community. But while the CFA has a global reach, the CAADP is directed to its participating countries. The VGRtF is different, because it targets its guidance primarily and explicitly to national States, even while acknowledging that “relevant stakeholders could also benefit from such guidance”.

The stated goals of the guidance provided in each framework also differ somewhat:

CFA: 1) address the current threats and opportunities resulting from food price rises; 2) create policy changes to avoid future food crises; and 3) contribute to country, regional and global food and nutritional security.

CAADP's: “help African countries eliminate hunger and reduce poverty through agriculture-led growth”.

VGRtF: aims to foster State implementation of the progressive realization of the right to adequate food in the context of national food security in order to achieve the goals of the World Food Summit Plan of Action, provide an additional instrument to combat hunger and poverty and accelerate attainment of the Millennium Development Goals.

The goals of the three frameworks converge in the overall goal of eradicating hunger, but each one offers a different perspective and prioritizes different aspects. There is at present no global, broadly consulted, internationally agreed framework whose main concerns are a comprehensive approach to the fight against hunger and the support of country-led processes (Rome Principles One and Three).

Areas of Content and Basic Structure

The areas of content and the basic structure of the GSF would of course stem from its purpose. Again in this case, it is useful to examine the three frameworks mentioned by the CFS Reform document to extract lessons.

CFA: The CFA is divided in some sections dealing with, broadly: i) general context analysis; ii) policy guidance; iii) present and future HLTF actions to help achieving intended outcomes. The policy guidance part is divided in two sections: one listing actions for the short-term (“Meeting immediate needs of vulnerable populations) and other listing actions for the long-term (“Building longer-term resilience and contributing to global food and nutrition security”), both kinds being deemed “urgent”. The guidance provided in “action menus” puts together actions that can be undertaken in a national context and actions (e.g.: completing the WTO Doha round) that are a multilateral enterprise. The “Achieving CFA outcomes” section deals in a) listing the actions already being undertaken by HLTF member organizations; b) proposing roles and options for the HLTF in fostering coordination at the global, regional and national levels; and c) estimating financial implications of achieving intended outcomes.

VGRtF: aside from an introduction to the basic legal instruments and the concept of the right to food, the VGRtF has two distinct sections: the first, “Enabling environment, assistance and accountability” deals mainly with policy recommendations and guidelines targeted at what individual member States can do domestically, ranging from legal frameworks to markets, education, labour, safety nets and genetic resources, among others. The second, “International Measures, Actions and Commitments”, deals with what States could do in the international arena, including international trade, ODA, and external debt, among others.

CAADP: The three finalized CAADP frameworks differ of course in their subject matter. The framework consultations and negotiations for Pillar 3 (Food supply and Hunger) resulted in the “Framework for African Food Security” (FAFS), and is the one closest to the subject matter of the CFS. Aside from an introduction about general CAADP operation, the FAFS is divided into three sections that conceptually are broadly similar to the three sections of the CFA: i) analysis of food security challenges in Africa; ii) policy guidance for responses to those challenges; iii) ways of implementation, including detail-heavy proposals on regional, national and local level coordination, evaluation and monitoring mechanisms and procedures.

Summing up: Policy guidance and action options are a part of all three frameworks. All of them include actions that could be undertaken both in the domestic and in the international level. Both the CFA and CAADP (FAFS) also go into prescribing coordination and reporting mechanisms to facilitate the achievement of the intended goals. But while the CFA offers some flexible, “light” options, that could differ from country to country, the FAFS suggests very detailed mechanisms and procedures appropriate to the context of CAADP. The only reference in the VGRtF to any such mechanism or procedure is the voluntary free form reporting on implementation of the VGRtF under the (old) reporting procedures of the CFS.

After reviewing the purpose, areas of content and structure of the three base frameworks mentioned in the CFS Reform Document, and taking into consideration the intentions expressed in the CFS Reform Document, including its Vision statement, and the Declaration of the World Summit of Food Security, the following proposals are made with regards to the GSF:

Purpose of the GFS:

Be a catalyst for action and joint work 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.

To that end, the GFS will provide policy guidance and offer action options related to food security and nutrition that could apply to national, regional or global contexts, and directed to either national States, donors, or any of a broad range of committed stakeholders, as appropriate, including intergovernmental organizations; the private sector; farmer organizations; research institutions; civil-society organizations, and the development community.

Basic structure and areas of content:

The structure and areas of content of the GSF should be defined during its elaboration process, instead of being pre-fixed by the CFS Plenary. However, some broad guidance by CFS Member Countries will be useful, and could be outlined as follows:

The Declaration of the World Summit on Food Security, its Strategic Objectives and its Five Rome Principles for Sustainable Global Food Security should serve as the main guidance for the definition of the areas of content of the GSF.

The GSF could also contain specific recommendations regarding increasing coordination and synergy among the different actors at all levels.

II. Principles that should guide the elaboration and use of the GSF

In order to better conduct the goal of the GSF as stated in the CFS Reform Document, namely “*improve coordination and guide synchronized action by a wide range of stakeholders*”, as well as to leverage the unique nature and strengths of the CFS, the following principles are proposed for approval by the CFS Plenary to guide the elaboration and use of the GSF:

- Adoption of GSF guidance will be voluntary by any country or stakeholder. It will not constitute a mandatory or normative document.
- The GSF should seek whenever possible to provide a range of options from which choices can be made by governments and institutions.
- The GSF should be interpreted according to the different local realities and contexts, and its recommendations may be adapted to suit specific country and institutional needs and circumstances.
- The GSF should be a reference to all countries and stakeholders. Programs and initiatives designed in accordance with options in the GSF should receive high level of attention and support by the international community, which includes the CFS and its members.
- The GSF will not be a financing document, but may recognize financial needs and point to ways of overcoming financial gaps.
- The elaboration of the GSF should include a broad participatory process that will strive to “ensure that the voices of all relevant stakeholders – particularly those most affected by food insecurity - are heard” (CFS Reform Document, para. 7)
- The GSF will be a main product of the CFS policy convergence and lesson learning process, and as such will be always updated to reflect and convey in a high-visibility document the recommendations and conclusions of its Plenary.
- Updates do not need to be far-reaching and comprehensive; the GSF can be updated gradually, according to necessity and to the outcomes of CFS debates.
- Final decision on the approval of the GSF will pertain to CFS Member States; even then, approval does not constitute endorsement of every specific action and recommendation, but rather an acknowledgement that the document constitutes a good overall framework for improving convergence and synchronized action in food security and nutrition.
- Stakeholders that are participants of the CFS will have the option of endorsing the completed GSF after its approval by Member Countries. As above, endorsement of the GSF will not constitute endorsement of every specific action and recommendation, but rather an acknowledgement that the document constitutes a good overall framework for improving convergence and synchronized action in food security and nutrition.
- The GSF will not be seen as a replacement of other international frameworks for food security, each one of which having been created in response to a specific aim and context. However, the entities responsible for those frameworks may wish to

consider bringing them in line with the GSF in the case of a revision/update, if that is considered appropriate.

III. Proposals for the elaboration process and timeline of the Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition

Some initial proposals for a 13-step elaboration process and timeline for the GFS follow. The main goals of this process should be to ensure inclusiveness; foster ownership; respect the ultimate responsibility of Member States; establish links to concrete experiences and reality on the ground; ensure the inclusion of CFS Plenary conclusions and recommendations; leverage the HLPE; and allow for regular updates.

The initial elaboration of the GSF is envisaged to take two years. Further updates can be approved in the CFS Plenary as a result of an annual process.

Approval of process of elaboration, basic principles, guidelines and timeline for GFS.	36 th Session of the CFS (October 2010)
Based on approved basic principles and guidelines, CFS Bureau and Advisory Group, supported by CFS Secretariat, finalize detailed work request to the HLPE for a first draft of the GSF, based on CFA and other existing frameworks.	December 2010
HLPE sets up work teams as required, defines work of each team, which should also coordinate with each other.	January 2011
Work teams finalize drafts, HLPE StC sets up work to harmonize results and consolidate first draft.	April 2011
HLPE finalizes Draft One.	May 2011
Extended and inclusive consultation process is opened which should involve the broad constituencies of the CFS at national, regional and global levels. Details of the consultation process, to be led by FAO, are agreed in Bureau, with support of AG and CFS Secretariat.	May 2011, deadline August 2011
As a result of the consultation process, Draft Two is forwarded to the CFS Member States.	October 2011
Draft Two is presented and debated in the CFS Plenary. Conclusions are noted, including any specific recommendation.	October 2011
Bureau and AG, supported by CFS Secretariat, work to ensure that CFS Plenary conclu-	Deadline November 2011

sions are reflected in the Draft.	
The resulting Draft Three is reviewed in an intergovernmental negotiation process, which can be supported by the HLPE as needed based on decision by the Bureau.	Deadline April 2012
Draft Four is finalized and put up for written observations and comments of all CFS stakeholders.	May 2012
Intergovernmental negotiation process revises observations and comments and decides on whether to incorporate them.	May 2012, deadline July 2012
Draft Five is submitted to the CFS Plenary for final approval.	October 2012

IV. Final words: the case for a Global Strategic Framework

Once the purpose, content, structure and elaboration process of the GSF are discussed, we are better equipped to reflect on this question: is there a case for a CFS Global Strategic Framework? What would be its added value, considering already existing frameworks, such as those mentioned in the Reform Document?

Added value for the CFS process

The value of the GSF for the CFS process itself is clear. The GSF would function as a highly visible “showcase”, or vitrine, for CFS recommendations and conclusions, and shall be its main deliverable. As such, it will be a powerful tool in support of the CFS’s three present roles of global coordination, policy convergence and support and advice to countries and regions. If the results of CFS debates and conclusions are put forth in a coherent, visible Strategic Framework, they would achieve much higher potential impact than if they were hidden in meeting reports and stray documents.

Added value for the international community

One important added value of the GSF would be its **comprehensive, unified approach** to food security and nutrition and the fight against hunger. The vast and multidisciplinary nature of food security has often been a huge challenge for the achievement of the necessary coordination of actions that are traditionally the domain of different ministries, agencies, organizations or departments. A high-visibility document with a unified perspective of the needed policies, such as the GSF, would contribute positively to spur a change of mentality.

Another important added value of a constantly updated Global Strategic Framework for the international community will be the **inclusiveness** of its elaboration process, leveraging the work done to revitalize the CFS. Much work has been and is still being done to strive to ensure that the voices of those most affected by food insecurity are heard. Any country, donor, organization or other stakeholder would therefore be sure that any recommendation in the GSF has been the result of informed and active debate and consultations.

The **flexible, dynamic and concrete** nature of the GSF recommendations, regularly updated to support new findings and actual country experiences, is another of its added-values, that can only be implemented due to its leveraging a standing platform with consultation links to the country level, such as the CFS. Bringing forward the reality of country experiences means that successful policies and solutions, that today are little known due to lack of communication and institutional inertia, would be brought to the surface, debated, and given due attention. On the other hand, the problems of unsuccessful policies could also be brought to light and suggestions for corrections and adjustments would be made.

The inclusiveness of the elaboration of the GSF would also be one of the factors for another of its added values: fostering **ownership**. Having been part of the process of its elaboration, all relevant stakeholders would pay more attention to its conclusions. Being the product of the foremost inclusive international and intergovernmental platform for the issues of food security and nutrition, the GSF recommendations will be difficult to ignore.

A further added value will be the **GSF elaboration process itself as a catalyst for convergence and joint action** in food security and nutrition policy. By participating jointly in the debate, the different stakeholders would know and understand each other's views and work more deeply, possibly contributing to ending feuds and forming partnerships. Participation in the process would give countries and stakeholders more impetus to pursue their work on food security. Finally, the process would also help to keep and build on the international political momentum for the issue of food security.

Added value compared to other existing frameworks

Several of the above-mentioned advantages of the GSF can be mentioned again in the context of other existing frameworks. While the VGRtF, for example, were the result of a broad and inclusive consultative process, it is mainly directed to States, and lacks a regular updating process and connection to concrete experiences at country level. On the other hand, it includes a general framework of actions needed.

The CFA also tries to adopt a comprehensive approach to food security (even while found lacking in some areas, such as the right to food). It is also action-oriented and based on concrete experiences. However, its preparation process lacked inclusiveness. While the recent consultation process of updating the CFA goes some extent towards addressing this issue, the end result will still be a UN management document, and as such it will lack the multi-stakeholder process of elaboration and ownership that can only be conferred by an inclusive platform such as the CFS. However, the comprehensive nature and the consultations involved in the preparation of the updated CFA would make it an excellent base for the GSF.

The four CAADP Frameworks respond to a regional need, and were developed based on some main regional assumptions, contexts and goals (such as the target of increasing agricultural productivity by 6% each year and the commitment by countries to devote at least 10% of GDP to Agriculture). Its four different "pillar" frameworks would, however, be a valuable source for the process of elaboration of the GSF under a comprehensive approach.

In sum, the different objectives and contexts of each of the above-mentioned frameworks mean that mainly they are not alternative, but complimentary. Each of those documents serves a specific demand, different and complementary to that of the GSF. The elaboration of the GSF would benefit from them, and each one of them would benefit from the GSF.

ENDNOTE: as previously stated, this document intends to put concrete issues on the table to advance discussions on the matter of the GSF and spur reflections and debate. Your suggestions with respect to any proposal herein are welcome.

This document contains comments received on the Initial Concept Note prepared by Brazil from IPC, Oxfam, Save the Children, Action Against Hunger, Concern, CIDSE, CONCORD, the HLTF and Andrew MacMillan

Comments on initial Concept Note from IPC

Development of a global framework for food security and nutrition

1. Purpose, areas of content and basic structure of the GSF

The list of frameworks reviewed by Brazil is limited to the 3 named in the CFS reform document. It is essential to include others, particularly the IAASTD. The document needs to include the point of the status of the various documents. CAADP and VGRtF are negotiated political documents and the CFA is not. We recognize the important role of the HLPE but the document should also refer to a strong reference to the Voluntary Guidelines on the Right to Food as the guiding principle.

2. Principles that should guide the elaboration and use of the GSF

Bullet 1 –we support the voluntary aspect but request a commitment to translate the GSF into national action plans.

Bullet 2 –we recognize that the GSF will provide a range of options from which countries can choose, but it is important that the implications/impacts of the different options be spelled out, and also the inter-relations among different options targeting different aspects of the problem.

Bullet 6 – we volunteer to come up with a methodology/indicators for meaningful participation.

Bullet 9 – We need to think about how to ensure coherent overall application while allowing for subsidiarity etc. Mention of accountability is missing.

3. Elaboration process

As already stated before in the general comments, we ask to be included in the process for the discussion document on the GSF - a task force with civil society participation could be formed.

The “inclusive consultation process” referred to in step 6 will require financial support. The CSO mechanism should be tasked with civil society consultation.

Comments on initial Concept Note from Oxfam

To help compile comments on the GSF I am posting separately the comments made by the 4 civil society members of the Advisory Group here. They were originally submitted together with other comments on 36th Session agenda items.

The CSO members of the Advisory Group welcomes the preliminary proposal presented by the Brazilian government and offers the following document as input on the purpose and outline of the Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition (GSF) of the Committee for Food Security (CFS).

1. A CSO perspective towards the GSF

Social movements and CSOs see the process of elaboration of the GSF as one of the key pillars for the consolidation of the work of the reformed CFS. Some governments have shown concern to – or would like to delay - the elaboration of the GSF, based on the assumption that promoting food security and nutrition is basically the obligation of national States, and that international “interference” would be counter productive. CSOs and social movements are in total agreement that national States have the main obligation to respect, protect and fulfil the right to adequate food in the context of national food security.

However, the analysis of the causes of the chronic food crisis and of its recent aggravation point clearly to the significant impact, in leading to the crisis and making it worse, of decisions and policies made by International Organizations, such as the WB, the IMF and WTO, and countries’ member of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD).

At the same time, many national States, weakened by the protracted food crisis, will need coordinated support from the international community of States, at the policy, regulatory and even financial level to support their national efforts to overcome hunger and undernutrition, and strengthen their agricultural and food and nutritional security policies, to guarantee the realization of the right to adequate food for all.

All this needs guidance from the GSF.

2. Challenges

- i. The goals of the various world food summits, as well as the MDGs will clearly not be even remotely met.
- ii. This situation is not a result of a lack of food in the world, as enough food has consistently been produced for decades.
- iii. A range of existing policies have contributed to the food crisis, but policy makers have found it difficult to agree on what has gone wrong so far. It is necessary to review the policies and seek consensus on failed policies as well as the more promising ones.

iv. The food crisis also highlighted the fact that institutions, governments and other actors are often not working in a coordinated way to end hunger.

3. Purpose of the Global Strategic Framework

i. A new approach is needed if we are to avoid repeating past mistakes. The GSF should articulate points of convergence on policies and approaches that have worked – and those that have failed – in ending hunger.

ii. The GSF should serve as a global, broadly consulted, internationally agreed framework that facilitates joint and coordinated responses. The GSF will not be mandatory, but is a normative document that would serve as guidelines for the interventions of intergovernmental organizations. Governments should be obliged to examine how they will adapt it to their national situations for implementation, with the participation of civil society in every step of the process. Inter-governmental institutions should do the same, including the High Level Task Force.

iii. The starting point of the GSF must be that any attempts to eradicate hunger and malnutrition must have the decisive involvement of those that are truly on the frontlines of the battle against hunger in policy formulation and implementation: the organisations of small-scale food providers and consumers.

iv. The GSF must be rights based, by clearly referring and spelling out that the Global Strategic Framework aims at the progressive realization of the Right to Adequate Food and will require that national and international policies with negative impacts in the enjoyment of this human right are stopped.

v. The GSF would also facilitate accountability and a related monitoring process, since it would be clear what policies all actors had committed to.

4. Building on existing analysis

In addition to the indicative list of documents referred to in the CFS Reform document on which the GSF would be built (CFA, UN Voluntary Guidelines on the Right to Adequate food, and the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme – CAADP), we propose to also include the International Assessment on Agricultural Science and Technology for Development (IAASTD), the synthesis report of the Nyeleni Forum for Food Sovereignty and the Policies and Actions to Eradicate Hunger and Malnutrition document.

5. Added value of the GSF

The need to have an inclusive drafting process: Other existing high-level frameworks have not been inclusive enough. The GSF is the chance for governments to get it right by endorsing and

facilitating the meaningful participation of the communities most affected by hunger and malnutrition. This would be an important added value of the GSF. The proposed consultative process to elaborate the GSF presents the possibility of placing people at the centre of the process and with a strong role in holding governments and international organizations accountable in the implementation of the related actions.

6. Basic structure/outline

- a. Analysis: Causes of ongoing food crisis and lessons learned
- b. The Human Rights approach of the GSF
- c. Sustainable, ecological food provision and access to territories and natural wealth
- d. Access to land and natural resources
- e. Environment, climate change and agrofuels
- f. Markets, trade, price policies and subsidies
- g. Ensuring access to adequate food and nutrition
- h. Finance, debt and development aid
- i. Research
- j. Governance
- k. Monitoring

Comments on initial Concept Note from Save the Children, Action Against Hunger, Concern

Save the Children UK, Action Against Hunger (ACF) and Concern Worldwide, welcome the opportunity to comment on the draft Concept Note on the future CFS Global Strategic Framework for Food Security & Nutrition (GSF).

This first draft provides a very good starting point for discussions, and we hope that we will have the opportunity to continue feeding into the initial and then development phases of the Framework.

We would like to make the following comments:

- We welcome the useful review of existing initiatives and processes and how they may relate to the future GSF as well as the Note's emphasis on coordination and joint action. However, we feel this exercise is too general and does not go into enough details. This may have been for the specific purpose of this short concept note, but we believe there is a need for a comprehensive review that would highlight key issues such as implementation, accountability mechanisms, indicators used as well as strengths and weaknesses of the different "instruments". We would also recommend that the GSF address all Rome principles and not solely Principles 1 and 3.
- The food security and nutrition landscape keeps evolving and there is now a Policy framework on [Scaling up Nutrition](#) which has received endorsements from multiple stakeholders, including UN agencies, and NGOs. The Framework constitutes a broad consensus of actions needed to reduce child and maternal undernutrition. Although the document puts more emphasis on direct interventions (rather than indirect), it does highlight the need for a cross-sectoral approach that encompasses food security and agriculture. The future GSF provides an opportunity to reinforce that element of the Scaling Up Nutrition framework whilst complementing its more direct – and therefore health related interventions. In addition, it is important that the GSF be informed by a mapping of nutrition and food security initiatives/policy frameworks.
- It would be also useful to make reference to the Madrid Statement (http://www.undg-policynet.org/ext/economic_crisis/Statement_of_the_Madrid_High-Level_Meeting_on_Food_Security_for_All.pdf) which constituted a significant step forward in the acknowledgment of nutrition security and the need to go beyond a single approach aimed at increasing food production.
- In terms of the highlighted principles for the future GSF:
 - The current proposal focuses on a "soft" framework which would rely on "voluntary" implementation by countries and other stakeholders. This means that no accountability and monitoring elements would be associated with the GSF. Ongoing failures by governments to take action and fulfil their commitments are well known and the need for accountability well

acknowledged; yet the current proposal and in particular the lack of reference to accountability and monitoring runs the risk of leading to the development of framework that remains nothing more than a document with no incentives for governments to translate it at national level and for donors to fulfil their pledges. Given the importance of country led and owned initiatives, some clarification about the link between the GSF and the national mechanisms referred to in paras. 24-27 of the CFS Reform document would be welcomed.

- The GSF must include specific recommendations on increased monitoring of progress/outcomes - including nutrition – effectiveness, and participation in partnerships (in the spirit of the CFS reform document).
- In relation to financing, we believe that the GSF needs to be a platform for the funding of recognized interventions that will contribute, and ultimately result in food and nutrition security for all. Again, the GSF needs to incorporate a monitoring/tracking and accountability element so as to ensure that committed funding is actually disbursed and properly used at country level, and that the funding gap is addressed.
- We welcome the proposal of the GSF as a living document to be updated as required.
- An additional principle should be the reliance of the GSF on a series of food security and nutrition indicators and outcomes.

Comments on Initial Concept Note from CIDSE

As CIDSE, we strongly support the reform of the Committee on Food Security (CFS) and we consider the development of a Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition (GSF) a crucial step in pursuing the Committee's new mandate of inclusive coordination, policy convergence, lesson learning and promoting accountability.

In view of the recent call by the Chair of the CFS Bureau, Mr. De Luna, for feedback on the draft Concept Note on the GSF, we would like to contribute our comments:

- We support the view expressed in the Note of the CFS as the platform for food security and nutrition that enables all voices to be heard, particularly those of people most affected by food insecurity. To honour this intent, the GSF should be built not only upon existing intergovernmental and UN-Frameworks such as the UN High Level Task Force CFA, the CAADP and the VGRtF. If the goal of inclusiveness and special attention to the voices of the food insecure is to be achieved, relevant analyses and concepts of the international organisations of small farmers, fishers, indigenous people etc. should also be part of the basis for the development of the GSF. The Concept Note recognises the lack of inclusiveness of the drafting of the original CFA, for instance. We do not believe that the process leading to the updated CFA compensates for this lack of inclusiveness, and therefore do not agree with the statement that the CFA is an excellent base for the GSF. The next draft of the Concept Note should refer to how the GSF will consider the existing analyses and proposals of organisations representing the voices of the most insecure. Otherwise, the goal of inclusiveness and special attention to the voices of the food insecure would be undermined from the beginning and "ownership", mentioned as one of the added values of the GSF in the current draft of the Concept Note, would probably not be achieved.

- With regard to existing intergovernmental and UN Frameworks to be considered in the preparation of the GSF, in addition to those already mentioned in the Concept Note, we believe that it is crucial that the report of the International Assessment of Agricultural Knowledge, Science and Technology for Development (IAASTD), also be taken into account in the next draft of the Note. The IAASTD report is the outcome of an intensive and inclusive consultation process, global in scope and with strong multistakeholder involvement – from scientific experts to NGOs, and from farmer groups to the private sector – that proposes several policy options and guidance for agricultural science and technology to support small scale farmers, local knowledge and to counter global warming.

- Furthermore, besides the VGRtF, the reports of the Special Rapporteur on the right to food should also be an information basis for the GSF. We believe that not involving the relevant Human Rights Institutions was a mistake in the development of the CFA – this mistake should not be repeated in the development of the GSF.

- We reaffirm the importance of **coherence** as one of the fundamental principles that should guide the whole GSF process. The GSF should inform the work of other bodies whose

operations affect food security. This includes the pursuit of coherence amongst the GSF and funding initiatives, such as the Global Agriculture and Food Security Programme at the World Bank. The ambition of enhancing coherence should be stressed throughout the Concept Note.

- Even if adoption and implementation of the GSF by governments or other stakeholders be voluntary, we believe that the creation of an accountability mechanism is important to strengthen the effectiveness and impact of the GSF. We propose that the Concept Note foresee periodical reporting of governments and other relevant stakeholders (including the World Bank, the WTO, and all relevant UN bodies) to the CFS on how they are taking into account the GFS in their policies and activities.

- Rather than providing a range of options from which choices can be made by governments and institutions, and which can be interpreted differently according to local realities, the GSF should instead focus on issues where global deliberation brings value added. Due to the very different national and local realities, we believe that a list of policy options cannot offer policies and technologies to spur food security that are relevant or appropriate for all contexts. The GSF should rather be a kind of “metaframework” that formulates goals, principles and process options that should be taken into account at national and local levels in order for national and local food security policies to be effective (e.g. establishment of appropriate institutional mechanisms to put the food insecure at the centre, implementing bottom up approaches, inclusiveness and participation, adoption and implementation of national strategies for the realisation of the right to food, implementing accountability and reporting tools etc).

- The Concept Note suggests that programmes and initiatives designed in accordance with the GSF should receive a high level of attention and support by the international community, which includes the CFS and its members. It also suggests that the GSF will not be a financing document, but may recognise financial needs and point to ways of overcoming gaps. The question of financial resources is crucial; a financial pillar for new global food governance with the CFS as its political pillar remains unanswered.

Disconnection between the implementation of CFS reform and ongoing international funding initiatives risks undermining the relevance and effectiveness of the CFS, despite its greater legitimacy based on its inclusive nature. The Concept Note should ensure this question be taken into account in the process of elaborating the GSF.

23rd June 2010

Comments on Initial Concept Note from CONCORD

Working towards negotiation of a Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition.

In this context we support the views already expressed by CIDSE, a EFSG member, to the effect that the CFS should avoid taking the revised Comprehensive Framework for Action of the UN High Level Task Force as the only or the privileged basis for the Strategic Framework which the CFS is tasked to negotiate. This topic on the agenda of the 36th Session would serve to suggest how the CFS Global Strategic Framework should be framed and to identify existing strategic documents which should be taken into account in developing it, thus providing guidance for the work of the High Level Panel of Experts and the Bureau/AG in this connection over the following months.

Comments on initial Concept Note from the HLTF

The GSF concept note is an excellent starting point. We appreciate it and understand that it is a living document. The road ahead will not be easy. From our experience there is widespread support for the idea of comprehensive food and nutrition security strategies. However it is a real challenge to secure agreement on what these should contain; the priority to be given to different outcomes; the coordination of different stakeholders; and – importantly - means for ensuring effective and equitable implementation at community level. This implies addressing a range of technical, institutional and programmatic challenges that apply to all stakeholders – most especially to governments. It calls for a combination of political insight and realism, on the one hand, and an understanding of the structural determinants of food and nutrition insecurity on the other. The CFS is the only global body that can make this kind of work meaningful for and accepted by all nations. Hence the only way forward is for the CFS to build on this GSF concept note in a way that (a) starts from its purpose and (b) reflects the realities of country experience in recent decades - through analyses (developing and testing hypotheses), debate and even negotiation. Precedence should be given to some of the excellent basic principles already agreed among nations– including the five Rome principles and the definition of food security.

Comments on initial Concept Note from Andrew MacMillan

In general, the paper gives far too much space to justifying why a GSF is needed, and what its comparative advantages are vis-à-vis the CFA, VGs, and the CAADP.

Strangely, it is not explicit about the main difference – and that is that the starting point for the other papers (explicit in the titles of the CFA and the CAADP but still very evident in the VGs) has been agricultural development for the expansion of food output, rather than the need to see that everyone in the world is able to eat adequately. Moreover the VGs concentrated only on country-level actions and deliberately avoided extra-territorial human rights dimensions. This may seem trivial, but it makes a huge difference in setting the breadth of vision and when defining what is actually required in terms of actions at both global and country levels.

The result is that it is rather thin on defining the goals for the GSF – and, without goals, it is clearly difficult to come up with a coherent and convincing strategy.

Presumably the ultimate goal for any strategy developed, overseen and updated by the CFS, is the sustainable eradication of hunger and malnutrition – i.e. to create conditions in which all humans are able to eat adequately (i.e. in ways that enable them to enjoy a full, healthy and productive life), with their food needs produced in an ethically and environmentally sustainable manner.

But I would suggest that it should have at least two intermediate strategic goals:

1. to prevent a recurrence of global food crises and to develop means, should they recur, of ensuring that the burden does not fall on those who are already poor and chronically hungry;
2. to ensure that immediate commitments, especially to the hunger-related MDGs and the WFS 2015 interim goal are met.

From a presentational point of view – and also from an operational perspective – I believe that it may be useful to make a clear distinction between issues that need to be addressed at the global and regional level (i.e. that require inter-country cooperation), and those that are essentially national and sub-national, that can and should be addressed by sovereign nations within their own territories, respecting their global commitments. Although the preparation of both parts of the strategy will need to be dovetailed, it might be useful to propose the creation of two working groups – one that focuses on the essentially global dimensions and one on those of a national scale.