



Open Ended Working Group (OEWG)

Global Strategic Framework (GSF)

Document No: CFS OEWG- GSF/2016/05/02/INF

CFS OEWG-GSF Meeting # 1

Date: 2 May 2016

Time: 14.30 – 17.30

Location: Lebanon Room, FAO

## COMPILATION OF INPUTS RECEIVED CONCERNING THE PERIODIC UPDATING OF THE GSF

### QUESTIONS

1. Aside from adding references to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (replacing MDGs) and the Second International Conference on Nutrition in Chapter 3 of the GSF, would you propose any additional initiative, policy tool and document?
2. What criteria or rationale should guide additional references? For example, do you agree any additional references should be based on i) globally agreed frameworks/statements, ii) explicitly address food security and nutrition issues, and iii) have been the subject of CFS debates since the GSF was endorsed?
3. Would you agree with the proposed idea to limit revision of Chapter 4 to revising the usability of the electronic version of Chapter 4 without reopening the endorsed text?
4. Would you agree with the proposed approach of creating an interactive online version of the GSF with direct links to the different sections of the CFS webpage? Do you think that this would contribute to a more efficient use of the GSF or other alternatives can be pursued?
5. Do you have additional ideas on how to disseminate the GSF?
6. Do you have any comment regarding the proposed minor editorial changes? Would you recommend any additional one?

### ANSWERS

**CUBA**

#### QUESTION 1:

No tenemos de momento, nada que añadir.

#### QUESTION 2:

Sí, de acuerdo en que las referencias deben basarse en todos los documentos que constituyen mandatos del Comité y del Marco Estratégico, los cuales han sido objeto de debate y de negociación por todos los miembros.

QUESTION 3:

Sí de acuerdo. No se debe reabrir ningún texto aprobado, sin llevarse a negociaciones.

QUESTION 4:

Consideramos que entrar en debates interactivos pudieran generar conflictos.

En este caso Cuba se reservaría comentarios, y de ser pertinente, defendería que es más sustancioso el debate en un contexto no virtual. Refrendaríamos los principios respondidos en las preguntas 2 y 3.

QUESTION 5:

Se tomaría nota de otras propuestas.

QUESTION 6:

En general, estos son los elementos básicos para este primer encuentro. Esperamos el resultado del mismo y de la versión revisada para ser discutida en la reunión del Grupo de Trabajo de Composición Abierta prevista para el 28 de abril.

---

**GERMANY**

QUESTION 1:

To highlight the interdependency between climate change and agricultural production as key of food security, the GSF should additionally refer to the outcomes of the COP 21. The Paris Agreement points out the fundamental priority of safeguarding food security and ending hunger, and the particular vulnerabilities of food production systems to the adverse impacts of climate change.

Climate change – as we currently observe – is a major driver of food insecurity and malnutrition. In order to feed the world’s population, agricultural production needs to cope with the implications of climate change. Referring to COP 21 allows to emphasize the role of agriculture – not only as a driver of climate change – but also as a means to limit the negative implications of climate change.

QUESTION 2:

To keep the GSF clear and well-arranged, additional references should fulfill all three criteria listed above. That is, reference should be based on globally agreed frameworks/statements, explicitly address food security and nutrition issues, and have been the subject of CFS debates since the GSF was endorsed.

QUESTION 3:

We fully agree.

QUESTION 4:

We fully support an interactive online version of the GSF to further improve the dissemination of GSF and adaptation of CFS products.

QUESTION 5:

To ease the download process of the GSF and, thus, to make it more accessible, the chapters could be uploaded separately.

---

**ITALY**QUESTION 1:

Italy suggests the introduction, as additional reference in Chapter 3 of the GSF, of the Milan Charter, the final statement of the Universal Exhibition, signed by over a million people, consisting in a commitment of States and civil society to eradicate hunger, pursuing and enhancing the targets of the 2030 Agenda.

QUESTION 2:

Recalling the main purpose of the GSF to provide a single reference document with practical guidance and recommendation on food security and nutrition, Italy believes that any additional references concerning food security and nutrition issues and strategies, should be intended as parts of the broader right to adequate food.

QUESTION 3:

Italy agrees with the idea of the Secretariat to limit revision of Chapter 4 to revisions of the usability of the electronic text.

QUESTION 4:

Italy agrees with the idea concerning the creation of an interactive online version of the GSF. Italy believes that this would contribute to a more efficient use of the GSF, enhancing, as a consequence, the function of the GSF as a single, living document in the CFS framework.

QUESTION 5:

In the view of Italy a greater publicity of GSF would contribute to its dissemination. In the light of this, Italy proposes to create a direct link to GSF in the home page of the CFS web site, the direct link should be clearly visible and easy to find. Italy believes that the creation of a GSF launch event (once revised) could further contribute to disseminate and improve knowledge of the GSF.

QUESTION 6:

Italy supports the Secretariat's proposals and changes directed to promote the usability of the GSF.

General comment

In the light of all the proposed changes, Italy believes that the periodic review should be primarily focused on the reduction of the length of the GSF, as the extreme length is one of the main barriers to an efficient use and dissemination of the GSF. Italy recommends, therefore, to replace some parts of the document, that are not essential for the efficiency of the GSF (for example descriptions on concrete cases), replacing them with direct links to separate web pages addressing those issues.

---

## **NORTH-AMERICA REGION**

### QUESTION 1:

No. At this time, we think that Chapter 3 and its areas of focus remain appropriate in the current global context of food security and nutrition and therefore the document does not need to consider any additional frameworks and/or recommendations from other fora. We are pleased with the proposed references to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the ICN2 in the updated version of the GSF.

### QUESTION 2:

We believe that any future additional references should be based on previously agreed food security- and nutrition-related debates. The Committee should ensure the acknowledgment of evidence-based developments, widely accepted frameworks and recommendations from other member states, taking into account CFS priorities and the global context.

### QUESTION 3:

Yes, the revision process of Chapter 4 must avoid a reopening and/or a renegotiation of text.

### QUESTION 4:

Yes, we believe that, aside from consolidated recommendations for policy coherence on a variety of topics that affect food security and nutrition, the GSF should definitely include case studies as a useful tool of dissemination of good practices and lessons learned. In addition, we agree with both the creation of an “interactive version” of the online GSF and with the introduction of keywords for a more “user friendly” repository.

### QUESTION 5:

No.

### QUESTION 6:

No. We agree with the proposed editorial changes.

---

## **FAO**

### QUESTION 1:

FAO would support the inclusion of the two mentioned references (SDGs and ICN2), along with the SSF Guidelines, as being directly relevant to the specific mandate of CFS. These could include a brief narrative text. The others mentioned are relevant, but these could potentially lead to lengthy

negotiations as to their inclusion or not, and, additional time to agree on the supporting text. Another option might be to list the others along the lines of the GSF Chapter III, section H, with no supporting text.

QUESTION 2:

These criteria are sufficient and would exclude those agreed frameworks that did not explicitly address food security and nutrition in line with the mandate of CFS.

QUESTION 3:

Yes, in principle, although "... to streamline its content and reduce its length ..." may imply changing some of the text, or, removing some text that provides context to the current document.

QUESTION 4:

Yes, in principle, although developing a user-friendly on-line version may be more challenging to do than it sounds. The assumption is that the GSF would be more accessible to potential users. However, it is not clear if this would enhance uptake or not of the GSF.

As indicated in the CFS effectiveness survey, albeit with the limitations of that survey, the actual influence of CFS policy instruments such as GSF was perceived as fairly low even if the potential influence was perceived as being higher. Part of the reason for that difference is awareness of the CFS policy products and instruments by the target audience at all levels. As has been expressed before, more attention and resources should be given to communication and outreach efforts regarding CFS policy guidance instruments and products, including GSF. Perhaps a targeted survey on how best to make the GSF more accessible and usable could be conducted before embarking on the on-line version. This may include developing short briefs on the GSF (1-2 pages) that highlight the purpose, objectives, and examples of how it has been used by stakeholders to "guide synchronized action" and other stated purposes.

Finally, the OEWG may wish to reflect on the nature and purpose of GSF when addressing the way forward, see excerpts below:

Its purpose is to improve coordination and guide synchronized action by a wide range of stakeholders. ... to provide ... practical guidance on core recommendations for food security and nutrition strategies, policies and actions validated by the wide ownership, participation and consultation afforded by the CFS. It offers guidelines and recommendations for catalysing coherent action at the global, regional and country levels by the full range of stakeholders, while emphasizing the primary responsibility of governments and the central role of country ownership of programmes to combat food insecurity and malnutrition. The GSF emphasizes policy coherence and is addressed to decision- and policy-makers responsible for policy areas with a direct or indirect impact on food security and nutrition, such as trade, agriculture, health, environment, natural resources and economic or investment policies. These guidelines and recommendations should be interpreted and applied in accordance with national policies, legal systems and institutions. The GSF is also an important tool to inform the actions of policy-makers and decision-makers, development partners, cooperation and humanitarian agencies, as well as international and regional organizations, financial institutions, research institutions, civil society organizations (CSOs), the private sector, NGOs, and all

other relevant stakeholders acting in the food security and nutrition fields at global, regional and country levels.

---



#### QUESTION 1:

Next to references to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Second International Conference on Nutrition the GSF could make reference to other major UN conferences and their outcomes such as:

- Third World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction (March, 2015)
- Third International Conference on Financing for Development (July, 2015)
- The Global Climate Change Conference (December, 2015)
- The World Humanitarian Summit (May, 2016)
- Third United Nations Conference on Housing and Sustainable Urban Development (October, 2016).

Moreover, it would be important to keep the SUN Framework and Roadmap in the document, which is being updated with the new SUN strategy.

#### QUESTION 2:

The main added value of the GSF is to provide an overarching framework and a single reference document with practical guidance on core recommendations for food security and nutrition strategies, policies and actions. As a general rule, the criteria or rationale guiding additional references should therefore remain flexible. However, as to ensure relevance and focus, additional references should mostly focus on i) globally agreed frameworks/statements and ii) explicitly address food security and nutrition issues. Additional references do not necessarily have to have been subject of CFS debates since the GSF was endorsed.

#### QUESTION 3:

As to avoid lengthy (re)negotiation of the endorsed text, WFP would agree with the proposed idea not to reopen it. Revision of the usability of the electronic version is welcomed and WFP would be happy to present case studies and good practices that will be made accessible through links in the different thematic areas.

The text on the successful implementation of the joint programme “Building Commodity Value Chains and Market Linkages for Farmers’ Associations” (Government of Mozambique, WFP, FAO, IFAD, UN Women) might need updating. WFP would be happy to provide input.

#### QUESTION 4:

Resources permitting, WFP supports the proposed approach of creating an interactive online version of the GFS with direct links to the different sections of the CFS webpage. We believe this will make the GSF more user friendly and accessible and could contribute to a more efficient use of the GSF.

#### QUESTION 5:

In addition to creating an interactive online version additional ways of increasing outreach and dissemination should be considered, for example through targeted awareness raising. It would be important for the CFS Secretariat to tailor its awareness raising to its various stakeholders, taking into account their respective roles and capacities. The Secretariat could write a 'quick guide' to the GSF briefly introducing it to specific stakeholder groups, explaining its added value in specific contexts and circumstances.

QUESTION 6:

WFP can agree to the proposed minor editorial changes. We feel point 4 which deals with keeping the GFS up-to-date is of particular importance, as this will also contribute to a more user-friendly document which can be used efficiently by all CFS stakeholders.

---

**SCN**

QUESTION 1:

We support the inclusion of the SDG agenda ( replacing the MDGs) and the ICN2 as overarching frameworks. Yes we propose addition overarching documents. Since the first version of the GSF, some other important overarching documents have been approved globally, by member states, particularly interesting for nutrition: The WHA assembly goals and the Non Communicable Diseases. Even though CFS in itself may not directly address these issues, since they are dealt with in the WHA, now CFS has taken nutrition as an important (standing) issue in its agenda, CFS should refer to these documents and ensure its own policies and products are in line with these. This is important for the policy convergence and policy coherency function of the CFS. The full reference to the documents is:

- The WHO Comprehensive Implementation Plan on Maternal, Infant and Young Child Nutrition (WHO 2013): This includes the six global nutrition targets: reduction of child stunting and wasting and no increase in childhood overweight by 2025; reduction of low birth weight; reduction of maternal anaemia and increase of breastfeeding. Furthermore, this plan outlines priority action areas, including the creation of a supportive environment for the implementation of comprehensive food and nutrition policies. The proposed activities call for the harmonization of policies and actions through the WHA as well as through the CFS and ECOSOC.
- The WHO Global Action Plan for the Prevention and Control of Non communicable Diseases 2013-2020 (WHO 2014): As stated in there, Enabling environments are important and agriculture is one key factor in this: Support national authorities to create enabling environments to reduce modifiable risk factors of non-communicable disease through health-promoting policies in agriculture, food, trade, transport and urban planning and other sectors.

QUESTION 2:

The criteria for additional reference: Globally agreed by an intergovernmental body ( such as UNGA, WHA, CFS) and of course be relevant for food security and nutrition

QUESTION 3:

A light review of chapter 4 is good, with exception of the nutrition paragraph G. Since CFS has decided to seriously work on nutrition, by a separate work stream as well as integrate in the rest of its work, paragraph G needs a more thorough revision. There is no need to renegotiate text, since the text that has been negotiated in the ICN2 to replace the current text. We would suggest a paragraph from the Rome declaration, para 13 b or 13 c on page 11 of the joint report. The part about ongoing CFS work could be replaced by a summary of the result of the deliberations in the current OEWG on nutrition.

#### QUESTIONS 4 AND 5:

Agree with an interactive online version. Active promotion of the GSF document to be published on websites of UN agencies and member states is an option.

#### QUESTION 6:

GSF should acknowledge that the SDGs are in nature very different from the MDGs. So instead of analysing where MDGs are referred to, we suggest to delete all references to MDGs and replace it with the innovative and universal character of the SDGs

---

#### **CSM**

The CSM Working group on GSF provides the following remarks on the proposal for the periodic update of the GSF, circulated by the CFS Secretariat:

1) The Document follows, in general lines, the proposal for a targeted revision of the GSF, as it was proposed by Brazil, discussed by the AG and Bureau on 15 April 2015 and then approved by the Bureau. However, the proposal needs to be completed in several aspects, in order to fulfill its role as Terms of Reference for the GSF targeted revision process:

- a) An explicit definition of the objectives and guiding principles of this process should be included in the document (possibly after the reference to the mandate given by the MYPOW, second page first paragraph).
- b) Before directly going into the questions on Chapter 3 and 4, the proposed methodology for the process should be made explicit, so that it becomes clear for which reason and what purpose which questions need to be addressed.
- c) A timeline for the process should be added at the end of the document, building on the timeline that was approved in April 2015.

2) The meeting of the OEWG on the GSF should help to clarify how the GSF is perceived at this moment, what should be its function in the future, and how we therefore define the objectives of this process in the context of a broader goal for the GSF. The CSM Working Group would like to share the following thoughts on this:

- a. the main function of the GSF should be to become a strongly used living document which serves as a main reference for the elaboration of policies with impact on food security and nutrition on national, regional and global level.
- b. This function is currently not met, and the upcoming targeted revision should help to significantly advance in this direction.

- c. The fact that the institutional and financial support to disseminate and promote the use of the GSF, as compared to other CFS Decisions, like the VGGT, was an important limiting factor.
- d. Another problem is that the GSF, by simply recompiling and adding all new CFS decisions to the text adopted in 2012, is becoming a difficult- to-use encyclopedia which, with the time, also leads to an erosion of coherence.
- e. Therefore the challenge is to convert the GSF progressively in what it was meant to be: a coherent synthesis of CFS decisions that offers the overarching framework for food security and nutrition policies on all levels. Hence, the main goal is to “make the GSF becoming the GSF”, and to ensure that the upcoming updating process is a step towards this goal.
- f. Three action lines need to be followed in this sense in the coming years:
  - i. A strong communication strategy for the use and application of the GSF
  - ii. The periodic update of the GSF until October 2017
  - iii. The development of a process beyond 2017 which abandons the “recompilation” approach and adopts instead an approach towards a GSF that offers a “coherent synthesis of CFS Decisions”

QUESTIONS 1 AND 2:

The rationale for including additional references should indeed be that only UN agreed resolutions should be taken up, that have been drafted and negotiated in inclusive and participatory (CFS like) processes, and have a strong relevance for food security and nutrition.

QUESTION 3:

The revision of Chapter 4 should follow the principle that agreed text of CFS Decisions must not be reopened, and that the way, any editorial change or new text added to the Chapter is fully consistent with the existing GSF.

In general, the case studies are not of the same political value as the GSF text that has went through intensive consultations and negotiations. They do not fully reflect what is actually in the text, sometimes they are actually incoherent with it; the current ones are mostly outdated. The case studies should all be removed from the document, and no new ones should be included.

QUESTIONS 4 AND 5:

Civil Society has used the GSF in many aspects and occasions. We produced a manual for social movements and CSO on how to use the GSF, and we supported FAO in producing technical guidance to countries how to use the GSF in national policies on food security and nutrition oriented towards the progressive realization of the Right to Food.

- We therefore know that a comprehensive communication strategy for the use and application of the GSF is very much needed, as well as the full institutional, operational and financial support of the Rome-based agencies and their outreach facilities. To have an easy to access online version is certainly helpful in this context, but not sufficient.

- To draft a broader communication and application strategy, a consultation process with those governments that are interested in such process (at least two from each region), the Rome based agencies and the other CFS actors should be conducted, under the guidance of the OEWG on GSF and with the support of the CFS Secretariat. CSM would be very interested to participate in this important endeavor.
- 

## WHO

Thanks for the opportunity to comment on the proposal for the Periodic Update of the Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition (GSF). We welcome this opportunity, and would like to make the following suggestions:

The CFS should set the example and nutrition in the Global Strategic Framework should be looked at, focused on and dealt with in equal terms as food security. Nutrition does not deserve to be only an afterthought in the GSF. The GSF should remove the barriers between the sectors and built the bridge especially between agriculture and health. The revised GSF should address all forms of malnutrition, in line with the commitments of the ICN2. Overweight and obesity have been increasing rapidly in all regions of the world. Over half a billion adults are obese and 42 million children under 5 years of age are overweight, while diet-related noncommunicable diseases are becoming serious global public health problems even in low and middle income countries. We therefore propose that the revision of the GSF fully incorporates this new dimension of malnutrition – overweight and obesity – throughout the text. In chapter 2 and under the sub-section 2c on emerging challenges and looking ahead, the importance of reshaping our food systems to support healthy diets in a sustainable way should be incorporated, as well as the emerging pandemic of overweight and obesity that is increasingly challenging our global food systems.

### QUESTION 1:

We fully support the inclusion and appropriate referencing of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the outcomes of the Second International Conference on Nutrition in Chapter 3 of the GSF. The section on the MDGs should be replaced by a section on the SDGs and the 2030 Agenda. Throughout the document references to the MDGs should be replaced, as appropriate, with the transformative and universal character of the SDGs that include all countries and all people on our planet.

We would propose that the following additional frameworks and plans are included in the new GSF:

- The WHO Comprehensive Implementation Plan on Maternal, Infant and Young Child Nutrition (WHO 2013): This includes the six global nutrition targets: reduction of child stunting and wasting and no increase in childhood overweight by 2025; reduction of low birth weight; reduction of maternal anaemia and increase of breastfeeding. Furthermore, this plan outlines priority action areas, including the creation of a supportive environment for the implementation of comprehensive food and nutrition policies. The proposed activities call for the harmonization of policies and actions through the WHA as well as through the CFS and ECOSOC.
- The WHO Global Action Plan for the Prevention and Control of Noncommunicable Diseases 2013-2020 (WHO 2014): As stated in there, Enabling environments are important and

agriculture is one key factor in this: Support national authorities to create enabling environments to reduce modifiable risk factors of noncommunicable disease through health-promoting policies in agriculture, food, trade, transport and urban planning and other sectors.

QUESTION 2:

Regarding the criteria for additional references, their nature should be global frameworks, plans etc. They should be adopted by an intergovernmental body (such as WHA, CFS, UNGA etc), they should be relevant to and address food security and nutrition.

QUESTION 3:

Chapter 4, we support the proposed that 'minor technical updates' of the text to be made. However, we suggest that this revision should ensure that the GSF addresses malnutrition in all its forms. With this regard, the section G on nutrition should be revised based on the ICN2 outcomes, the SDGs and the above mentioned global plans on nutrition. This should also recognise the current work of the OEWG on Nutrition. For this update the already agreed language from the ICN2 outcome documents should be used. Where appropriate, addressing all forms of malnutrition and more attention to the prevention of noncommunicable diseases should be mainstreamed throughout the GSF document.

QUESTIONS 4 AND 5:

We are in support of the proposal to create an interactive online version of the GSF.

QUESTION 6:

The SDGs are in nature very different from the MDGs. We suggest that all references to MDGs should be deleted in the text, and replaced with the innovative and universal character of the SDGs.