

Global Strategic Framework (GSF) – Periodic Update

Proposed process, guiding principles and budget estimate

GSF Periodic Update

Proposed process, guiding principles and budget estimate

Introduction

1. At its 40th Session in October 2013, the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) endorsed the process for updating the Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition (GSF). This process foresees a periodic updating of the GSF that would entail a review of the full text and adjustments to its length so as to incorporate new developments in the area of food security and nutrition, especially frameworks and recommendations from other fora. *“This process is likely to require more substantive consultations since it will deal with text which has not been discussed and agreed beforehand. In terms of arrangements, the CFS Bureau may decide to propose modalities for its revision and to re-establish the Open-Ended Working Group (OEWG) on GSF to oversee the process, taking into account the CFS Programme of Work and Priorities, the outcome of the OEWG on Monitoring as well as available resources. All updated versions of the GSF would be presented to the CFS Plenary for endorsement”*¹.

2. In February 2015 the Bureau, in consultation with the Advisory Group, agreed that the Periodic Update should be postponed to 2017, instead of 2016 as originally proposed. The periodic updating process will also offer an opportunity to think about dissemination options for the GSF, including by making it a more user-friendly on-line resource that might offer more scope to include case studies.

3. The Secretariat was requested to develop a proposal on how the process should be carried out based on the results of the survey among Bureau and Advisory Group members (see Annex A for the feedback received).

4. Given the diverging views that came out of the survey, the Secretariat prepared two alternative proposals concerning the Periodic Update of the GSF. The first one foresees a major updating process in line with the decision taken in 2013 while the second would imply a lighter approach, reflecting the majority of feedback received through the survey.

PROPOSAL 1 – MAJOR REVISION

5. This option would be intended to make substantial changes in terms of content and length. The following sections presents a detailed description of all the steps to be undertaken and a detailed timeframe, the guiding principles that should lead the different phases of the process as well as a detailed budget estimate.

a) Proposed process and timeframe

¹ CFS 2013/40/5 Rev.1

Global Strategic Framework (GSF) – Periodic Update

Proposed process, guiding principles and budget estimate

6. The process would be handled by the OEWG on GSF under the leadership of the OEWG Chair and with the support of the CFS Secretariat. The consultation phase would take place between September 2015 and March 2017 with a view to discussing the final draft during a multi-stakeholder negotiation in June 2017. Following the negotiation, the Updated Version of the GSF would be presented at CFS 44 in October 2017 for final endorsement.

DATE	ACTIVITY
Nov 2015	CFS stakeholders to prepare <u>position papers</u> on how the GSF should be updated based on a proposal circulated by the GSF OEWG Chair.
Dec 2015	A <u>technical workshop</u> to discuss how to revise the GSF in line with its purpose, scope and intended users, in order to inform preparation of Terms of Reference (TORs) for the GSF updating process. Core questions would be presented to guide the debate.
Feb 2016	<u>OEWG meeting</u> to agree on the draft TORs developed from inputs at the Technical Workshop. OEWG members would be invited to provide further proposals concerning the content revision of GSF.
May 2016	The outcomes of the OEWG meeting and the Technical Workshop would be reflected in a <u>Zero Draft</u> to be circulated by the OEWG Chair.
July 2016	<u>OEWG meeting</u> to provide feedback on the Zero Draft.
Jul–Sep 2016	<u>Electronic consultation</u> within CFS stakeholders to provide written inputs, suggestions and comments concerning the Zero draft of the Updated GSF.
Oct 2016	An <u>update</u> on the status of the process would be provided at CFS 43.
Jan 2017	The <u>1st draft of the Updated GSF</u> , taking into account the inputs provided at the OEWG meeting in June and the subsequent electronic consultation, would be circulated within the OEWG members.
Feb 2017	<u>OEWG consultation</u> to get further inputs and comments on the 1 st draft of the Updated GSF.
Mar 2017	<u>2nd draft of the Updated GSF</u> , taking into account the results of the OEWG consultation, is circulated for negotiation.
Jun 2017	A week would be dedicated to the <u>multi-stakeholder negotiation</u> to reach consensus among CFS actors on the content of the different sections of the document. The negotiation would be fully interpreted and the document available in all FAO languages.
Oct 2017	The Committee would be requested to endorse the updated version of the Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition (GSF).

Global Strategic Framework (GSF) – Periodic Update

Proposed process, guiding principles and budget estimate

b) Guiding principles of the updating process

7. The objective of the updating process would be to make the GSF more purpose-oriented and enhance its relevance as a living document which is intended to improve coordination, guide synchronized actions by a wide range of stakeholders as well as provide practical guidance on core recommendations for food security and nutrition strategies.

8. As a result of this process, the Updated GSF should be an easier and more authoritative reference for its intended users, namely decision and policy-makers that are responsible for policy areas with direct or indirect impact on food security and nutrition.

9. In order to better align the content of the document with its intended nature and purpose, the revised version of GSF should consider how to best present the policy convergence tools and recommendations that were adopted by CFS. Furthermore, guidance on how the policy work done by the Committee could contribute to concrete actions at regional and national level could be provided. Finally, the list of global developments in the area of food security and nutrition could be updated and revisited by highlighting potential linkages with the work of CFS.

10. In order to fulfil these requirements, a major update of the GSF would be required. This would imply a full revision of the text with substantial changes in terms of content while the structure and the titles of the six chapters will be kept as they are. The objective would be to reduce their length when needed, streamline the text and keep the focus on the nature and purpose of the GSF. Changes, inclusions and deletions should fulfil the following criteria:

- Value add of the GSF, its purpose and intended users;
- Provide practical guidance on how to address challenges in the area of food security and nutrition at global, regional and national level;
- CFS comparative advantage as participatory, multi-stakeholder and evidence-based model
- Focus on how to strengthen linkages between CFS and policy-makers through the GSF.

11. Once the guiding principles of the process are agreed upon, Terms of References (TORs) would be developed through a wide and inclusive consultation process. The TORs would provide clear indications on the types of modifications that would be made through the text of the document. For each chapter, the modalities of intervention would be highlighted and the text to be deleted or changed would be differentiated from the text to be kept.

12. Once the TORs are approved by the OEWG, they would provide the reference to be followed throughout the consultation and negotiation phases.

c) Budget estimate

13. The following budget estimate is intended to highlight all direct and indirect costs associated with the proposal of having a major revision of the GSF.

Global Strategic Framework (GSF) – Periodic Update

Proposed process, guiding principles and budget estimate

TECHNICAL WORKSHOP	
Travel/Living allowances ca 20 participants	60,000
Travel/Living allowances/honorarium moderator	15,000
Audiovisual and refreshments	3,000
Subtotal	78,000
OEWG NEGOTIATION	
Interpretation costs (5 full days) with 2 evening sessions	140,000
Document translation (6 FAO languages) for negotiation	35,000
Printing/Audiovisual/messengers	9,000
Subtotal	184,000
STAFF RESOURCES	
Part-time Secretariat Technical Officers and Admin Assistant	270,000
Subtotal	270,000
FINAL PRODUCT	
Document production	11,000
Translation/language revision/printing	14,000
Subtotal	25,000
TOTAL	557,000

PROPOSAL 2 – TARGETED REVISION

14. This proposal is in line with the idea to undertake a targeted revision that would foresee a multi-stakeholder consultation (instead of a negotiation) at the end of the process in 2017.

a) Proposed process and timeframe

15. The Periodic Updating process would have the following two objectives:

- a) Incorporate major new international developments relevant to food security and nutrition in the text, particularly in Chapter 3 “*The foundations and overarching frameworks*”. For example, the Sustainable Development Goals as well as the outcomes of the Second International Conference on Nutrition should be reflected in the updated version of the GSF have been widely suggested for inclusion. Additional proposals can be found in Annex A.

Global Strategic Framework (GSF) – Periodic Update

Proposed process, guiding principles and budget estimate

- b) Carry out a minor technical update of Chapter 4 “*Policy, programme and other recommendations*” to streamline its content and reduce its length by focussing primarily on including CFS recommendations.

DATE	ACTIVITY
Dec 2015	CFS stakeholders to prepare <u>position papers</u> on the kind of developments in the area of FSN to be incorporated and how Chapter 4 should be updated, based on a proposal circulated by the GSF OEWG Chair.
Feb 2016	GSF OEWG Chair will circulate <u>draft Terms of Reference (TORs)</u> for the updating process. TORs should provide clear indications on the types of modifications that will be made.
Apr 2016	<u>OEWG meeting</u> to agree on the draft TORs.
Sep 2016	The outcomes of the OEWG meeting would be reflected in a <u>Zero Draft</u> (in all FAO languages) to be circulated by OEWG Chair in collaboration with CFS Secretariat.
Nov 2016	<u>OEWG meeting</u> to provide feedback on the Zero Draft.
Mar 2017	<u>1st draft of the Updated GSF (in all FAO languages) will be circulated by GSF OEWG Chair in collaboration with CFS Secretariat.</u>
May 2017	<u>OEWG meeting</u> to approve the Updated Version of the GSF
Oct 2017	The Committee will be requested to endorse the updated version of the Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition (GSF).

b) Budget estimate

16. The following budget estimate is intended to highlight all direct and indirect costs associated with the proposal of having a targeted revision of the GSF.

STAFF RESOURCES	
Part-time Secretariat Technical Officers and Admin Assistant	54,000
Subtotal	54,000
FINAL PRODUCT	
Document production	12,000
Translation/language revision/printing	30,000
Subtotal	42,000
TOTAL	96,000

Global Strategic Framework (GSF) – Periodic Update

Proposed process, guiding principles and budget estimate

NEXT STEPS

17. Bureau and Advisory Group members are invited, at their Joint meeting on 15 April 2015, to provide views and feedback concerning the two proposals on the Periodic Update of the GSF. The Bureau, at its meeting on 16 April, is expected to take a decision on the type of revision and proposal to be submitted to the attention of the Open-Ended Working Group that is working on the preparation of the Multi-Year Programme of Work of CFS for the biennium 2016-2017.

Global Strategic Framework (GSF) – Periodic Update Proposed process, guiding principles and budget estimate

ANNEX 1

Answers to the survey concerning the Periodic Update of the Global Strategic Framework (GSF)

Bureau and Advisory Group were invited to answer to the following six questions.

- 1) *What would you expect as the major value added of the review?*
- 2) *In this context, what would be the most suitable type of review process (major revision, focused revision, minor revision, etc)?*
- 3) *In your opinion, should the objective and purpose of the GSF be re-visited?*
- 4) *Do you think that the structure of the document should be changed?*
- 5) *What type of modifications could make the GSF more effective and fit for its purpose?*
- 6) *Do you suggest any additional parameter or guiding principles to be adopted for the updating process?*

Please find below the inputs of those respondents who agreed to share them with Bureau and Advisory Group members.

AFGHANISTAN

It is odd that the Update means reviewing the full text, but we can accept it.

QUESTION 1: We expect the values added from the review to be:

- Make GSF more purpose-oriented;
- Enhance its relevance as a living document;
- Make GSF easy to read and comprehend;
- Upgrade GSF to serve as an authoritative reference document on specific topics of global interest.

QUESTION 2: Definitely, it should be a highly focused review. Not to add more to the existing text of 65 pages but to trim some chapters in order to make space for new developments like the ICN2 and Post-2015 Agenda.

QUESTION 3: From reading page 6 of the Third Version of GSF (2014), we find no sub-section on Objective and I do not think it is necessary to have one. The word Purpose is adequate. That said, there is room for sharpening the first three paragraphs of B (page 6).

QUESTION 4: We do not see any compelling reason to change the existing structure of the GSF. However, within each Chapter there may be room for amendments, deletion or addition.

QUESTION 5: Any modifications introduced should possess one or more of the following five qualities:

- Does the modification add value to the GSF and why?
- Does the modification help provide practical guidance to challenges facing food security and nutrition, globally, regionally or nationally?
- Does the modification contribute to multi-stakeholder approach?
- How useful is the modification for addressing structural problems, especially resilience building?

Global Strategic Framework (GSF) – Periodic Update

Proposed process, guiding principles and budget estimate

- How useful is the amendment in addressing vulnerability?

QUESTION 6: Yes. We suggest two additional parameters:

- Innovation;
- More boxes from experience of low income countries

Finally, we suggest the inclusion of the following two developments in the revised GSF:

- Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-scale Fisheries in the Context of Food Security and Poverty Eradication
- A box on India's National Food Security Act, 2013 which is intended to provide food grains at low prices to approximately two-thirds of its population of 1.2 billion.

NORTH AMERICAN REGION

The original intent outlined in document CFS 2013/40/5 for approving the Periodic Update in 2016 was to incorporate new developments in the area of food security and nutrition, especially frameworks and recommendations from other fora. We believe the process for updating the GSF must be simple and avoid a renegotiation of text, all while providing the opportunity to periodically adapt it to the Committee's evolving understanding of effective, evidence-based policies, and priorities and context. In our view, the starting point for deciding the scope of the Periodic Update is determining whether there have been any new developments that would fundamentally change the content and/or structure of the GSF. It is the opinion of the North America Government that this criterion has not been met. The basic structure of the document and its core content areas are sound and remain appropriate in the global context of food security and nutrition and the priorities the Committee has identified. We therefore conclude that a Periodic Review at this time is unnecessary. We conclude that the purpose of the GSF is to improve coordination and offer voluntary guidelines and recommendations for coherent action at the global, regional and country levels by all relevant stakeholders. Simply put, the GSF is a resource that offers consolidated recommendations for policy coherence on a variety of topics that affect food security and nutrition. The framework is a culmination of the work of the Committee and is the central repository for the negotiated outcomes of CFS work-products. In the same way, the future work of CFS should be guided by areas of the GSF that need to be developed further, because of evolving circumstances of global food security and nutrition, or understanding of the solutions that can best achieve global food security and nutrition. Finally, we believe that consideration must be given to the impact of the outcomes of the negotiations on the Post-2015 Strategic Development Goals on the GSF. Depending on the final goals and/or the indicators, the outcome of the Post-2015 Goals may meet the criteria for a review of the GSF. To that end, we recommend postponing the Periodic Review until the Committee can consider the outcomes of the SDGs. At that time, the same criteria should be applied to determine whether or not a Periodic Review of the vision, structure, and content of the GSF is needed. Do the Post-2015 Goals introduce new developments in the area of food security and nutrition? If so, then a Periodic Review could be warranted, likely for review by the Committee in 2017. Similarly, the work of the CFS Open Ended Working Group on Monitoring, including its baseline on-line survey, and conclusions from other major global food security- and nutrition-related debates like the 2016 Global

Global Strategic Framework (GSF) – Periodic Update

Proposed process, guiding principles and budget estimate

Humanitarian Summit should inform whether there is need for a more substantive review of the GSF in the future.

QUESTION 1: The review should consider whether the areas of focus and content of the GSF are accurate and relevant, given our collective understanding of the global state of food security and nutrition, global developments in the area of food security and nutrition, and evidence-based solutions to food security.

QUESTION 2: We believe that no revision, or a minor revision, is the most appropriate approach at this time. The GSF is a relevant document in content and length. We therefore believe that this first periodic review need not focus on content; rather it should be used to inform the multi-year program of work of the CFS.

QUESTION 3: No, the objective and purpose of the GSF are sound, and the GSF continues to be relevant and useful to policy makers deliberating the best means to improve food security and nutrition. However, the way the CFS uses the GSF could be revisited. The GSF should be used to guide the future work of the Committee under its Multi-Year Program of Work (MYPOW), including to: (1) identify policy gaps in food security and nutrition; (2) assess whether it is the best forum to fill such gaps, and (3) inform its future work in the choice of topics for major work streams, including selection of the HLPE report topics.

QUESTION 4: No. At this time, the structure and length remain appropriate.

QUESTION 5: The addition of the policy decisions from each of the CFS annual plenaries adds to the value of the GSF, but their subject matter is disjointed and lacking in strategic focus. An overall strategy to reinforce the framework and make it a comprehensive resource for addressing food security and nutrition would give strategic direction to the Committee and its work and increase the relevance and use of the document. There may occasionally be the need to reconcile policy decisions taken at different points at time. However, we do not believe this is the case for the current version of the GSF.

QUESTION 6: First, the Bureau, in consultation with the Advisory Group, should determine if the criteria for a Periodic Update have been met. Only then should the Bureau recommend that the Periodic Review be undertaken. Per CFS 40, the updating process should be simple and avoid the renegotiation of text. It should focus on acknowledging new, evidence-based developments in the area of food security and nutrition, especially appropriate, widely accepted frameworks and recommendations from other member state fora.

UNSCN

QUESTION 1: Food Security and Nutrition are dynamic fields where new studies, policies and evaluations are surfacing frequently. In order to maintain an up to date document, reviews are needed to be made to insure that the information contained in the framework is relevant and functions as a tool to help improve policy coherence and coordination and guide the actions of stakeholders. Furthermore, this review will allow for topics which have been neglected in the past to be highlighted more prominently, such as nutrition and more specifically the topic of overnutrition and obesity. With new policy recommendations on nutrition being adopted member-states, such as

Global Strategic Framework (GSF) – Periodic Update

Proposed process, guiding principles and budget estimate

the Second International Conference on Nutrition (ICN2) outcome documents and the Post-2015 Sustainable Development Agenda, this review will allow for these new policies and programmes to be included into the framework to address the post-2015 agenda adequately.

QUESTION 2: We suggest conducting a major review that allows for the inclusion of recently adopted member-state policy and programmatic recommendations in the revised GSF. These new recommendations and agenda include, but are not limited to: the ICN2 outcome documents, which include, the Rome Declaration on Nutrition and the Framework of Action, the Post-2015 Sustainable Development Agenda, Global Action Plan for the Prevention and Control of NCDs and potentially elements of the Global Nutrition Report. Furthermore, the case studies included in the GSF could merit an update. Lastly, we suggest that the revision be used as a chance to formulate more clearly the connections between the different policy area on the topics of nutrition, food security, food systems and agriculture.

QUESTION 3: We consider the purpose and objective to still be pertinent, however, would like to suggest that these elements be more clearly highlighted in the document.

QUESTION 4: Currently we feel that there is no clear link present between the different policies and programmes included in the GSF. We suggest that a new structure be adopted in order to more clearly show how these elements relate to each other and lead in the end to improved human nutrition outcomes.

QUESTION 5: We suggest that additional definitions of key terms be added to the GSF in order to help guide the actions of a wide range of stakeholders. The new definitions should include, but not limited to: Nutrition, nutrition security and Food Systems.

QUESTION 6: We suggest that additional guiding principles be added that focus on member-state adopted policies, programmes and recommendations. These additional guiding principles should include, but not limited to: the ICN2 outcome documents, which include, the Rome Declaration on Nutrition and the Framework of Action, the Post-2015 Sustainable Development Agenda, Global Action Plan for the Prevention and Control of NCDs and potentially elements of the Global Nutrition Report.

CSM

Civil society organizations had been very active in the elaboration process of the GSF as adopted in 2012 and have also produced a manual for civil society organization and social movement about how to use this overarching reference document for advancing the right to adequate food on the national, regional and global level. It is the clear understanding of civil society organizations that the GSF is the most comprehensive document of the CFS which includes the different more specific decisions taken by this body by ensuring consistency and coherence among them.

In addition to the questions posed by the CFS secretariat, CSO suggest to:

- ask all CFS members and participants about how they have used the GSF, and which are the lessons that can be learned from it;

Global Strategic Framework (GSF) – Periodic Update

Proposed process, guiding principles and budget estimate

- request the CFS secretariat and the Rome based agencies detailed information about what measures have been taken to promote the dissemination of the GSF and to assist countries in the use of the GSF.

QUESTION 1: The GSF as adopted in 2012, was elaborated and negotiated according to the mandate of the CFS reform as the main reference framework of the CFS to promote convergence, coherence and coordination of policies for food security and nutrition on the national, regional and global level, based on the CFS Vision to overcome food insecurity and malnutrition and advance towards the progressive realization of the right to adequate food. This specific function of being the overarching framework for CFS members and participants is the major added value of the GSF, and needs to be at the center of the review.

QUESTION 2: Currently, the automatic inclusion of more recent CFS decisions into the GSF brings along the risk of converting the GSF into a “garbage” where everything is in, but very few actually use it for political deliberation processes, and where the consistency and coherence of the document is not ensured. The revision should ensure such internal consistency, coherence and usefulness of the document as the main global reference document that is to guide policies on food security and nutrition on the national, regional and global levels.

QUESTION 3: At the end of the GSF review in 2017, the CFS shall have been adopted as an updated, consistent and useful document which complies with the mandate of the CFS reform to be the main reference framework of the CFS to promote convergence, coherence and coordination of policies for food security and nutrition on the national, regional and global level, and is in line with the CFS Vision to overcome food insecurity and malnutrition and advance towards the progressive realization of the right to adequate food.

QUESTION 4: This needs to be further discussed, after getting an assessment about how it has been used so far, and reaching an agreement about what should be the objective and purpose of its review.

QUESTION 5: Same reply as on question 4.

QUESTION 6: The elaboration of guiding principles for the GSF review is crucial and should build on the mandate established in the CFS reform document, and on the principles that guided the elaboration of the GSF in 2011-2012.