

High Level Task Force on the Global Food Security Crisis

**UPDATED
COMPREHENSIVE FRAMEWORK FOR ACTION**

September 2010

HIGH-LEVEL TASK FORCE ON THE GLOBAL FOOD SECURITY CRISIS

**UPDATED
COMPREHENSIVE FRAMEWORK FOR ACTION**

September 2010

UPDATED
COMPREHENSIVE FRAMEWORK FOR ACTION
September 2010

UN High Level Task Force on the Global Food Security Crisis

Chair: Mr. Ban Ki-moon, United Nations Secretary-General

Vice-Chair: Mr. Jacques Diouf, Director-General, Food and Agriculture Organization

Food and Agriculture Organization (**FAO**)

International Fund for Agricultural Development (**IFAD**)

International Labour Organization (**ILO**)

International Monetary Fund (**IMF**)

Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (**UNHCR**)

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (**OECD**)

Special Adviser on Millennium Development Goals (**MDGs**)

United Nations Children's Fund (**UNICEF**)

United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (**UNCTAD**)

United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (**DESA**)

United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations (**DPKO**)

United Nations Department of Political Affairs (**DPA**)

United Nations Department of Public Information (**DPI**)

United Nations Development Programme (**UNDP**)

United Nations Environment Programme (**UNEP**)

United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (**OCHA**)

United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (**OHCHR**)

United Nations Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries,

Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States (**OHRLLS**)

World Bank (**WB**)

World Food Programme (**WFP**)

World Health Organization (**WHO**)

World Trade Organization (**WTO**)

Coordinator: Dr. David Nabarro, Special Representative of the UN Secretary-General for Food Security and Nutrition

UNITED NATIONS



NATIONS UNIES

THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

--

**MESSAGE FOR UPDATED COMPREHENSIVE FRAMEWORK FOR ACTION
ON FOOD SECURITY**

August 2010

As chair of the High-Level Task Force on the Global Food Security Crisis, I am pleased to share with you the Updated Comprehensive Framework for Action.

This Updated Framework is the result of a collaborative effort by the 22 member organizations of the Task Force. Their work has been enriched by comments received from Member States, civil society organizations and UN Country Teams, and has benefited from a spirited dialogue in Dublin in May.

The Updated Framework reaffirms the importance of a comprehensive approach to food and nutrition security that incorporates availability of food, as well as its access, utilization and sustainability. It also puts forward recommendations for meeting the immediate needs of vulnerable populations as well as longer-term strategies for lasting impacts. Small scale producers – farmers, fishermen and pastoralists – and the plight of women – remain at the Framework's core.

Although there is no room for complacency, I am encouraged by the progress that has been achieved since the original CFA was published in June 2008. Numerous governments, international institutions, regional bodies, non-governmental organizations and private sector entities have joined a global effort to strengthen agricultural development and improve food and nutrition security. These stakeholders have made promising political and financial commitments.

Sustaining this political momentum and securing additional financial resources will be crucial as we move ahead. Transparency and accountability must also be among our touchstones. I look forward to working with all partners – and above all with the millions of families affected most severely from hunger and malnutrition – for tangible, sustainable results. This is one of the most critical challenges of our time. It is my hope that the Updated CFA will stimulate a coordinated, comprehensive and effective response.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Ki-moon Ban".
BAN Ki-moon

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Acronyms	ix
FOREWORD	xi
A. CONTEXT ANALYSIS	1
1. Causes of food insecurity and undernutrition: current situation and future risks	2
2. Strategies for improving food and nutrition security	3
3. New opportunities for long-term improvements in food and nutrition security	5
B. OUTCOMES AND ACTIONS	7
1. Meeting immediate needs of vulnerable populations	8
1.1 Emergency food assistance, nutrition interventions and safety nets enhanced and made more accessible	8
1.2 Urgent increases in food availability from smallholder farmer food production	12
1.3 Adjustments to trade and tax policies	15
1.4 Management of macroeconomic implications	17
2. Building longer-term resilience and contributing to global food and nutrition security	19
2.1 Expanded social protection systems	20
2.2 Sustained increases in food availability through growth in smallholder farmer food production	22
2.3 Better-managed ecosystems for food and nutrition security	26
2.4 Improved performance of international food markets	28
3. Supporting information and accountability systems	32
3.1 Strengthened information monitoring and accountability systems	32
C. ACHIEVING UCFA OUTCOMES	35
1. Partnerships at country level	35
2. Partnership at regional level	38
3. Partnerships at global level	39
4. Synergized working and cooperation	41
5. Investing in food and nutrition security	42
Annex A: Topic Boxes	44
Food Assistance	
<i>Topic Box 1: Local Food Purchase</i>	44
<i>Topic Box 2: Fisheries, Aquaculture and Food Security for the Poor</i>	44
Social Protection	
<i>Topic Box 3: Food and Nutrition Security for the Urban Poor and Balanced Regional Growth</i>	45
<i>Topic Box 4: Social Safety Net Programmes</i>	46
<i>Topic Box 5: Social Protection, Productive Employment and Decent Work</i>	46
Smallholder Farmer Food Production and Value Chain	
<i>Topic Box 6: Sustainable Food Production Systems: Soil Fertility, and Integrated Soil, Land and Water Management</i>	47
<i>Topic Box 7: Development of Private Sector Market Linkages With Smallholders and the Rural Poor</i>	48
<i>Topic Box 8: Large-scale Land Acquisitions</i>	48
<i>Topic Box 9: Rehabilitate Rural And Agricultural Infrastructure</i>	50
<i>Topic Box 10: Reducing Post-Harvest Losses</i>	51
<i>Topic Box 11: Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs)</i>	52

Ecosystems	
<i>Topic Box 12: Inter-linkages between Food and Nutrition Security and Ecosystems</i>	52
International Food Markets and Trade	
<i>Topic Box 13: Food Sovereignty</i>	53
<i>Topic Box 14: Agriculture in International Trade Agreements</i>	54
<i>Topic Box 15: Inflation and Food Prices</i>	54
Information, Monitoring and Analysis Systems	
<i>Topic Box 16: Information Monitoring and Analysis Work Underway</i>	55
<i>Topic Box 17: Progressive Realization of the Right to Food: How does it work in practice?</i>	56
<i>Topic Box 18: Indicators to Assess Access to and Utilization of Food</i>	57
Annex B: Increasing International Consensus on Biofuel Production and Use	60
Annex C: Main Actions by the United Nations and Bretton Woods Institutions to Address Food and Nutrition Security	63

List of Acronyms

AfDB	African Development Bank
AFSI	L'Aquila Food Security Initiative
ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
CA	Conservation Agriculture
CAADP	Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme
CFA	Comprehensive Framework on Action
CFS	Committee on World Food Security
CSD	Commission for Sustainable Development
CSOs	Civil Society Organizations
FAC	Food Aid Convention
FDI	Foreign Direct Investment
GAfSP	Global Agriculture and Food Security Programme
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GPAFSN	Global Partnership for Agriculture, Food Security and Nutrition
GMOs	Genetically Modified Organisms
GSF	Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition
HLPE	High Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition
HLTF	United Nations System High Level Task Force on the Global Food Security Crisis
IAASTD	International Assessment of Agricultural Knowledge, Science and Technology for Development
ICESCR	International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights
ICT	Information and communication technology
IFPRI	International Food Policy Research Institute
IFC	International Finance Corporation
IPM	Integrated pest management
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
NGOs	Nongovernmental Organizations
ODA	Official Development Assistance
PRGF	Poverty Reduction and Growth Facility
SUN	Scaling-up Nutrition: A Framework for Action
UCFA	Updated Comprehensive Framework for Action
UNCEB	United Nations Chief Executives Board
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNSCN	United Nations Standing Committee on Nutrition
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

FOREWORD

The United Nations System High Level Task Force on the Global Food Security Crisis (HLTF) was established in April 2008. It developed the first Comprehensive Framework for Action (CFA) in July 2008 when the world was being rocked by spiralling food prices that led to increased hunger, social tension and distress for millions of poor households. The CFA was designed to encourage concerted responses to the food price crisis with actions that respond to the immediate needs of vulnerable populations and contribute to longer-term resilience (the twin track approach). Progress by the HLTF against these outcomes has been documented in an annual progress report available on www.un-foodsecurity.org.

Following the release of the CFA there was increasing consensus on the policies and investments needed for sustained improvement in food and nutrition security along the lines of the CFA outcomes. The two tracks are still distinct, but they have evolved. Governments increasingly appreciate the importance of the first track to ensure predictable support for households in difficulty. Household members (especially women and children) may be unable to access the food and nutrients they need because of violence and warfare, climatic events and natural disasters, loss of assets, unemployment, changing market conditions or inability to work because of accident or illness. Given these multiple demands, low-cost and effective social protection systems are a challenge to implement, especially when budgets are tight.

The second track is also challenging. How to stimulate longer-term productive capacity, resilience and earning opportunities through investments that prioritize the interests of smallholder farmers, especially women, and which lead to improvements in both livelihoods and nutritional status? How to help them to obtain the agricultural inputs they need in a predictable way and enable them to increase their share of the value derived from their produce as it is stored, transported, processed and marketed? There is little appetite for long-term subsidies that favour smallholders: the emphasis is on encouraging self-reliance despite the challenges posed by volatile prices, unpredictable access to land, water, agricultural inputs and markets, and — in the context of the current recession — impediments to intercontinental trade.

In 2009 and 2010, the significance of a comprehensive approach to food and nutrition security was more widely understood, given that communities where overall food production had increased still experienced high levels of child undernutrition. There has also been an increasing recognition that viable ecosystems provide the basis for long-term food security. They are increasingly being factored into immediate and longer-term planning. The potential impacts of climate change, including extreme climate events, on agricultural production, and the need for adaptation and mitigation measures, have been given particular attention, and call for robust inter-agency collaboration.

Since the creation of the HLTF and release of the CFA in 2008 there has been a massive effort to encourage greater investment in food and nutrition security. The case for an increase in funding for comprehensive approaches to food security continues to be made. Governments have increased the share of national budgets being spent on agricultural development and food security. The combination of coordinated policy advice, carefully developed plans, intensive appraisal, sound project management, improved financial control and audit systems has encouraged the mobilization of additional external support from development partners, including development banks, donor agencies and private foundations. This is a remarkable turnaround after two decades in which spending on agriculture and food security had reached an all-time low.

How did this happen? Towards the end of 2008 and early in 2009 major donors — including the European Commission, Spain and the United States — indicated that if the opportunities were right they would be prepared to increase their investment in food and nutrition security. Positive signals included (a) synergy within the international system achieved through the HLTF's improved coordination at global and country level, (b) the work of the African Union (together with Africa's Regional Economic Commissions) through the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development

Programme (CAADP) to stimulate multi-stakeholder efforts for formulating country and sub-regional compacts and investment plans, and (c) the joint efforts by CAADP and donors to coordinate national government, development bank, donor, private sector and civil society engagement in developing investment plans.

As the months evolved the African Union and Regional Commissions, the European Union, bilateral donors, development banks, the G8 and G20, with consistent support from the UN Secretary-General and HLTF members, worked together on options for increased investment in food and nutrition security. There was a remarkable convergence of ideas around (a) the intention for a major scale-up in national and international investment for food and nutrition security, (b) the set of principles that would underlie this increased investment and (c) the means through which the investment would be planned and managed — building on existing processes where these could be shown to work. There was increased donor confidence in the potential for national-level food security partnerships to be supported through the coordination — and, in some cases, pooling — of funds, using existing operating procedures at country level. At the 2009 L’Aquila G8 Summit heads of state of twenty-six nations and representatives of fourteen international and regional organizations adopted a coordinated and comprehensive approach to food and nutrition insecurity. They pledged a substantial increase in development assistance for effective long-term responses, and the “L’Aquila Food Security Initiative” (AFSI) is now being implemented. In November 2009 the World Summit on Food Security, in Rome built on the AFSI approach with the adoption of the “Five Rome Principles for Sustainable Global Food Security”. Particular emphasis is given to principle one: *invest in country-owned plans, aimed at channeling resources to well designed and results-based programmes and partnerships.*

In September 2009 heads of the G20 – meeting in Pittsburgh – called for a mechanism to respond to national food security investment plans with predictable access to pooled funds through transparent procedures. The Global Agriculture and Food Security Programme (GAFSP), which reflects the five Rome Principles, was established as an element of AFSI early in 2010.

During the last two years the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) has been revitalized so that it has the membership, powers and opportunities needed to fully support the actors and processes that contribute to food and nutrition security. This can only encourage greater policy convergence based on best practices, lessons of experience and the potential of multi-stakeholder partnerships.

It is within this promising context that — towards the end of 2009 — the HLTF asked that the CFA be updated to better reflect ways in which UN System bodies advise the national authorities and numerous other stakeholders engaged in promoting food and nutrition security. Those charged with this task have concluded that the CFA’s analysis and emphases are as relevant now as they were in 2008 when it was first produced. However, policymakers still face challenges as they seek ways to link agriculture, food security, rural employment, social protection, better nutrition, climate change and humanitarian action. The Updated CFA (UCFA) hopes to inspire even more efforts for coordinated and synergized action, and the realization of agreed outcomes.

Still based on the twin track approach, the UCFA covers a wider range of issues and contains a more detailed treatment of all aspects of food and nutrition security than its predecessor. It prioritizes environmental sustainability, gender equity, the prerequisites for improved nutrition and the needs of those least able to enjoy their right to food. It acknowledges that, while States have the primary role in ensuring food and nutrition security for all, a multiplicity of other actors have vital contributions to make.

This updating would not have been possible without the active involvement of, and constructive comments from, stakeholders from governments, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), civil society organizations (CSOs), smallholder farmers’ organizations and the private sector. The HLTF would like to extend its thanks and gratitude to all.

Millennium Development Goal 1: Eradicate Extreme Poverty and Hunger

Declarations of High-Level Conferences on Food and Nutrition Security

UN CEB Communiqué on UN response to the Global Food Crisis

UPDATED COMPREHENSIVE FRAMEWORK FOR ACTION

<p>OBJECTIVE Improve access to food and nutrition support and take immediate steps to increase food availability</p>	<p>U R G E N T S I M U L T A N E O U S</p>	<p>OBJECTIVE Strengthen food and nutrition security in the longer-term by addressing the underlying factors driving the food crisis</p>
<p>OUTCOMES 1. MEETING IMMEDIATE NEEDS OF VULNERABLE POPULATIONS</p> <p>1.1 Emergency food assistance, nutrition interventions and safety nets enhanced and made more accessible</p> <p>1.2 Urgent increases in food availability from smallholder farmer food production</p> <p>1.3 Adjustments to trade and tax policies</p> <p>1.4 Management of macroeconomic implications</p>		<p>OUTCOMES 2. BUILDING LONGER-TERM RESILIENCE AND CONTRIBUTING TO GLOBAL FOOD AND NUTRITION SECURITY</p> <p>2.1 Expanded social protection systems</p> <p>2.2 Sustained increases in food availability through growth in smallholder farmer food production</p> <p>2.3 Better-managed ecosystems for food and nutrition security</p> <p>2.4 Improved performance of international food markets</p>

3. SUPPORTING INFORMATION AND ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEMS
3.1. Strengthened information monitoring and accountability systems

ACHIEVING UCFA OUTCOMES

Country and Regional Levels

- Reflect joint working in country and regional level partnerships
- Undertake regular assessments
- Build on and strengthen existing mechanisms and programmes
- Consolidate actions to avoid overlaps, fill gaps and attain objectives
- Review (and install, if required) monitoring mechanisms to track food and nutrition security outcomes
- Promote effective public communication and encourage public participation in decision-making

Global Level

- Track achievement of UCFA outcomes
- Ensure regular reporting, monitoring and evaluation
- Support effective action in countries
- Advocate funding for urgent action and long-term investment
- Inspire a broad engagement by multiple stakeholders
- Improve accountability of the international system

A. CONTEXT ANALYSIS

1. *Food and nutrition security*¹: Food security exists when all people, at all times, have physical, social and economic access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food which meets their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life. Food insecurity exists when people do not have adequate physical, social or economic access to food as defined above. Food security therefore covers availability, access, utilization and stability issues, and — because of its focus on the attributes of individuals — also embraces their energy, protein and nutrient needs for life, activity, pregnancy, growth and long-term capabilities.

2. *2008–2010: Two crises and their impacts affecting food and nutrition security*: The Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and the World Food Programme (WFP) reported in their 2009 publication “The State of Food Insecurity in the World” (SOFI 2009) that— for the first time since 1970 — more than one billion people (around one-sixth of all of humanity) are hungry and undernourished worldwide. At the same time, as many as two billion people suffer from a range of micronutrient deficiencies, including vitamin A, iron and iodine deficiencies. Several factors converged to make 2009 particularly damaging to people at risk of food insecurity.

- i) The world was faced by two crises at the same time. The first was a food crisis that in 2006–2008 pushed the prices of basic staples beyond the reach of millions of poor people. This strained the already limited ability of poor households to buy food. Many families were especially vulnerable to the rising prices as they were net food buyers. The rise in food prices did not always translate into an increase in farmers’ incomes due to ill-functioning markets.
- ii) Higher food prices can be beneficial for smallholders. They increase incentives for long-term investments in agriculture. At the same time, smallholders, landless labourers and other poor households use much of their income to purchase food. The 2008 spikes pushed food prices beyond the purchasing power of many: high prices forced many poor families to sell assets or make sacrifices in health care, education and/or food consumption just to stay afloat. Although prices have retreated from their mid-2008 highs, they remain elevated by recent historical standards, and they are volatile. In mid-2009, domestic staple food prices were, on average, 19 percent higher in real terms than three years earlier.
- iii) The second crisis was a breakdown of world financial systems in 2009 that affected all nations and reduced the capacity of developing country finance ministers to act in ways reflecting the needs of their poorer populations. With their resources stretched to breaking point, households found it difficult to ride out the economic storm. The financial and economic crisis was not easy to handle because of its magnitude and spread, which affected large parts of the world simultaneously.
- iv) An impact of these crises is the resulting damage to the economies of nations that are financially and commercially dependent on the world economy. They experienced the effects of economic contraction, with an associated cut-back in export markets and a shortage of credit. Many countries experienced across-the-board drops in their trade and financial inflows, and saw falls in their export

¹ “The State of Food Insecurity 2001”, FAO, Rome, 2002. This definition is based on a paper prepared by Edward Clay of the Overseas Development Institute, London, UK, for the FAO Expert Consultation on Trade and Food Security: Conceptualizing the Linkages, Rome, 11 – 12 July 2002. The definition has evolved over time. In 1974 food security was defined in terms of the volume and stability of food supplies (“availability at all times of adequate world food supplies of basic foodstuffs to sustain a steady expansion of food consumption and to offset fluctuations in production and prices”). In 1983, the concept was expanded to cover securing access by vulnerable people to available supplies: “ensuring that all people at all times have both physical and economic access to the basic food that they need”. In 1986, the World Bank report “Poverty and Hunger: issues and options for food security in developing countries” introduced the widely accepted distinction between chronic food insecurity — associated with problems of continuing or structural poverty and low incomes — and transitory food insecurity, which involved periods of intensified pressure caused by natural disasters, economic collapse or conflict. This concept of food security is further elaborated in terms of: “access of all people at all times to enough food for an active, healthy life”. This definition was agreed to at the 1996 World Food Summit in FAO, Rome.

earnings, inward investment by foreign enterprises, receipts of development aid, remittances from citizens living abroad and income from taxes.

3. Faced with the effects of economic contraction, households have had to make undesirable but often unavoidable compromises — such as replacing more-nutritious with less-nutritious food, selling productive assets, withdrawing children from school, forgoing health care or education, skipping meals and eating less. Based on direct interviews with people who are most affected by food insecurity, country case studies conducted by WFP² have revealed how households are affected by the fall in remittances and other impacts of the economic downturn. The case studies also show how governments are responding to the crisis by investing in agriculture and infrastructure and expanding both social protection schemes and safety nets for those in distress.

1. CAUSES OF FOOD INSECURITY AND UNDERNUTRITION: CURRENT SITUATION AND FUTURE RISKS

4. *Structural factors and market failures:* In the last two decades many countries have successfully promoted food security with — in some cases — discernable improvements in the nutritional status of vulnerable people. However, the two crises have confirmed inadequacies in the structure and functioning of food systems that prevented these from withstanding the impact of successive shocks and from improving food security in a sustainable manner. This reflects (a) increasing inequalities in access to and control over productive resources, in particular land and water; (b) policies that undermine smallholder tenure security; (c) decades of under-investment in agriculture (particularly smallholder-based production and processing systems), rural development and infrastructure; (d) inconsistent attention to the effective operation of markets for food, and trading systems; and (e) lack of support for safety nets and social protection systems.

5. *Price volatility:* Poorer people are particularly affected by fluctuations in the prices of food, as well as costs of inputs and transport. Price volatility also poses a threat to national authorities, who are often obliged to adopt unplanned and extra-budget interventions in the food and agriculture sector in an effort to stabilize prices. Increased price volatility tends to divert resources away from agriculture development. Even though prices have dropped since the 2008 peak and economic systems are recuperating, domestic commodity prices in many developing countries have often stayed high. Volatile prices add to the difficulties faced by farmers when making choices about what crops to grow, livestock to rear or new ventures to undertake, and result in increased levels of food insecurity among poor people. Volatility also undermines confidence in global systems to maintain prices and secure supplies in times of need.

6. *Vulnerabilities:* The food price and the financial and economic crises revealed that different groups of poor people are particularly vulnerable to the impact of crisis situations. These include the nearly half a billion small-scale food producers and millions of waged agricultural workers (usually employed as casual labourers) who help produce the food on which we all depend, as well as poor people in urban areas whose purchasing power also depends on their ability to earn an income. Vulnerabilities are particularly pronounced in countries experiencing (or recovering from) breakdowns in political systems, civil strife and/or warfare.

7. *Challenges faced by women:* Women are responsible for about half of the world's food production: they produce between 60 and 80 percent of the food in most developing countries. They constitute the majority of smallholder farmers in developing countries. Women also play a key role in the livestock, fisheries and aquaculture activities. In spite of their significant contribution to agricultural growth, women face many constraints that limit their ability to ensure food and nutrition security for themselves, as well as within their households and communities. In some cases, discriminatory practices prevent them from accessing natural

² Reported in SOFI, "The State of Food Insecurity", FAO/WFP, publication 2009

resources (especially land and water), technology, training and extension facilities, marketing services and credit. Such practices may limit their ability to participate in decision-making.

8. *Need for better governance*: Good governance for food and nutrition security is fundamentally about national governments prioritizing policies, plans, programs and funding to tackle hunger, malnutrition and food insecurity in the most vulnerable populations, whether it be through humanitarian or development assistance, nationally, bilaterally or multilaterally. The current scenario has exposed the fragility of global mechanisms for food and nutrition security. Existing systems for resource mobilization and allocation do not respond rapidly, predictably or adequately enough to the food and nutritional needs of poor people when they are affected by substantial external shocks. In addition, persistent levels of undernutrition affecting more than 25 percent of the world's children under 5 years of age underscore the fundamental weaknesses in the world's response to defeat hunger. The effort to overcome its structural causes calls for convergent policies, strategies and programmes that give urgent priority to meeting both long-term needs and emergency requests for food and nutrition security. Successful pursuit of these objectives requires across-government support, political will and long-term coordinated actions. Interventions need to be properly financed and benefit from adequate capacities both to implement them and monitor their impact. The need to strengthen food security governance has now been recognized and is receiving attention at global, regional and country levels. Its reform must build on the best of existing structures (and dispense with the elements that are just not working).

9. *Future risks*: Within many developing countries, anxiety about high food prices and intense competition over land, water and transport capacity has already increased the risks of civil unrest, political instability, displacement of people and migration across borders. Unstable energy prices, continued food price volatility, and lack of infrastructure for market access create a context in which farmers find it difficult to operate profitably and meet their own food security needs. Increased global demands for food (due to population growth) within the context of limited land, water and other natural resources, combined with the impact of climate change on agricultural production and food systems, will increase the risks of food insecurity for smallholder households. Those unable to access land or employment are at greatest risk and should be prioritized for protection, especially during times of crisis.

2. STRATEGIES FOR IMPROVING FOOD AND NUTRITION SECURITY

10. *The twin track Updated Comprehensive Framework for Action*: This Updated CFA sets out ways in which the HLTF can support food and nutrition security policies in a coordinated way. The UCFA is presented in two tracks: (a) meeting the immediate food and nutritional needs of vulnerable people and (b) building longer-term resilience and contributing to global food and nutrition security. Given the evolution of national and international strategies for food and nutrition security since 2008, it is evident that several areas need additional emphasis.

- i. *Agriculture as an engine for development*: There is now a trend towards investing in agriculture as an engine for economic development. This approach — strongly fostered, within Africa, by the African Union — usually involves increased government spending on agriculture, infrastructure (for inputs and marketing) and the encouragement of private investments, including foreign direct investment in food production, post-harvest storage, processing and marketing. It also includes investment in food and agricultural science, technology and knowledge development and transfer — in ways that take account of, and respond to, the needs of smallholder farmers. It encourages the organization of smallholder farmers and agriculture workers in the elaboration and implementation of national plan for food and nutrition security so they can better participate in the new investments. In this context, policies enhancing secure and equitable access to and ownership of productive resources (especially land, water and seeds) are key for unleashing the full potential of smallholder farming and other artisanal food production systems, such as small-scale fishing and livestock.

- ii. *Smallholder farming, pastoralism and environmental sustainability:* There is a need for urgent attention to ways in which agriculture can contribute to environmental sustainability³ and mitigate climate change through new patterns of agricultural and livestock development. Long-term food and nutrition security policies need to recognize that smallholder farmers who are currently food insecure, are likely to be hard hit by climate change and other environmental shocks, because they farm and rear on marginalized land and depend on erratic rainfall. Hence nations are investing in policies for disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation to help those at risk increase the resilience of their cropping and livestock systems. These policies include access to diverse and flexible water tenure systems to mitigate the impact of climate change, particularly for users of the commons, such as the millions of indigenous peoples, fisherfolk and pastoralists. The latter tend to keep their flocks on marginal lands, earn their livelihoods through livestock rearing, and are particularly vulnerable to climatic shocks (droughts and floods), mobility restrictions and limited access to scarce resources (water and grazing land).
- iii. *Safety nets, social protection and nutrition:* More attention is now being given to the needs of those who lack the necessary purchasing power for food and nutrition security through extra emphasis on social protection and safety nets — especially for people with very limited access to land. They can be helped through employment guarantee programmes (accompanied by legal protection regarding worker compensation and minimum wages) and through interventions for better nutrition and dietary diversity. Exploitation of migrants and child labour must also be addressed.
- iv. *Strengthened multilateral trading systems:* Trade can assist developing countries in meeting their developmental goals. Enhanced market opportunities — by way of reductions in trade barriers⁴ and elimination of trade-distorting support to agriculture — are being pursued through trade negotiations. An effective system for special treatment of developing countries is integral to the current negotiations. A strengthened and reformed international agricultural trading system should result in increased trade for all on the basis of comparative cost advantages, and not be influenced by subsidies and distortions. There is widespread interest in ensuring that trade reforms contribute to (a) reductions in food and nutrition insecurity of the most vulnerable populations and (b) the realization of internationally agreed human rights.
- v. *Policy options for scaling up nutrition:* Specific actions to improve nutrition security are described in “Scaling Up Nutrition: A Framework for Action” (also called the SUN Framework)⁵. This Framework encourages investment in development strategies that will contribute to better nutrition within all societies (“nutrition-sensitive development”), combined with universal access to a range of tried and tested interventions that directly contribute to less undernutrition, especially among pregnant women, children under the age of two and persons affected by illness or distress (“nutrition-specific interventions”). Care should be taken to ensure that hard-to-reach populations can access the interventions that are being offered. In this regard a Road Map for implementing the SUN Framework was prepared in September 2010.
- vi. *Ensuring that women are at the centre of action for food and nutrition security:* There is increased appreciation of the need for food and nutrition security strategies to take account of the challenges

³ The 17th Commission for Sustainable Development (CSD) calls for increased emphasis on sustainable agriculture with mutually beneficial linkages among small- and large-scale agricultural enterprises.

⁴ Especially on products of export interest to developing countries, including through duty-free and quota-free access to exports from the least developed countries.

⁵ The SUN Framework was prepared with financial support from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, the Government of Japan, United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) and the World Bank. It is based on a series of consultations hosted by the Center for Global Development, the European Commission, the International Congress of Nutrition (ICN), United Nations Standing Committee on Nutrition (SCN), United States Agency for International Development (USAID), UNICEF, World Health Organization (WHO) and the World Bank. Many developing country partners, CSOs, bilateral partners, UN and multilateral agencies have contributed to this effort.

faced by women — as farmers, food processors, consumers, marketers, managers of household resources and as household carers. Among the most important determinants of young children's nutrition are the time available for women to feed their children under age 2 years (particularly to breastfeed them in the first six months of life), and the variety and nutrient density of the food they are able to offer them. Secure access to land is a lifeline for all poor people, and especially for women. It enables women to increase farm-level investment, improve overall productivity and negotiate and guarantee food and nutrition security in the household. The Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) highlights the rights of women in this context and provides practical guidance on their realization.

- vii. *A human rights based approach*: The global food security crisis has revealed the extent to which the world's people are unable to enjoy their right to food⁶ — to be able to access adequate food or the means for its procurement at all times. An increasing number of countries have moved to use the right to food as a framework for the design, implementation and evaluation of national laws, policies and programmes. The legally binding International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), as well as the “Voluntary guidelines to support the progressive realization of the right to adequate food in the context of national food security”⁷ adopted by FAO Council in 2004, offer policies and practical guidance for this approach. They provide also a reference framework for civil society, private sector and government institutions in the development of their programmes.
- viii. *Indicators for measuring progress*: Bodies within the HLTF are joining efforts with other stakeholders to agree on indicators that will help measure progress in relation to UCFA outcomes. This work will be given increasing attention during 2010 and 2011.

3. NEW OPPORTUNITIES FOR LONG-TERM IMPROVEMENTS IN FOOD AND NUTRITION SECURITY

11. *Stronger partnerships, better institutions and improved governance*: To implement comprehensive strategies for food and nutrition security stakeholders at international, national and community levels are seeking stronger partnerships, better-functioning institutions and renewed governance. Multiple actors seek ways to work in synergy and create an enabling framework for investing in resilient food systems. This convergence has encouraged significant increases in funding for food and nutrition security, and revitalization of governance and institutions to this end.

12. A global partnership for agriculture and food was proposed at the High-Level Conference on World Food Security: the Challenges of Climate Change and Bioenergy (FAO, June 2008) and at the G8 Summit in Japan (July 2008, Hokkaido-Toyako, Leaders Statement on Global Food Security). The concept was expanded to include food and nutrition security at the Madrid High-Level Meeting on Food Security for All (January 2009). Discussions continued at the FAO Conference in November 2008 and the G8+ L'Aquila Summit in July 2009 where, in addition, US\$ 22 billion were pledged for food security. At the 2010 G8 Summit in Muskoka, G8 Leaders announced that US\$ 6.5 billion of the L'Aquila pledge had been disbursed and committed to disburse the rest by 2012.

⁶ According to Art.11 of the ICESCR, ratified by 160 States, every human being has the right to adequate food and the fundamental right to be free from hunger. This means that every man, woman and child has a right to access at all times affordable adequate food or means for its procurement, without needing to compromise the enjoyment of other human rights. Adequate food means food which is of sufficient quantity and quality to satisfy the dietary needs of individuals, free from adverse substances and acceptable within a given culture. The human right to adequate food is also recognized under Art. 25 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Some of the Member States who are not party to the ICESCR share the objective of a world where everyone is food secure but do not treat the right to food as a formal enforceable obligation. They also do not concur with any interpretation of this issue which suggests that states have particular extra-territorial obligations arising from a right to food.

⁷ Available at: http://www.fao.org/righttofood/publi_01_en.htm.

13. In November 2009, the World Summit on Food Security in Rome adopted the “**Five Rome Principles for Sustainable Global Food Security**” based on the “L’Aquila Joint Statement on Global Food Security” issued at the G8+ Summit 2009:

Principle 1: Invest in country-owned plans, aimed at channelling resources to well-designed and results-based programmes and partnerships.

Principle 2: Foster strategic coordination at national, regional and global level to improve governance, promote better allocation of resources, avoid duplication of efforts and identify response gaps.

Principle 3: Strive for a comprehensive twin-track approach to food security that consists of: 1) direct action to immediately tackle hunger for the most vulnerable and 2) medium- and long-term sustainable agricultural, food security, nutrition and rural development programmes to eliminate the root causes of hunger and poverty, including the progressive realization of the right to adequate food.

Principle 4: Ensure a strong role for the multilateral system by sustained improvements in efficiency, responsiveness, coordination and effectiveness of multilateral institutions.

Principle 5: Ensure sustained and substantial commitment by all partners to investment in agriculture and food and nutrition security, with the provision of necessary resources in a timely and reliable fashion, aimed at multi-year plans and programmes.

These serve as a basis for turning political commitments into action and outcomes at community level.

14. *Changing governance of food security and nutrition:* Member States of the United Nations are reforming the CFS⁸ so that it can serve as the foremost international and intergovernmental platform at the heart of the Global Partnership for Agriculture, Food Security and Nutrition (GPAFSN). Strengthened by greater inclusiveness and continuous action, the reformed CFS is to (a) coordinate a global approach to food security, (b) promote policy convergence, (c) support, advise and coordinate actions at national and regional levels, (d) promote accountability and the sharing of best practices, (e) receive scientific guidance from the High Level Panel of Experts (HLPE) on Food Security and Nutrition and (f) develop a Global Strategic Framework (GSF) for food security and nutrition. Member States expect similar attention to the revitalized governance of national food and nutrition systems, both to ensure food security of their citizens and to participate in the changing global governance of food security.

15. *Private sector action to reduce food insecurity:* In November 2009, representatives of private entities committed to food security attended a side event held as part of the preparation for the World Summit on Food Security. They emphasized their desire to help increase farmer productivity and their wish to help smallholders derive benefit from quality improvements, processing and marketing. Over the last 12 months consumer industry partners of the World Economic Forum (WEF) have contributed through regional consultations in Africa and Asia to develop a “New Vision for Agriculture”. With this initiative they seek to enhance public-private partnerships to accelerate growth of sustainable agriculture calling on collaboration among national governments, farmers and intergovernmental bodies. This initiative receives advisory support from the Global Agenda Council for Food and Nutrition Security chaired by the President of the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD).

16. *Increasing partnerships:* It is hoped that partnerships, policy coherence and synergized working will be pursued by a growing number of stakeholders, including governments, regional and international bodies, organizations of farmers and labourers, food producers, NGOs and civil society, philanthropic organizations, local authorities and research institutions. This will enable the evolution of participatory approaches to food and nutrition security in ways that integrate the technical, financial and human resources required to meet both the needs of the population and the demands of national strategies (*see section C*).

⁸ See <http://www.fao.org/cfs/en>

B. OUTCOMES AND ACTIONS

1. MEETING IMMEDIATE NEEDS OF VULNERABLE POPULATIONS

Objective: Improve access to food and nutrition support and take immediate steps to increase food availability

Outcomes and Actions

1.1 Emergency food assistance, nutrition interventions and safety nets enhanced and made more accessible

- Ensure that emergency food needs are fully met
- Protect basic consumption needs of vulnerable populations
- Scale up nutritional support
- Support management and prevention of undernutrition
- Promote school feeding
- Adjust social protection programmes for food prices
- Allow free and predictable flow of food assistance
- Ensure that local purchases of food and food components for humanitarian purposes are exempt from restrictions
- Explore the establishment of efficient and effective humanitarian food reserves
- Reach all households with pertinent public information on food assistance, nutrition and hardship alleviation programmes

1.2 Urgent increases in food availability from smallholder farmer food production

- Provide productivity-enhancing safety nets
- Reduce post-harvest crop losses and improve food stocks along the value chain
- Remove artificial constraints to domestic trade throughout the food chain in order to link smallholder farmers to markets
- Address basic energy needs of smallholders and rural households

1.3 Adjustments to trade and tax policies

- Encourage better functioning food markets through improved regional political and economic integration and better functioning environments for trade in food
- Immediately review trade and taxation policy options and their likely impacts
- Use limited strategic grain reserves
- Avoid generalized subsidies for food consumers
- Minimize use of export restrictions
- Reduce restrictions on use of stocks
- Reduce import tariffs and other restrictions
- Improve efficiency of trade facilitation
- Temporarily reduce VAT and other taxes

1.4 Management of macroeconomic implications

- Hold down core inflation and inflation expectations
- Assess the impact on the balance of payments and feasibility/sustainability of a reserve drawdown
- Mobilize external support to finance additional food imports
- Ensure adequate levels of foreign exchange reserves
- Assess and comprehensively cost all fiscal measures taken in response to the rise in food prices

2. BUILDING LONGER-TERM RESILIENCE AND CONTRIBUTING TO GLOBAL FOOD AND NUTRITION SECURITY

Objective: Strengthen food and nutrition security in the longer term by addressing the underlying factors driving the food crisis

Outcomes and Actions

2.1 Expanded social protection systems

- Strengthen capacity to design and implement social protection policies and programmes
- Ensure that special care is taken in identifying and addressing the needs of the most vulnerable
- Balance the need to ensure effective coverage of the vulnerable with the need to maintain efficient use of resources
- Improve linkages between sectors and between actors
- Improve the quality and diversity of foods
- Support the implementation of international labour standards

2.2 Sustained increases in food availability through growth in smallholder farmer food production

- Ensure that the macroeconomic, budget, trade and sector policy framework provides incentives for sustainable increases in smallholder production
- Stimulate private investment in agriculture with focus on small-scale farming
- Enhance secure and equitable access to natural resources
- Invest in agricultural research
- Improve rural infrastructure
- Ensure sustained access to competitive, transparent and private-sector-led markets for food produce and quality inputs
- Support development of, and strengthen producer organizations with the participation of women
- Strengthen access of smallholders and other food value chain actors to financial and risk management instruments
- Improve animal production services

2.3 Better-managed ecosystems for food and nutrition security

- Strengthen ecosystems monitoring and assessment
- Improve natural resource management within agricultural ecosystems
- Improve economic and institutional mechanisms to support sustainable management of agricultural ecosystems

2.4 Improved performance of international food markets

- Support development of mechanisms for improving emergency access to food through stock sharing
- Assess the feasibility of models for the establishment and operation of sustainable, strategic reserves of key grains
- Strengthen international oversight and analysis of food commodity and futures markets to improve their transparency and predictability and to limit the scope for speculation to exacerbate price volatility
- Promote increased agriculture trade and more open trading environments
- Reduce/eliminate agricultural trade distortions in higher-income countries
- Complete the Doha Round of trade negotiations
- Ensure additional resources for "Aid for Trade"
- Develop trade financing infrastructure
- Reduce constraints to enabling environment that encourages private sector involvement in food markets
- Build capacity for international financial markets to better meet needs of lower-income countries

3. SUPPORTING INFORMATION AND ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEMS

Outcome and Actions

3.1 Strengthened information monitoring and accountability systems

- Implement systems that track and review the implementation of national policies strategies, and legislation relevant to food and nutrition security
- Improve further the coordination of information systems
- Continue to carry out comprehensive food and nutrition security assessments, monitoring and evaluation
- Undertake integrated analysis and monitoring of the impacts of shocks on food and nutrition security
- Conduct nutrition assessments
- Review contingency plans and early warning systems
- Put in place remedial mechanisms

1. MEETING IMMEDIATE NEEDS OF VULNERABLE POPULATIONS

17. This section outlines the four basic outcomes and “elements of the action framework” derived from them needed at national, regional and global levels to improve with immediate impact access to food and nutrition and increase food availability. The outcomes are:

- 1.1 Emergency food assistance, nutrition interventions and safety nets enhanced and made more accessible**
- 1.2 Urgent increases in food availability from smallholder farmer food production**
- 1.3 Adjustments to trade and tax policies**
- 1.4 Management of macroeconomic implications**

18. These outcomes are considered critical because they will assist the most vulnerable and minimize the number of families who fall into food and nutrition insecurity because their incomes can no longer buy the food they need. They aim to meet the current and future demands for availability of food and its access so as to avert humanitarian crises, instability and longer-term detrimental consequences for people’s health and livelihoods.

19. To achieve these outcomes, actions must simultaneously occur at local, national, regional and global levels. Social and agricultural inputs made available to local farmers and other vulnerable populations must be complemented by macroeconomic actions to ensure sustainability. Thus, the outcomes presented below embrace the “spectrum” of actions needed to improve the availability, access and consumption of sufficient, safe and nutritious food, both in quantity and quality to meet nutritional needs. It is understood that actions will be adapted to national and local conditions, take into account poverty reduction initiatives and include coordinated efforts by key stakeholders, particularly national governments, civil society and the private sector.

20. Given that these outcomes must be realized speedily, the UCFA emphasizes building on available resources and capacities, scaling up activities that are already underway, and improving interventions that have not fulfilled their potential rather than launching new interventions which might require elaborate planning or oversight. While the emphasis is on actions that can produce quick results, the duration of activities may vary depending on a number of factors, such as restrictions of movement at borders (e.g. export bans), speed and scale of supply response, and adjustments in food prices.

Outcome 1.1: Emergency food assistance, nutrition interventions and safety nets enhanced and made more accessible

21. Hunger and undernutrition are the greatest threats to public health, killing more people than HIV/AIDS, malaria and tuberculosis combined. Each day, 25,000 people, among them more than 10,000 children, die from hunger and related causes. The number of people suffering from hunger and the severity of their condition has increased since 2007–2008: first, as a result of higher food prices, and second, due to the financial and economic downturn. Those who spend over 60 percent of their income on food are particularly exposed; they include the urban poor and displaced populations, the rural landless, pastoralists and the majority of smallholder farmers. Households unable to access the food they need will reduce the quality and quantity of their dietary intake, thus increasing risk of micronutrient deficiency as well as insufficient total energy intake. Other harmful coping mechanisms include taking children, in particular girls, out of school to work; migration; sale of much-needed assets; decreased expenditure on healthcare, and depletion of resources. Together, these mechanisms increase the risk of debt and destitution, hunger and undernutrition.

22. Undernutrition can have long-term health consequences on vulnerable populations, in particular pregnant and breastfeeding women, infants and young children, as well as the elderly and people living with

HIV/AIDS and tuberculosis. If not addressed, undernutrition can permanently stunt mental and physical growth in the first years of a child's life. It worsens health status, leads to chronic illnesses, impairs school performance and limits earning potential as an adult. In extreme cases, undernutrition kills. Nutrition interventions must address the specific needs of women and of children from the moment of conception until the age of two. As a result, specially developed food products are becoming increasingly available for addressing the nutrition needs of all population groups, particularly pregnant and breastfeeding women and children under two years of age. It is therefore vital that agencies pay specific attention to the nutritional impacts of all their programmes through better understanding and incorporation of the right interventions, including the best food products, with a particular focus on pregnant women, those who are breastfeeding and all children under two years of age.

23. To avert humanitarian crises, social instability and long-term consequences for people's health and livelihoods, the immediate needs of vulnerable populations must be recognized in all interventions designed to improve food and nutrition security. Timely responses are key. Responses may include scaling up ongoing assistance and/or the design and implementation of new targeted initiatives after assessments and prioritization. In-country and international food assistance programmes should be applied with caution so as not to undermine the capacity of smallholders to scale up food production and obtain remunerative prices for their produce through local market channels. Comprehensive, well-designed, nutrition-sensitive food-based interventions to increase food production and access to food by smallholders, in combination with nutrition education programmes aimed at increasing awareness of a varied and diverse diet, should be promoted. Food assistance programmes must also address the numerous challenges raised by urban hunger and food insecurity, which are on the rise worldwide.

24. Emergency food assistance and social safety net measures play an important role in addressing the immediate needs of vulnerable and high risk populations and in stabilizing their situation⁹. In practice, different safety net programmes are likely to be operating in a country, reflecting varying geographic circumstances and beneficiary needs. Effective targeting is key to keeping costs manageable, especially in urban areas. For each programme, nutrition objectives¹⁰, concerns and considerations, specific interventions and means of delivery need to be discussed directly with local authorities and with community groups. Tracking systems need to measure the progress gained against specific targets, so programmes can be adjusted accordingly. While these programmes are ongoing in many countries, the surge in vulnerability and impoverishment, combined with higher prices for food procurement, have dramatically increased the volume of demand for, and the costs of, interventions over the past two years.

25. A combination of direct and indirect interventions is needed to address immediate and underlying causes of undernutrition. Indirect interventions are best delivered through development programmes that respond to the factors that precipitate undernutrition, and are implemented through the full range of sectors, including social welfare (with income generation), health, water sanitation, agriculture and food systems, and emergency assistance.¹¹ Where possible and appropriate, the capacity of the private sector should be mobilized, especially in areas requiring specialized technical knowledge (e.g. information and communication technologies (ICT) for electronic transfers of resources to vulnerable groups) and physical capacity (e.g. micronutrient fortification facilities). A human rights-based approach serves as a valuable starting point, with due attention to ensuring that needs are adequately assessed and met. In addition, pregnant women and children under two years of age will benefit from a sharp scaling up in the provision of nutrition-specific

⁹ Safety nets are a subset of broader social protection systems. They include mostly non-contributory transfers in cash, vouchers or in-kind/food, which can be unconditional or conditional — such as conditional cash transfers, school feeding, food-for-work and cash-for-work — and other interventions to improve access to food and basic essentials, such as price subsidies. In addition to safety nets, social protection also includes aspects of labour market policies and insurance options, such as contributory pensions and health insurance, and aspects of other sectoral policies for education, health, nutrition, HIV/AIDS and agriculture. Broader social protection is considered in section 2.1.

¹⁰ Nutrition-sensitive safety nets will ensure that women have adequate access to food and other productive resources. This allows women to be centrally involved in the planning and distribution of assistance in ways that take account of existing coping strategies and ensure information sharing.

¹¹ This requires a coordinated approach which is being pursued by both the SCN and the reformed CFS.

public health interventions¹² by mainstreaming them, where possible, within sectoral programmes. The choice of interventions should be based on assessments and take country-level needs and capacities into account.¹³ Strengthening the linkages between food and nutrition security assessment and decision-making at programme level will be essential for determining the most appropriate actions to be taken.

26. Effective implementation of nutrition interventions at scale requires technical and managerial capacities. These are often weakened by a shortage of staff and lack of nutrition knowledge amongst community-based

The Food Aid Convention, 1999

For more information see <http://www.foodaidconvention.org>

Current patterns of international food assistance are governed through the Food Aid Convention (FAC), which sets standards for quality and delivery, urges member countries* to procure food aid locally and to respect local habits and nutritional needs. It enshrines a practical collective response based on a shared responsibility to tackle hunger regardless of prices. Under this convention, FAC members commit to minimal levels of food aid, agreeing to target vulnerable groups with timely assistance.

Some FAC stakeholders have proposed transforming the FAC into a Food Assistance Convention (which includes the use of cash transfers and vouchers to increase the quantity or quality of food consumed). These stakeholders also propose a greater emphasis on the problems being addressed (households needing assistance rather than food to be donated); and the tailoring of responses to specific problems (e.g. responses to nutritional needs, improving market access, ensuring adequate food quality) with the involvement of recipients in the design, conduct, monitoring and evaluation of immediate responses to food and nutrition insecurity.

FAC Member States are carrying out informal negotiations pending formal negotiating starting December 2010.

**FAC Membership as of December 2009: Argentina, Australia, Canada, European Union and its Member States, Japan, Norway, Switzerland, United States*

households. Hence, beyond the need to ensure emergency food assistance and safety nets, land and other natural resources should be acknowledged as primary assets in household food production and as key to preventing social and economic exclusion, especially in times of crisis. In urban areas, reliable employment and access to essential services, especially water, health, and sanitation, are critical. The challenges facing women in urban areas must be better understood and factored into programmes. Emergency food assistance programmes should, as far as possible, be self-targeted and use local food resources to support local agricultural development and facilitate acceptability of distributed emergency foods.

28. Many communities need resources — from national governments, through regional processes and from the international community — to maintain and expand ongoing food assistance programmes and extend support to those newly impoverished. These resources are most effectively used if decision makers have access to functioning early warning systems, vulnerability analyses and emergency assessments, and if programmes can respond to immediate food and nutrition security needs even when not part of a humanitarian crisis. Poor households often lack the knowledge and resources to acquire the nutritious foods they need, so any assistance programmes should be supported by public information campaigns.

workers, including nurses in charge of delivering these interventions. These gaps may be especially acute in urban settings. However, training institutions exist in most countries with a cadre of skilled and experienced nutritionists or nutrition experts, often located in capital cities, outside the government system (e.g. in universities, private practice, international organizations or international NGOs). This knowledge and human resource potential should be identified as part of a systematic review of each country's nutrition capacity, and it should be tapped into as appropriate.

27. Lessons learned since the 2008 food crisis show that secure and equitable access to land and control over it mitigates the impact of food price volatility for poor rural

¹² These include public health interventions such as promoting breastfeeding, complementary feeding for infants after the age of six months, improved hygiene practices including handwashing, periodic Vitamin A supplements, therapeutic zinc supplements for diarrhoea management, multiple micronutrient powders, deworming drugs for children to reduce losses of nutrients, salt iodization, iron fortification of staple foods, iron-folic acid supplements for pregnant women to prevent and treat anaemia, iodized oil capsules where iodized salt is unavailable; treatment of children with severe undernutrition with ready-to-use therapeutic foods.

¹³ Recommendations are being developed by the multi-agency REACH (Renewed Efforts Against Child Hunger) initiative.

29. Renegotiation of the FAC could provide an opportunity for enhanced commitment, flexibility, and nutritional effectiveness of food assistance programming. Impediments to the export, trans-shipment and import of humanitarian food aid in recipient and neighbouring countries — which delay the ability to respond quickly — must be removed. Global and regional agreements are needed to ensure the free flow of food assistance across borders and to develop innovative approaches to accessing food, possibly including physical and virtual food stocks. The creation of food reserves at a regional level, in harmony with regional agricultural and food policies, can help regulate food markets and protect countries against supply shocks and fluctuations (*see also sections 1.3 and 2.4*). The development of strategic cross-border grain trading systems and regional grain reserves can allow countries to access food in a fairer and logistically efficient way, avoid speculation, and create a buffer against shocks (*see also section 2.4*).

Elements of the Action Framework

Outcome 1.1: Emergency food assistance, nutrition interventions and safety nets enhanced and made more accessible

Actions:

- **Ensure that emergency food needs are fully met.** Develop disaster risk management frameworks preparing for increased extreme events due to climate change. Scale up food assistance, nutrition interventions, and safety net programmes, such as school feeding and job creation schemes, to address hunger and undernutrition in the most vulnerable populations.¹⁴ Especially important is the nutritional quality of food transfers — i.e. getting the right kind of food to recipients. Distribution of food assistance and related services must at all times reflect the specific needs of women and children.
- **Protect basic consumption needs of vulnerable populations.** Targeted assistance can be provided in the form of food aid,¹⁵ vouchers or cash transfers,¹⁶ taking into account food safety, the nutritional, dietary and cultural and religious needs of recipients, local food market conditions and financial infrastructures. Food aid should be provided with a clear exit strategy to avoid the creation of dependency. Unconditional transfers can go hand-in-hand with self-targeting programmes which engage beneficiaries in training, asset and job creation. Channelling food assistance via women should be encouraged, provided that it does not expose them to physical danger. Opportunities to improve programme efficiency should be pursued and carefully monitored.
- **Scale up nutritional support and other context-specific requirements through safety nets** to meet specific food and nutrition needs of vulnerable groups and prevent longer-term health consequences. For instance, mother-and-child health programmes can address nutritional deficiencies, using multi-micronutrient supplements for pregnant and breastfeeding women, as well as timely complementary feeding for infants and young children with quality foods and nutrient products.¹⁷
- **Support management and prevention of undernutrition, including therapeutic feeding and care for treatment of children with severe acute malnutrition.** Technical and managerial capacity-building and reliable information are required to address severe undernutrition and provide adequate supplies of therapeutic foods through community-based interventions. Other options and foods, often locally sourced, are available to deal with moderate undernutrition. A reliable evidence base on the impacts of alternative interventions is needed.

¹⁴ Including in particular groups, such as internally displaced persons (IDPs) and refugees.

¹⁵ Food assistance packages should be carefully selected and independently certified for quality. Uncertified commercial foods should be excluded. Commodities should be reviewed in light of the acceptability to the recipients, to health and nutrition policies of the recipient countries, as well as in light of their production and trade policies. They should be adequate in terms of energy and nutrient content.

¹⁶ Vouchers and cash transfers should be emphasized in areas where food is available and markets are functioning well.

¹⁷ To include innovative nutrient supplements, such as micronutrient powders, and spreads; as well as vitamin A and zinc supplements.

- **Promote school feeding**¹⁸ to address hunger and undernutrition among children, improve their enrolment and attendance in school, and contribute to a much-needed sense of normalcy for children living in insecure environments. In order to control and prevent micronutrient deficiencies, school feeding should make use of micronutrient rich foods, though nutrition may not be the primary objective of the intervention. School feeding can also reach other needy household members through take-home rations.
- **Adjust social protection programmes for food prices** when the programmes are not indexed to the cost of living, or are only adjusted annually. Such adjustments can be an important, visible response by government, requiring limited additional implementation capacity. Food insecure people who do not benefit from existing schemes should be integrated as quickly as possible.¹⁹
- **Allow free and predictable flow of food assistance** to countries most in need. The current donor practice of earmarking contributions may inadvertently result in cutbacks of humanitarian projects in those countries in need which are short of donor support. Some donor countries have partially or fully un-earmarked their contributions and provided more assistance in the form of untied cash. Others have come through with multi-year commitments. Such increased funding predictability and flexibility in the use of resources should be encouraged.
- **Ensure that local purchases of food and food components for humanitarian purposes are exempt from restrictions.** This entails ensuring access to local purchases of food and food components for humanitarian purposes where market conditions are conducive to such purchases, exempting purchases of humanitarian food from export restrictions or extraordinary taxes, and ensuring unhindered and safe movement of humanitarian food within and across borders, as per best practice.
- **Explore the establishment of efficient and effective humanitarian food reserves** to enable communities, countries and regions to deliver lifesaving access to cereals and other commodities. Such reserves could contribute to the efficient and responsive supply of food in areas of acute and chronic needs, and promote well-functioning markets, building on the foundation of lessons learned from existing national reserves and local cereal banks(*see also sections 1.3 and 2.4*).
- **Reach all households with pertinent public information on food assistance, nutrition and hardship alleviation programmes.** For better nutrition outcomes, provide assistance in conjunction with improved access to primary health care services and public information to promote breastfeeding and food hygiene and to dispel inappropriate food taboos and restrictions.²⁰

Outcome 1.2: Urgent increases in food availability from smallholder farmer food production

30. Three out of four poor people in developing countries live in rural areas and most of them depend directly or indirectly on agriculture, including crops, livestock, fish, and forests (non-timber forest products). Excluding the minority of larger farms and landless rural workers, smallholder farmers and their families represent some 2 billion people, about one third of the global population, and are central to any solution to today's global food and nutrition insecurity and its sequelae — poverty, hunger and malnutrition.

¹⁸ School feeding is a popular intervention choice in many emergency contexts, with a range of direct and indirect benefits (including gender equality and socio-economic benefits): the choice of this intervention should be based on a careful study of both direct and indirect costs and benefits. School feeding programmes should be based as much as possible on local purchase, to provide local farmers with extra marketing opportunities and to stimulate production. Wherever possible, daily rations are desirable.

¹⁹ Eligibility criteria for targeted assistance should be transparent and take into account the prohibited forms of discrimination (e.g. discrimination based on race, colour, sex, language, age, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth and disability).

²⁰ Knowledge and information about diet and the impact of inadequate diet should be communicated in a culturally sensitive way.

31. Although average farm size trends are heterogeneous across countries, it is estimated that globally 450 million farms (85 percent of farms worldwide) measure less than two hectares. With increased migration and off-farm employment, many small-farm holdings are now run by women farmers who face disadvantages in terms of access to agricultural inputs, extension services, markets, and financing. The majority of smallholder farmers and landless farm workers are net buyers of food and live on less than \$2 a day. The capacity of smallholder farmers to grow more food is constrained because they cannot afford improved seeds²¹ or inputs such as fertilizer, veterinary drugs²² and services. Their production systems are likely to be affected by climate change because they have little margin for adapting soil and water management practices and often lack the necessary information about how to do this. They are more likely to react to difficulties by expanding the area used for agriculture, bringing unsuitable land under cultivation and threatening local ecosystems.

32. Smallholder farmers' access to key inputs in the near term (i.e. in forthcoming cropping seasons) immediately increases their capacity to produce food and earn an income. In times of crisis, urgent responses are needed — for instance, providing access to tools and implements, quality seeds, planting material (e.g. cuttings for cassava), fertilizer and improved practices for cultivation, livestock rearing and aquaculture. The provision of these inputs should be designed to have a direct impact on small farmers' production and productivity. Supporting the development of producers' organizations such as cooperatives can help reduce smallholders' expenses and strengthen the value chain linkages. They need assistance to adapt to, and mitigate the increased risks associated with extreme climate events, higher temperatures and shifting rainfall patterns.

33. Immediate steps for improving access to inputs should aim at building market-based linkages. This requires that the State acts to provide core public goods, improving the investment climate, regulating natural resource management and securing desirable social outcomes. Specific measures may include vouchers for purchase from the private sector when markets are working and inputs available.²³ Where inputs are not adequately available, vouchers could inflate input prices and make inputs less accessible to those that do not receive vouchers. Where input markets are not working, input distribution contracts with existing private dealers, NGOs, projects and government services are an alternative. There is need for continuous assessment of the constraints faced by agribusinesses that have led to market failures. Productivity-enhancing safety nets should go hand-in-hand with emergency food assistance as an incentive for smallholders to participate in agricultural training and collective marketing. Farmer schools and innovative support to smallholders adopting new technologies can improve soil, land and water management. The building of institutions that take into account (and learn from) new challenges posed by climate change will help smallholders act in ways that respond to immediate and long-term needs. Such institutions work best if they involve farmer organizations and link public sector, private sector and civil society stakeholders — ideally in partnership.

34. Better access to critical production inputs needs to be complemented by urgent measures to improve services to farmers, to ensure the preservation of vital terrestrial and aquatic ecosystem services, and in particular climate change adaptation and mitigation measures. Smallholders' access to information, knowledge and technical support (e.g. on use of seeds and fertilizer, integrated soil and water management, integrated pest control, information on weather and climate change) needs to be deepened and expanded using context-specific approaches. Also important is access to information on price markets and crop production forecast, to enable smallholders to negotiate better terms with big buyers and retailers. Both can be facilitated through innovative use of information communication technologies.

²¹ Quality seed can be of scientifically-bred varieties but also of local farmer varieties or landraces depending on what is the most appropriate and cost-effective under the circumstances.

²² In many countries, animals are an important source of power for ploughing, harvesting and transport, and of food and nutrition. Animals can also serve as an informal means of savings and generation of cash for input, investment and food purchases.

²³ This can have the dual advantage of targeting poor producers and boosting input markets.

35. Increasing production and productivity will only achieve the desired increases in food availability if post-harvest losses are reduced. A significant quantity of the food produced in developing countries is lost after harvest, resulting in wastage both of the produce itself and of other resources such as land, water, labour, energy and fertilizer used in its production. These losses contribute to increased food prices. With adequate investment and training, food losses can be significantly reduced. Interventions to reduce post-harvest losses must be considered within the context of the food value chains and focus on improving the overall efficiency of the chain, with economic incentives for all actors.

36. Smallholders' productive and rural household energy needs should also be addressed in times of crisis. In the context of climate change, information and measures should also apply to energy-related mitigation measures, including both the reduction of direct and indirect energy use to avoid greenhouse gas emissions, and the increase in sustainable biomass-based renewable energy production to avoid carbon emissions.

Elements of the Action Framework

Outcome 1.2: Urgent increases in food availability from smallholder farmer food production

Actions:

- **Provide productivity-enhancing safety nets²⁴** to poor smallholder farmers by providing targeted programmes to supply critical inputs such as tools and implements, locally adapted quality seeds,²⁵ fertilizer, animal feed, small irrigation pumps, and veterinary drugs and services. Technical advice on good farm management practices, market and price information and local seed multiplication should be expanded to include soil, water and integrated pest management (IPM), climate-smart technology choices and risk management practices and adapted to reach women farmers,²⁶ ethnic minorities and other vulnerable groups. Restrictions on imports and other taxes should be reduced. For landless poor people, a similar package could be provided together with access to small cultivation plots for market or kitchen gardens.²⁷
- **Reduce post-harvest crop losses and improve food stocks along the value chain** through pest and disease control and post-harvest support for storage rehabilitation, improvement of handling and storage practices, processing and value-adding equipment, and reinforcing extension services with inputs, ongoing training and logistics.
- **Remove artificial constraints to domestic trade throughout the food chain in order to link smallholder farmers to markets**, including removal of bureaucratic barriers to transporting and trading inputs and food, and “informal” taxation. Such interventions could address quality of production, reliability of supply, efficiency improvements, waste reduction, collective marketing, investments in small-scale market infrastructure, value addition activities such as rural processing and facilitation of contractual arrangements between smallholders and companies.
- **Address basic energy needs of smallholders and rural households** through low carbon energy options, and develop the measures to make these options accessible.

²⁴ Monitoring and accountability mechanisms should be put in place to prevent mismanagement of administering safety nets (e.g. arbitral selection of eligible recipients by local officials or community leaders). Such monitoring and accountability mechanisms should encourage an active, free and meaningful participation by local communities, including women and other people facing marginalization or exclusion within the communities.

²⁵ Quality seed can be of scientifically-bred varieties but also of local farmer varieties or landraces, depending on what is the most appropriate and cost-effective under the circumstances.

²⁶ It is important to ensure that women farmers participate in all community activities and have access to agricultural credit and loans, marketing facilities, appropriate technology, training and education, and all community and extension services so as to increase their technical proficiency and their ability to participate in all community activities.

²⁷ Interventions should also include support to increasing food production in urban areas.

Outcome 1.3: Adjustments to trade and tax policies

Export Management

Export restrictions were a contributing factor to high price volatility in grain markets in early 2008. Their use is not, however, prohibited under the World Trade Organization (WTO), although countries are expected to consider their impact on food and nutrition security. Discussions are underway regarding further discipline in their use. The challenge is not to admonish countries which have acted within the WTO framework, but to encourage them to consider alternatives that make export restrictions their last, rather than first, option. Countries need clear incentives at a regional and global level to pursue more transparent and predictable approaches that can accommodate immediate, domestic political pressures.

37. Care is needed in implementing new trade and taxation policies, and their broader impacts in terms of their effect on government revenues and the economy, as well as on other countries, the environment and food markets as a whole, must be assessed. In particular, any new policies need to reconcile consumer interest in low-priced food with the need to provide the incentives that higher food prices give to farmers to increase their production. For example, while the pass-through of higher prices provides appropriate incentives to producers, and can contribute to a strong supply response, it is also likely to have a substantial adverse impact on the real incomes of rural and urban net food buyers, especially among the poorest households who traditionally allocate a large share of their incomes to food.

38. In the face of high food prices, some governments consider introducing trade and taxation measures to complement domestic social safety nets and investment actions. It is important that such measures directly target the poor: untargeted policies result in the transfer of significant resources to the non-poor at the expense of other public expenditure priorities. Because trade and taxation measures can be implemented quickly and, in the absence of effective social protection programmes, have an immediate widespread impact, countries frequently resort to them to address short-term food access concerns. However, measures such as direct price controls, export restrictions, generalized subsidies or across-the-board wage increases can further distort markets, be ineffective in the medium- to long-term or be fiscally unsustainable.

39. A particular concern is the imposition of price controls that may stabilize food price expectations in the short run, but act as a disincentive to food producers and retailers, can be difficult to enforce, and may actually lead to food shortages. In a similar manner, export restrictions can increase price volatility, reduce food availability in international markets and dissuade farmers from productivity-enhancing investments. During the food price crisis of 2007–2008 more than 40 countries imposed export controls on food commodities. In such circumstances, as said in the above box, the challenge is (a) to encourage countries to consider making export restrictions their last, rather than first, option, and (b) to improve the impact of WTO rules on export restrictions.

40. The need for individual countries to take potentially damaging policy actions can be mitigated by stronger political and economic integration — and associated trading environments — within regions. Enhanced regional integration needs to be prioritized globally and by governments as it can contribute significantly to food and nutrition security through making local and regional markets more accessible to farmers, especially smallholders. Better-integrated regional markets offer opportunities for more diverse and increased agricultural production, and regional bodies can provide the critical policy space needed to develop trade policies that fit with broader development needs. In food crises, regional integration increases the potential for local sourcing of food to respond to the needs of communities in need and to help protect countries against supply shocks and price volatility (*see also section 2.4*). Stronger regional markets give countries, and their small farming communities, greater control over agriculture policy and food supply, and make them less vulnerable to negative shocks and trends that originate in the wider global system.

Elements of the Action Framework

Outcome 1.3: Adjustments to trade and tax policies

Actions:

- **Encourage better functioning food markets through improved regional political and economic integration and better functioning environments for trade generally and in particular in food.** Regional integration can significantly increase the opportunity for the local sourcing of food, including for emergency food aid, to respond to the needs of food insecure communities and to help protect countries against supply shocks and price volatility that are caused by factors beyond their immediate control.
- **Immediately review trade and taxation policy options and their likely impacts** on the poor, consumers and smallholder farmers, including on the realization of their right to food, as well as implications for government revenues, international food markets and commitment to enhanced international trade. Trade-offs between poor consumers' needs for low food prices and farmers' need for price incentives to increase production need to be clearly identified and understood.
- **Use limited strategic grain reserves** in countries with existing stocks, particularly where they can be channelled to food assistance programmes (*see also sections 1.1 and 2.5*). While such reserves can play a useful role in addressing emergencies, the release of large amounts of grain from stock can disrupt the workings of the open market. Good stock management is essential. Procurement and storage of grain reserves requires government expenditure. Under the WTO domestic support rules, public stockholding programmes for food security purposes in developing countries are covered under the "Green Box"²⁸ so the expenditure incurred by the government in relation to accumulation and holding of stocks is exempt from a monetary ceiling (*see also section 2.4*).
- **Avoid generalized subsidies for food consumers** that have high fiscal costs and divert public resources from support to the poor. An effective and efficient policy response to ensure access to food while prices are high is to increase the purchasing power of poor consumers, which can, in the short-term, be done through social safety nets. While some subsidy programmes try to improve efficiency by focusing on specific foods or foods more likely to be consumed by the poor, these are difficult to administer and can encourage smuggling of the subsidized items to neighbouring countries. These programmes, once in place, can be difficult to phase out when better-targeted mechanisms are developed or when food prices fall.

Food exporting countries

- **Minimize use of export restrictions**, which in food security crisis situations may increase volatility of international prices, depress incentives for farmers to invest in food production, encourage smuggling, and undermine progress towards multilateral trade reforms and freer trade in the agriculture sector. In cases where countries do consider export restrictions, it is important to avoid transferring shocks to importers, by utilizing the internationally-agreed procedures for transparency and prior consultation with concerned stakeholders.
- **Reduce restrictions on use of stocks** to support humanitarian needs and international trade in periods of significant market turmoil. This benefits all countries through reduced price volatility.

²⁸ For information on the "Green Box", see http://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/agric_e/agboxes_e.htm.

Food deficit and importing countries

- **Reduce import tariffs and other restrictions** on food commodities and agricultural inputs. While trade liberalization generally has a positive overall impact on an economy, governments should anticipate the impact on the domestic agriculture sector, including smallholder farmers, as well as government revenue losses and balance of payment effects.²⁹ When trade is being liberalized, including in negotiations for trade agreements, national authorities will first pay attention to protecting their citizens' ability to enjoy their right to food, as well as the potential impact of such measures on the enjoyment of the right to food by people in other countries.
- **Improve efficiency of trade facilitation** to reduce the cost and time required for importing critical food and agricultural inputs. These costs can often be significantly reduced through rapid upgrading of documentation, harmonizing procedures at the regional level, and infrastructure improvements.
- **Temporarily reduce VAT and other taxes** on food and critical agricultural inputs where taxes represent a significant proportion of retail prices. Tax reductions are generally less difficult to administer than a subsidy programme. However, governments need to consider generating financial resources from alternative means and the potential side-effects of public revenue losses, to avoid negative longer-term impacts on other priority expenditures in support of poverty reduction and economic growth.

Outcome 1.4: Management of macroeconomic implications

41. High food prices in 2007–2008 created strong inflation pressures in low-income countries and important fiscal and balance of payments implications for net food-importing countries. The International Monetary Fund (IMF) estimated that, for the 33 net food-importing countries eligible for the Poverty Reduction and Growth Facility (PRGF),³⁰ the adverse effect of the rise in food prices on the balance of payments amounted to 0.5 percent of 2007 gross domestic product (GDP) during January 2007 – April 2008.³¹ The fiscal costs of remedial policy measures, such as cutting food tax rates and bolstering food price subsidies, were also estimated to be significant. Thirty-one low- and middle-income countries reported that the fiscal cost of food tax cuts between 2006 and 2008 ranged from near zero to 1.1 percent of GDP, with a median cost of 0.1 percent.

42. The macroeconomic impact of the surge in food prices was complicated by the onset of the global financial and economic crisis. After their peak in mid-2008, food prices declined substantially worldwide at the outset of the global financial and economic crisis as demand fell off sharply, stabilized in the first quarter of 2009, and recovered modestly in the spring. In low-income countries this crisis thus greatly eased the inflationary pressures that had been anticipated as a result of the food price hike. At the same time, these economies were hit severely as export growth, remittances, and foreign direct investment (FDI) inflows contracted substantially in 2009, deepening vulnerabilities, particularly of the poorest households, and complicating government efforts to ensure food and nutrition security.

43. Many developing countries had strengthened their economic and financial position over the decade before the crisis in terms of debt reduction and macroeconomic stabilization, though to varying degrees. Higher

²⁹ Sometimes, it is argued that with a decrease in tariffs there will be an increase in subsidized imports, negatively affecting domestic production. This would decrease local employment, thereby contributing to poverty, particularly when social safety nets do not exist or are not sufficient to compensate for the loss of employment. Increased poverty would then adversely affect economic accessibility to food. The issue of a substantial reduction in trade-distorting agricultural subsidies, especially by the developed countries, is being actively pursued in the Doha Round negotiations. In addition, WTO Members adversely affected by subsidized imports have the option to seek recourse under the Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures.

³⁰ The PRGF was the IMF's principal lending facility for low-income countries, providing concessional balance of payments support. It was replaced in 2009 by the Extended Credit Facility (ECF), in the context of the overhaul of the IMF's overall low-income lending facilities.

³¹ See "Food and Fuel Prices—Recent Developments, Macroeconomic Impact, and Policy Responses", IMF, June 2008, available at <http://www.imf.org/external/np/pp/eng/2008/063008.pdf>.

growth, smaller fiscal deficits, higher international reserves, and lower debt levels created more fiscal and policy space. Average inflation in low-income countries was also much lower during 2000–2007 than in the 1990s.

44. In response to the global financial and economic crisis, most low-income countries have implemented fiscal policies that, to some extent, preserve or expand spending to protect the poor and support the economy. In particular, capital spending was increased, and countries have sought to preserve or increase social spending.³² Social support measures, such as public works programmes and cash transfer programmes, have also played an important role in some economies. These social support programmes have also addressed the needs of vulnerable households most affected by the earlier food prices. Some countries also eased monetary policy in order to help support growth, given the subdued inflation risks.

45. The global financial and economic crisis has demonstrated the importance of Governments being able to apply counter-cyclical policies in the face of economic downturns. In the near-term, premature fiscal and monetary tightening should be avoided until an economic recovery is firmly under way. However, low-income countries tend to be more exposed to economic shocks and natural disasters than other economies, in part as a result of their limited economic diversification. Over the medium term, therefore, many low-income countries will need to rebuild their policy buffers through fiscal consolidation and prudent borrowing policies. Given countries' urgent and large spending demands, especially to address infrastructural needs, fiscal efforts should generally focus on revenue growth rather than spending restraint. In order to meet higher investment needs without excessive reliance on external borrowing, further development of domestic financial systems will be important, as this should help mobilize and utilize higher domestic savings. In addition, it will be crucial to establish or improve social safety net systems to channel support to vulnerable groups quickly and efficiently, especially in case of renewed adverse shocks.

46. Food prices are expected to rise only moderately in the medium term, while the higher cost of energy and increased biofuel usage could pose upward price risks in the longer term. Stronger social safety nets embedded in policy buffers, combined with international support, can help low-income countries better manage the impact of price volatilities in the future.

Elements of the Action Framework

Outcome 1.4: Management of macroeconomic implications

Actions:

- **Hold down core inflation and inflation expectations** by setting a sufficiently firm monetary policy stance to prevent spillover of higher food and energy prices into more generalized and persistently higher core inflation and inflation expectations. For developing countries, this may be challenging, as a tight monetary policy could induce slower growth or provoke a recession. However, the repercussions of allowing rising inflation through unduly accommodative monetary policy will be even more damaging to growth and the reduction of poverty.
- **Assess the impacts on the balance of payments and feasibility/sustainability of a reserve drawdown.** Some countries are able to finance higher net food imports from their reserves — at least initially. This gives time to adjust the composition of demand and to stimulate domestic agricultural production. However, net-food-importing developing countries with insufficient reserves, rising import bills and deteriorating terms of trade, need balance of payments support, or risk currency depreciation that would further raise the domestic price of food.

³² For example, early evidence suggests that in Sub-Saharan African countries, capital spending increased as a share of GDP despite revenue shortfalls in most countries, while outlays on health and education were preserved in 2009.

- **Mobilize external support to finance additional food imports.** For countries with inadequate reserves, additional resources must be mobilized rapidly. Such resources can come from either bilateral donors or international financial institutions in the form of grant-based humanitarian aid, increases in official development assistance (ODA) or direct balance of payments support. Planning of such international assistance should take account of potential long-term upsets, for example, on local food production and availability of adequate food to the most vulnerable.
- **Ensure adequate levels of foreign exchange reserves,** including through reducing non-essential imports by the government and/or increasing exports once immediate food needs are met.
- **Assess and comprehensively cost all fiscal measures taken in response to the rise in food prices.** All measures, whether in the form of additional public expenditure on support programmes for producers or consumers, or tax or import tariff reductions, need to be accurately costed so that their immediate and medium-term financial consequences are known. Some governments need external assistance in the form of budget support to cope fiscally with sudden rises in food prices. Such assistance should help prevent an under-financing of social sectors, and foster awareness of the vital importance of social protection in coping with high food prices.

2. BUILDING LONGER-TERM RESILIENCE AND CONTRIBUTING TO GLOBAL FOOD AND NUTRITION SECURITY

47. This section outlines the four basic outcomes and “elements of the action framework” derived from them to build resilience and respond to food and nutrition insecurity in the long term by addressing its underlying factors at national, regional and global levels. The outcomes are:

2.1 Expanded social protection systems

2.2 Sustained increases in food availability through growth in smallholder farmer food production

2.3 Better-managed ecosystems for food and nutrition security

2.4 Improved performance of international food markets

48. These outcomes, when realized, will enable vulnerable populations, farmers, and — ultimately — whole nations to withstand shocks and reach food and nutrition security. They will directly contribute to achieving the Millennium Development Goal (MDG) 1 on eradicating extreme poverty and hunger and focus on actions to support smallholder farmers (mostly women), and the rural and urban poor, by addressing the issues of social protection, infrastructure and other public goods, ecosystem and climate change, and by encouraging greater and more sustained private sector collaboration with smallholder farms, e.g. through development of contract farming operations.

49. As with section B1, the above outcomes require actions at local, national, regional and international levels and concerted, long-term commitment from all stakeholders. They also require actions to be flexible and adjusted to evolving conditions. In most cases, action linked to these outcomes is needed urgently; this would also reduce the demand for the actions listed under immediate needs in the preceding section.

50. It is understood that actions taken will be adapted to national and local conditions, will take into account initiatives to address global climate change and poverty reduction, reflect the need for long-term sustainability and avoid unplanned environmental changes. They need to be agreed on and taken forward jointly by the principal stakeholders, including national governments, civil society, and the private sector, with representation from the communities most affected by food and nutrition insecurity.

Outcome 2.1: Expanded social protection systems

51. Well-functioning social protection systems help protect households and individuals against shocks, and can be a vital component of strategies to reduce poverty, hunger and undernutrition. When properly designed and implemented, these policies and programmes support food-insecure and vulnerable households. They help individuals to meet their nutritional needs through periods of crisis, thereby preventing them from resorting to coping mechanisms with adverse consequences, including forced labourer migration. They accommodate, in the best cases, the specific nutritional needs of individuals based on their geographical area, age, gender, health, livelihoods and other conditions; and employ a multiplicity of approaches in order to reach their objectives. While progress has been made in aligning and coordinating nationally funded and externally supported programmes, and in improving programme efficiency, there is much to be done to improve coverage of vulnerable groups with benefit levels that will cover their basic, but often differentiated, needs (such as enabling pregnant and breastfeeding women, and children under two, to achieve the nutritional status needed for the fulfilment of their growth and development potential).

52. Such programmes can be components of more comprehensive systems that provide a minimal level of social protection, often known as a social protection floor.³³ Typically, this concept envisages a guaranteed (rights-based) level of well-being achieved through both transfers and services. However, some of the actual assistance can come from programmes that encompass one or more instruments, including, *inter alia*, in-kind assistance in the form of food or food supplements; food fortification; school feeding, conditional or non-conditional cash transfers and employment guarantees.

53. While many of these instruments (such as food aid) are intended to address the short-run vulnerabilities of individuals and households, some instruments (such as dietary diversification and food fortification) are intended to provide support in the long term, reflecting the longer-term vulnerabilities of specified populations (e.g. children). The short-term instruments in particular need to be flexible enough to respond to changing needs whether they are expected (e.g. underemployment and seasonal unemployment in the rural sector) or unforeseen (e.g. natural disasters or aggregate economic shocks).

54. Short- and long-term social protection programmes should be supported by legal frameworks and outreach initiatives that help the most vulnerable communities to access these programmes. As already indicated, the human rights-based approach³⁴ can be used to help all those eligible to secure access to benefits of a particular nature. At the same time, the specific measures adopted must be sustainable, effectively targeted and designed within fiscal constraints. It is also important to exploit opportunities that may arise in different sectors. For example, inclusion of knowledge about better nutrition practices in school curricula could move households beyond basic awareness of what they should do to children encouraging actual changes in household diets. These would result in improved household food consumption patterns and contribute to better nutritional outcomes.

55. Most countries already extend some elements of social protection that contribute to the food and nutrition security of at least some parts of the population. It is possible in many countries to build upon these so as to progressively achieve universality in the coverage of individual and groups excluded from existing schemes,

³³ Recognizing the importance and necessity of adequate social protection systems, the United Nations System Chief Executives Board (CEB) adopted in April 2009 the “Social Protection Floor Initiative” (SPF). The SPF corresponds to a set of essential transfers, services and facilities that all citizens everywhere should enjoy to ensure the realization of the rights embodied in human rights treaties. By working on both supply and demand side measures, the SPF takes a holistic approach to social protection including:

- 1) Services: Ensuring the availability, continuity, and geographical and financial access to essential services, such as water and sanitation, food and adequate nutrition, health, education, housing, life- and asset-saving information and other social services.
- 2) Transfers: Realizing access by ensuring a basic set of essential social transfers, in cash and in kind, to provide a minimum income and livelihood security for poor and vulnerable populations and to facilitate access to essential services. It includes social transfers (but also information, entitlements and policies) to children, people in active age groups with insufficient income and older persons.

³⁴ A human rights-based approach requires respect for the rule of law, clear eligibility criteria, transparency, access to information and accountability mechanisms. Participation by right-holders in the design, implementation and monitoring of measures would also benefit their legitimacy.

thus developing greater resilience to shocks. The pace at which such development could occur will vary, depending on specific country needs; available social infrastructure; and present and future vulnerability patterns; as well as fiscal space and institutional capacity to design and administer different types of programmes and instruments. At the same time, macroeconomic policies during periods of crisis and recovery should be designed to accommodate as far as possible the increased levels of social protection-related public expenditures that are triggered by the crisis and may need to be maintained until a recovery is sufficiently underway.

56. Countries may run multiple social protection schemes and apply different approaches, administered and financed by a variety of actors. In such cases one of the challenges is to synergize, build on best practices, and pool resources and implement capacities with a view to increase efficiency and the developmental potential of programmes. They should be effective in reaching the most vulnerable populations and incorporate the most efficient means of transfer, while improving linkages with other basic social services — such as maternal and child care and basic education. Information systems should permit vulnerability mapping and accurate beneficiary identification, while linking to complementary human development and income-generating and employment opportunities to enable beneficiaries to adopt sustainable livelihoods.

57. Systems should include mechanisms to adjust the benefits being provided to changes in beneficiary circumstances as well as fluctuations in food prices and inflation. They should go hand-in-hand with risk management instruments (e.g. insurance) so as to jointly mitigate the effects of natural disasters, an issue likely to gain greater urgency due to climate change. In the case of food-based programmes for nutritional support, efforts should be made to link up with the private sector and promote local production, access to and consumption of varied and diverse foods rich in micronutrients. For agriculture to make a significant contribution to reducing levels of undernutrition, there is a need for stimulating the production of diversified foods with high nutritive value and promoting their consumption and proper utilization through training agricultural and other extension workers, intensifying nutrition and consumer education and implementing multimedia campaigns.

Elements of the Action Framework

Outcome 2.1: Expanded social protection systems

Actions:

- **Strengthen capacity to design and implement social protection policies and programmes** to provide the basis for introducing or scaling up social assistance initiatives. Countries need to be equipped with policy frameworks and technical capacities to assist those who may suffer chronic disadvantages, as well as being able to rapidly respond to crises. Programmes and policies, based on a country-specific assessment of options, should be mindful of the need to avoid building up or perpetuating unnecessary fiscal or political liabilities that may lead to the system becoming unresponsive to changing needs. The design and implementation of social protection policies should ensure the participation of a broad range of stakeholders, including the most vulnerable, or their representative organizations.
- **Ensure that special care is taken in identifying and addressing the needs of the most vulnerable.** Food and nutrition insecurity may be pervasive in certain population groups defined by geography, gender, nature of livelihood, age, disease, disability, ethnicity or other characteristics. Care must be taken in matching the nutrition needs of these groups with the kind of support provided. It is also important to address any implicit or overt forms of discrimination that may exist in social or institutional settings, and that may be exacerbating the problem. For example, migrant workers, while not explicitly recognized as a group that is discriminated against, might turn out to be among the hardest to reach and therefore in need

to special targeting measures. Defining the benefits allocated through the programme and policies as a right can reduce the element of stigma attached to participation.

- **Balance the need to ensure effective coverage of the vulnerable with the need to maintain efficient use of resources.** There is no universal blueprint to ensure adequate coverage of vulnerable populations. In some cases (e.g. micronutrient fortification of basic foods), universal coverage may well meet the needs of both effectiveness and efficiency. In other cases, there might be a need to develop appropriate targeting criteria and mechanisms, and improve programme delivery methods through learning and innovation, in accordance with country-level capacity. In all cases, there is a need to ensure accountability and transparency in order to ensure effective coverage of the vulnerable and efficient use of resources.
- **Improve linkages between sectors and between actors.** For example, employment guarantee programmes that engage the unemployed can help rehabilitate or create small-scale infrastructure and agricultural assets that provide lasting benefits for the community. Similarly, Food/Cash-For-Training can assist people in adopting skills, (re-)entering the labour market and moving towards self-sufficiency. School feeding, an effective incentive to improve school enrolment and attendance, is a valuable tool for improving nutrition among children, especially girls. This can be enhanced by introducing food and nutrition education and school gardening into the school curriculum. While governments are primarily responsible for ensuring social protection, encouraging the participation of NGOs, CSOs and other stakeholders may be especially important in building awareness about patterns of vulnerability among different sections of the population, as well as helping monitor the reach and efficacy of programmes. Other forms of complementing public sector efforts are also possible: e.g. the private sector can be given incentives for local production of nutritionally rich foods
- **Improve the quality and diversity of foods** channelled through nutrition interventions to highly vulnerable groups, taking into account cultural sensitivities. Promote closer involvement of local producers and small- and medium-scale businesses in producing micronutrient-rich foods at the country level. Support the production, consumption and access of locally-produced high nutritional quality products — e.g. animal-sourced foods, high nutritive value crops, fruits and leafy vegetables, as well as fortified and bio-fortified foods — through training of agricultural extension agents and other service providers, intensifying nutrition and consumer education and implementing multi-media campaigns.
- **Support the implementation of international labour standards** by States, in particular those applicable to the agrifood sector and rural areas, in order to safeguard purchasing power of waged workers, including waged agricultural workers, thereby strengthening their access to adequate food. Such measures should include establishing a legally-defined minimum wage corresponding to a living wage, ensuring labour inspection in agriculture, securing legal entitlement to social security by agricultural workers equivalent to those applicable to other industries, establishing compulsory registries of agricultural workers and the compulsory licensing of labour contractors. Support ratification of relevant International Labour Organization (ILO) conventions by States where necessary.

Outcome 2.2: Sustained increases in food availability through growth in smallholder farmer food production

58. The extent to which investments in food security lead to long-term increases in the resilience of rural communities depends on the sustainability of improvements in smallholder farmers' food production and income. This is influenced by a number of factors, including alterations to the production environment due to climate change and potentially emerging competition between food and energy crops (*see Annex B*). The design of investments must be preceded by analysis of the context within which farmers are operating, the opportunities for marketing, the risks they face, and their longer-term prospects. The analysis must give due attention to gender-based obstacles faced by women farmers, as well as the identification of strategies to

overcome them. One of the options is to replicate the green revolution approach of the last two decades through enabling farmers to access improved seeds, fertilizers, pesticides and small-scale irrigation systems. But it will also be necessary to implement safeguards — restoring degraded soils and preventing further damage, improving the efficiency of water use, ensuring the biodiversity of agro-ecosystems (focusing on local varieties, land, watersheds and other resources), using research to enhance these systems (including the protection of local seeds), and developing improved market linkages between farmers, buyers and consumers. This means that investment policies should, wherever possible, reflect the heterogeneity of farming systems.

59. The productivity of most of the world's smallholders is still far below what could be achieved. This “yield gap” is usually a result of farmers being unable to access finance to purchase productivity-enhancing inputs and technologies, having insecure or inappropriate land access and tenure, lacking knowledge and training opportunities (especially for young people entering rural labour markets), being served by inadequate commercial infrastructure, facing high market costs for inputs and lacking information about sales price options. Unsustainable approaches to land and water management, including deforestation, insufficient use of nitrogen fixation and farming practices that damage topsoil, contribute to losses in soil fertility and productivity. They disrupt food production in fragile and marginal environments where smallholder farmers, herders and fishing people are the major custodians of natural soil, water, forests, pastoral land, fisheries, and biodiversity.

60. It is possible — in most countries — for smallholder farm yields to be doubled through policies that encourage the use of available technologies — linking support for the use of agricultural inputs to transfer of technologies. Priority would be given to technologies that reinforce existing smallholder farming and risk management systems. Integrated natural resources management, such as soil and water conservation approaches and Conservation Agriculture (CA) (*see Topic Box 5 and Annex A*), agro-forestry systems, linkage of crop and animal production systems, small-scale aquaculture and enhanced inland fisheries, provide a strong basis for enhanced productivity, sustainable use of resources and better adaptation to climate change.

61. Increases in farm yields can often lead to greater diversity in production — including crops or animal products with high nutritive value, to increase the likelihood that household diets are optimal in terms of nutritional content. Agriculture can make significant contributions to rural nutrition by closing the “nutrition gap” — the gap between what foods are available and what foods are needed for a healthy diet — on through increasing the production of foods with high nutritive value and encouraging their consumption.

62. Unleashing the full potential of smallholder farming is key to global food security, but needs to be supplemented with increased public and private investments that enable smallholders to derive more value throughout the food chain. For example, smallholders able to meet the quality, volume and timeframe requirements of commercial markets will be more likely to increase their incomes compared with those who cannot. Smallholder farmers able to grade, sort, pack, bulk up and store produce, and have strong business, marketing and negotiation skills, are likely to earn more when selling their produce.

63. This capacity is best built through effective organizations of smallholder farmers which work — on behalf of their members — for better access to services and higher prices for their products. Efforts to strengthen national farmer organizations and their networks, combined with encouragement of policy dialogue among purchasers, consumers, representatives of government and other actors in the food chain, contribute to the empowerment of farmers, enabling them to generate higher incomes and contribute to enhanced food security. This implies that developing the business skills, governance and management of producer organizations will improve their engagement in food chains and increase farmers' ability to retain a fairer share of the value added. Participation in these chains will generate increased income for small producers, create rural employment and thereby contribute to enhanced food security.

64. Well-dispersed and market-responsive agro-industries are vital for the development of competitive value chains. They take raw materials from farmers and transform them into value-added products that meet the needs of domestic, regional or international consumers. Policies that foster the evolution of skilful entrepreneurs with competitive agro-enterprises are essential. They will appreciate that markets work best when the different actors within food chains — including consumers, investors, researchers, service providers, processors, transporters and marketers — speak regularly with each other. They will also encourage value chain apex organizations and their technical teams to contribute to this dialogue so that all can raise their gains.

65. Secure and equitable access to natural resources, including land, water and biodiversity, benefits smallholder farmers, especially women and their families, indigenous peoples, pastoralists, fisherfolk and landless rural workers. Policies that improve access in this way are fundamental to the sustainability of smallholder farming systems, improving the potential of all rural producers, mitigating the risks related to food price volatility and achieving long-term food security. They are likely to involve: (i) transparent and inclusive processes for developing land, water, seed and biodiversity policies; (ii) people-centered land policies; (iii) gender equality in access to land and land tenure; (iv) recognition of diverse, flexible and plural legal systems; (v) land redistribution when needed to enable the landless and land-poor to gain sufficient access to the land they need; and (vi) transparent and accessible information about land and its availability. Democratic land governance, with the meaningful participation of all stakeholders, builds long-term resilience to food insecurity, creates opportunities to eradicate poverty and increases political, social and economic stability.

66. Public sector actions in support of smallholder farming include investments in “public goods” such as ecosystem services, improvements to rural infrastructure,³⁵ better markets for agricultural inputs and produce, sustainable management of water, forests, fisheries, genetic and other natural resources, provision of veterinary and extension services, smallholder-accessible financial services, relevant agricultural research and the dissemination of technologies. The owners of larger farms will also benefit from “public good” investments — including better infrastructure and veterinary services.³⁶

67. During the next four decades the world will need to double food production so as to meet the demands of growing populations within the context of changing climates. Agriculture has a dual role as energy user and supplier. Increasing international consensus on biofuel production and use will be a key contribution to debate (*see Annex B*). Subsidies for conventional inputs to agriculture, such as fertilizers, water supply and fossil fuel, may reduce the incentive for farmers to adopt “green technologies” in the food chain. To counteract this, there is increasing popularity of long-term investments in sustainable agriculture. These seek to (i) reduce greenhouse gas emissions by lowering the direct and indirect use of energy, (ii) replace energy derived from fossil fuels with energy from renewable sources and (iii) increase carbon sinks within the organic matter in soil and through above-ground biomass.³⁷ There are many technical, financial and institutional barriers to the adoption of these green technologies — including small farm size, credit constraints, risk aversion, lack of access to information, inadequate rural infrastructure and unsatisfactory land tenure arrangements.

³⁵ Critical local infrastructure, such as rural roads and bridges, public storage facilities and existing small-scale irrigation facilities require rehabilitation and where small-scale irrigation facilities do not exist, they need to be developed. These measures, combined with removal of internal policies which restrict or impede the movement of agricultural products, can significantly lower costs and improve the incentives for farmers to increase production.

³⁶ As for all social protection transfers, increasing access to production inputs without full cost recovery must be carefully designed. Risks include leakage of benefits to non-target groups, resale of inputs or input vouchers by the target group and rent seeking by officials, and that the interventions become a regular activity that would be difficult to terminate once the crisis subsides. It is also crucial not to impede or drive out local and national private sector input suppliers.

³⁷ This makes use of soil management systems that use by-products of bioenergy production.

Elements of the Action Framework

Outcome 2.2: Sustained increases in food availability through growth in smallholder farmer food production

Actions:

- **Ensure that the macroeconomic, budget, trade and sector policy framework provides incentives for sustainable increases in smallholder production and the development of input and output markets that serve smallholders (with a focus on the interests of women).** Analysis of national and regional food systems and their governance arrangements is critical for improving the functioning of food markets and identifying most effective public and private investments. It is also key to building more coherence between the various sectors involved in food and nutrition security, including agriculture, health, education, social services, finance. Smallholder-focused national and local governance of agriculture and food systems will contribute to improvements in accessibility of resources and services. The design and implementation of such policy frameworks are more likely to succeed with the participation of smallholder farmers' representatives.
- **Stimulate private investment in agriculture with focus on small-scale farming so that agriculture not only serves as a sustainable, environmentally sound and competitive source of growth and employment for the national economy, but also as a prime driver of industrial development in rural areas and the rural non-farm economy.** This requires creating an enabling environment for investments, including well-defined and transparent business regulations, contract enforcement, improvements in basic transport, communication and power infrastructure, and investments in basic education and health services. Coordination between public and private investment is critical. Effective public investment in rural development should lay the ground for further investments by businesses in inputs and services to smallholders, as well as expansion of agricultural marketing and value-adding agro-enterprises which integrate smallholders into both national and regional food supply chains.
- **Enhance secure and equitable access to natural resources, including land, water and biodiversity** by developing people-centred land policies; promoting gender equality in access to land and land tenure, flexible and plural legal systems and dissemination of transparent land information. Land redistribution can be envisaged for landless and land-poor.
- **Invest in agricultural research on food crops, animal production, aquaculture and inland fisheries in ways that reflect the interests of women and are sensitive to the challenge of improving nutrition.** The promotion of technology for improving food and nutrition security must take account of climate change. Emphasis should be given to research on improving the productivity of local foods so that they are more competitive and contribute to improvements in nutrition. Priority should also be given to technologies that improve soil fertility — such as integrated soil and water management, agricultural practices that reduce manual labour and save energy (particularly reducing demand for women's labour on the farm), and research within the food chains that builds on local knowledge and practices. Smallholder farmers should be the primary clients for information (including data on weather and climate change) and knowledge sharing (for example, through farmer-to-farmer exchanges and farmer field schools).³⁸ Smallholders should be provided with incentives to adopt low carbon energy mechanisms along the food chain and increase creation of bioenergy within agriculture as a sustainable energy source.

³⁸ The 2008 IAASTD presents a broader change agenda for the Agricultural Knowledge, Science and Technology systems “to be used to reduce hunger and poverty, to improve livelihoods and facilitate equitable environmentally, socially and economically sustainable development”. See: <http://www.agassessment.org/>. This was supported by the CSD 17 decision.

- **Improve rural infrastructure** such as roads, irrigation, electrification, and rural and wholesale markets to remove bottlenecks in agro-processing and marketing, reduce transaction costs and facilitate productivity. As mentioned above, this will help stimulate private investments.
- **Ensure sustained access to competitive, transparent and private-sector-led markets for food produce and quality inputs**, focusing on the key food commodity chains (from producer to consumer) and their stakeholders (producers, traders, processors, government). Strengthen market linkages, especially between farmers and food traders and processors (for instance through contract farming) and allow smallholder farmer and small-scale producer organizations in decision-making processes.
- **Support development of, and strengthen producer organizations with the participation of women.** Strong producer organizations enable smallholders and other actors in the food chain to reduce costs, manage common resources and learn together. They need support at local, national and regional levels to improve bargaining power in policy dialogue and within food value chains. Links between smallholder farmers and other actors in the food value chains (including traders, marketers, processors, consumers, etc.) are key for building a common vision, identifying the critical public and private investments to be made, and coordinating investments and services throughout the chains. These links should cover research, infrastructure, finance, production, storage, transportation, processing, services, and marketing. Improvement in the capacity of value chain apex organizations, equipped with technical teams, will increase the efficiency of food chains, better enable smallholder participation and contribute to effective policy dialogue among stakeholders.
- **Strengthen access of smallholders and other food value chain actors to financial and risk management instruments** in ways that encourage farm-level investments, boost productivity, and enhance assets. These instruments include leasing, insurance schemes for risk mitigation, matching grants, warehouse receipt systems, commodity-based financial products, and overdraft facilities for input dealers. They should be accompanied with good practice principles by professional financial institutions with no interference by governments in the provision of credit at retail level.
- **Improve animal production services.** The availability and quality of livestock genetics, animal health services and medicines, and feed are important to protect smallholder assets and to support crop production, nutrition and livelihoods.

Outcome 2.3: Better-managed ecosystems for food and nutrition security

68. Around 70 percent of the estimated 1.1 billion people in poverty live in rural areas and depend on the productivity of ecosystems for their livelihoods. Ecosystems provide communities with a diverse range of edible plant and animal species as food sources³⁹ and support entire agricultural systems. Farmers depend on them for pollination, pest control, water for drinking and irrigation, spawning of fisheries, and the conservation of wild species that form the basis of today's crops. The contribution of sustainable agro-ecosystems to food and nutrition security is often undervalued. Wild fish stocks, for example, support more than half a billion livelihoods and provide at least 25 percent of the animal protein intake for one billion people.

69. In some settings the overexploitation of natural resources and inadequate understanding of the value of agro-ecosystems has led to focus on increasing one type of service at the expense of others, resulting in land or watershed degradation. Modern ecosystem management encourages biological processes that underpin sustainable agricultural production. They include using agricultural inputs efficiently, which has the added

³⁹ These include vegetables, fruits, nuts, roots, algae, fungi, bush meat, insects, birds, and fisheries products. Also low-income rural people rely heavily on the direct consumption of wild foods, medicines and fuels, especially for meeting micronutrient and protein needs, particularly during periods of food shortages.

benefit of reducing the costs of production and raising farmer income. Sustainable biofuel development could also help inject new capital, technology and knowledge transfer in rural areas. This could help, in turn, increase agro-ecological productivity, and the engagement of smallholders, with possible food production benefits (*see Annex B*).

70. Healthy and productive agro-ecosystems are the backbone of sustainable food production and are at the heart of societal resilience. Within any society, farmers — particularly smallholders — are most likely to be affected by changing climate, degradation of the environment and increasing competition over natural resources. Their farms cover 38 percent of the global land area, 70 percent of which is grassland. Their long-term food security depends on the way in which ecosystems are managed and access to natural resources is governed. Further pressure on their food and nutrition security could come from large scale operations — including in the energy crops — if run without responsible governance of land tenure (*see Topic Box 8 and Annex B*). Increasingly governments are linking programmes for natural resource management and agro-ecosystem resilience within a broader set of policies for agriculture, food and nutrition security. They will usually seek to manage agricultural ecosystems in ways that permit sustainable production and encourage resilience in the face of a range of potential shocks. This means treating farmers as the custodians of ecosystems and recognizing their role in ensuring ecosystem viability.

71. Well-managed agro-ecosystems are also the basis for the well-being of rural communities as a whole: they protect watersheds, mitigate climate change and conserve biodiversity. They form the basis for long-term sustainable development and the continued provision of the essential services on which the whole of society depends.

Elements of the Action Framework

Outcome 2.3: Better-managed ecosystems for food and nutrition security

Actions:

- **Strengthen ecosystem monitoring and assessment.**
 - Assess the internal and external benefits of agro-ecosystem services in ecosystem monitoring and assessment programmes.
 - Give greater support for monitoring of key ecosystem services relevant to agricultural production (soil and water quality, agricultural biodiversity, nutrient cycling) as well as to positive externalities (watershed protection, biodiversity conservation, climate change mitigation).
 - Consider the different institutional mechanisms that must be put in place to facilitate sustainable use of ecosystems.
- **Improve natural resource management within agricultural ecosystems to improve their efficiency and resilience, particularly in the face of climate change.**
 - Improve soil management to reduce degradation and erosion, store carbon, retain water and increase soil fertility. This in turn can yield direct benefits to agricultural productivity and resilience, as well as indirect benefits in the form of higher returns to capital inputs (such as fertilizer and irrigation). One approach to improve soil management is to apply the three principles of CA: minimal soil disturbance, permanent soil cover and crop rotations.
 - Improve agro-biodiversity, including genetic resources within the production systems at community/regional levels, to control pest/disease incidence through practices such as IPM, provide greater yield stability, create opportunities for plant breeding to develop varieties that perform better under environmental stress, support ecosystem resilience and adaptability to climate change, and provide better nutrition.

- Improve water management in rain-fed and irrigated systems, including at river basin level, to improve productivity and water use efficiency, promote ecosystem services, and account for competing uses.
 - Develop programmes based on the progress of agricultural science and knowledge, for instance the International Assessment of Agricultural Knowledge, Science and Technology for Development (IAASTD), including better-referenced and validated indigenous knowledge.
 - Give a central role to local communities to put in place such strategies, taking into account gender and capacity-building issues.
- **Improve economic and institutional mechanisms to support sustainable management of agricultural ecosystems.** There are a range of policies and institutions that impact the constraints and incentives agricultural producers face in managing agricultural ecosystems. These range from input pricing and distribution policies (e.g. fertilizer, pesticides, seeds) to institutions governing property rights and access to resources (management of collective lands, pastoral systems, irrigation systems and fisheries), improving farmers' management capacity and access to technologies (extension programmes, farmer field schools), payment for environmental services (agricultural labelling, direct payments for conservation/mitigation), and tools to manage transitional and long-term risks. There is a need to better assess, in economic, environmental and social terms, the overall policy environment affecting agricultural ecosystem management incentives. A coordinated set of instruments — and not only economic tools — to improve the incentives and the enabling environment for sustainable use needs to be developed.

Outcome 2.4: Improved performance of international food markets

72. Well-functioning food markets are characterized by price transparency, low costs, efficiency and accessibility. They should serve as the basis for increased benefits, rather than risks, for the poor, and reduce food price volatility. Efforts to improve food markets should be consistent with the goal of improving food and nutrition security and improving the sustainability of smallholder production. Poor people have been particularly affected by weaknesses in the functioning of international food and agricultural markets. Food prices were relatively stable and low for several decades. The price volatility which started in 2007 has highlighted that current markets are neither perfectly transparent nor fully open — and they are also unpredictable. The impacts of policy actions taken by some countries have highlighted limitations in the international trading systems for agricultural products and food. Some analysts have concluded that speculation in futures and commodity markets played a major role in fuelling price rises.⁴⁰ To ensure well-functioning and transparent trading, and to limit the impact of speculation, financial and commodity markets should be reformed. Appropriate regulatory measures should be introduced at the multilateral level to ensure that the reforms are implemented.

73. The food price crisis has shown that many of these challenges require collective action at the multilateral level, especially to ensure strengthened international food markets free from distortions. Countries need to act in a coordinated way to avoid actions which respond to in-country needs but which worsen the situation in other countries. Efforts to rebuild and improve the management of household, community and national stocks should be complemented with regional and global stocks and related mechanisms to ensure food access. Stocks should be released strategically to support food access by the most vulnerable populations and to dampen price fluctuations. Food stock management often involves the private sector, including through private-public partnerships. Coordinated arrangements at the regional or global level, such as real or virtual strategic stock arrangements, can increase the confidence of governments that their people's urgent needs can be met rapidly in case of future food crises. However, further work is needed to assess the feasibility of an

⁴⁰ See: Robles, Miguel, Maximo Torero and Joachim von Braun, "When Speculation Matters" International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) Issue Brief 57, February 2009, available at <http://www.ifpri.org/sites/default/files/publications/ib57.pdf>.

international system of cereal stocks as a key strategy to counter the impacts of future disruptions to supply or demand (*see section 1.3*).

74. Similarly, there are emerging financial instruments which can support countries at much lower cost than holding physical stocks. These need further examination to ensure that they are appropriate for low-income countries and to ensure that governments can be confident in their reliability. Analysis is needed on the feasibility of the creation of food security reserves at regional levels, and linking production and stocks to improvements in access and better food and nutrition security (*see section 1.3*).

Food Reserves

Grain stocks have declined by about half over the past six years, largely reflecting consistently low prices and the confidence of countries in using foreign exchange reserves in procuring critical food purchases from the international market. However, the recent price spikes have called into question this approach.

Within the last two years several countries have increased their food reserves so that they have stocks that can be used to enable people to access to the food they need during periods when prices are volatile. Food from the stocks are released in response to an assessment of need and made available to vulnerable populations.

Governments recognize the need for caution before rushing into large increases in national stocks. Given limited current supplies and generally thin international food markets, rapid build-up of national stocks will put additional pressures on markets and contribute both to price rises and increased volatility. This is particularly likely following shortages associated with low harvests (e.g. wheat in Russia and Eastern Europe in 2010).

A judicious mix of policies involving, for example, buffer stocks (an attempt to use commodity storage for the purpose of stabilizing prices, often for an individual commodity) and measures to enhance the efficiency of markets might be practiced to address price volatilities. There are significant costs and complexities associated with the procurement and management of food stocks, particularly if undertaken by the public sector. Commonly commodities are bought when there is a surplus in the economy (e.g. harvest time), stored, and are then sold from these stores when there are economic shortages. In buffer stocks schemes the government establishes ceiling and floor prices at which to both buy and sell (if ceiling and floor are identical. Such schemes not only stabilize commodities prices but fix them). Such complexities can be reduced through a range of approaches, including development of regional stock or food reserve agreements, virtual stocks, financial instruments such as options or bonds, and contracts with local businesses to manage stocks. Warehouse receipts systems allow small-scale farmers to store their produce (primarily maize, rice and other staples) individually or collectively during harvest time, when prices are low; receive credit, using the product as collateral; and wait until prices are more favourable for selling. Receipts can become equivalent to advance-cash for farmers: the systems may be considered as a cost-effective means to maintain food reserves, which also provide additional benefits, including in the form of enhanced market efficiency, easing access to rural finance and facilitating trade.

75. Within any food crisis there will be questions about the extent to which it is affected by the speed, sequencing and nature of on-going trade liberalization in agriculture. These changes do enhance export and income generation opportunities for farmers in developing countries. But for their benefits to be felt by poorer communities, agricultural policies need to encourage efficient and competitive production by smallholders and increased investment in those parts of the agricultural sector on which smallholders depend. These include research, introduction of technology, agricultural extension, infrastructure, market information and marketing — all areas within which most countries have reduced investment in recent decades. These needs are recognized within the frameworks⁴¹ governing agricultural trade, with ongoing efforts to encourage such public support. As in other technological domains there are active debates on how to balance the role of intellectual property rights as incentives to innovation in agriculture and the need to ensure rapid and low-cost access of smallholders to these innovations.

⁴¹ In the framework of WTO rules, various policy measures relating to, inter alia, research, infrastructure, extension, marketing, nutritional food security, and rural employment-related programmes can be covered under the Green Box where expenditures are not subject to any monetary ceiling. Moreover, in the agriculture negotiations under the Doha Round WTO members are considering modifying the Green Box so as to even more effectively cover developing country's programs.

76. More liberalized international markets would contribute to global food and nutrition security through increased trade volumes and access to diverse sources of food imports.⁴² However, if there is an initial, rapid surge in imports, governments may need to intervene with temporary support mechanisms for national farmers and food producers. Governments should take into account the potential impact of changes in the trade regime on the fiscal revenue base. The extent to which developing countries lower their import tariffs on food requires careful assessment,⁴³ particularly if they are a strong source of government revenue and/or if the tariff line in question protects local production against cheap and subsidized imports.⁴⁴ Similarly, reductions in trade-distorting agricultural support in developed countries are particularly important, and should remain a priority concern for all nations.

77. Most developing country export profiles are characterized by a high degree of concentration on a limited range of product tariff lines (e.g. minerals, oil, agrifood and textiles). This renders them particularly vulnerable to demand-side volatility and to the impact of external shocks such as climatic events. So-called climate protectionism — the imposition of trade restrictive measures, such as trade tariffs, taxes or other charges on the imports of products from developing countries on climate grounds — could have a major impact on developing country trade, especially if there is a high degree of export concentration.

Elements of the Action Framework

Outcome 2.4: Improved performance of international food markets

Actions:

- **Support development of both regional and global mechanisms for improving emergency access to food through stock sharing** and reduced restrictions on the release of stocks to other countries under emergency conditions.
- **Assess the feasibility of models for the establishment and operation of sustainable, strategic reserves of key grains to counteract the impacts of future disruptions to supply and demand, as well as the management of food stocks at international, regional, national and community and household levels.**
- **Strengthen international oversight and analysis of food commodity and futures markets to improve their transparency and predictability and to limit the scope for speculation to exacerbate price volatility.** Analysis is needed on the impact of speculative activities on the volatility of agricultural markets. There is a risk that the use of these markets for quick financial gain will dominate price transparency and risk management functions in agricultural markets. However, given the direct impact of food price volatility on the well-being of poor people, it is also important to ensure that appropriate market safeguards are in place to limit the volatility that results from speculation and other factors, and — when it does occur — to reduce the impact of this volatility on poor people.
- **Promote increased agriculture trade and more open trading environments in ways that ensure sufficient investment in public goods to enable small farmers to gain access to innovations in agricultural technology, and that provide safeguards against sudden and excessive influxes of competing imports of foodstuffs.**

⁴² Note that gender inequalities should be addressed, and measures taken to ensure that women also benefit from opportunities that arise. A smooth adjustment process should be assured for those whom trade necessities dictate must shift from subsistence agriculture to other sectors.

⁴³ Such assessments are generally undertaken in the context of a broader economic policy setting and more specifically with a view to reconciling the interest of consumers in low-priced food and the interest of farmers in higher returns on their production. The Special Rapporteur on the right to food considers that an ex-ante human right assessment should be conducted.

⁴⁴ The presence of social safety nets may assist developing countries in their trade liberalization undertakings.

- **Reduce/eliminate agricultural trade distortions, in particular subsidies and market restrictions, in higher-income countries**, which undermine incentives for farmers in lower-income countries and impede progress on the broader free trade agenda.⁴⁵
- **Complete the Doha Round of trade negotiations⁴⁶ to provide an enhanced set of agreed rules for a more transparent and fair international trading system**, taking into account the food and nutrition security, livelihood security and rural development needs of the developing countries. The WTO Marrakesh Decision on Measures Concerning the Possible Negative Effects of the Reform Process on Least-Developed Countries and Net Food-Importing Developing Countries may need to assist these countries during a transitional period of higher food prices stemming from the implementation of the reforms, including how to ensure that incentives for private innovation and international publicly-funded research support the challenge of improving smallholder production in the short and longer term.
- **Ensure additional resources for “Aid for Trade”** in order to better enable developing countries to engage in and realize benefits from international trade in food products. This can include building capacity to utilize the provisions of trade agreements effectively, to design and implement appropriate trade policies, to assist with handling supply constraints and to overcome impediments to accessing markets (such as failure to meet quality and sanitary and phyto-sanitary standards, or insufficient labelling).
- **Develop trade financing infrastructure** to enable developing countries to expand their access to trade finance. Scarcity of trade finance may lead to a slow-down of both trade and production. It constrains the developing and low-income countries from participating fully in international trade. The development of trade financing infrastructure has also been pursued under the “Aid for Trade” initiative. During the 2009–2010 liquidity squeeze, better coordination between private sector financing agencies (which account for close to 80 percent of the market) and public sector and multilateral agencies has helped to reduce the gap between the demand and supply of trade finance.
- **Reduce constraints to an enabling environment that encourages private sector involvement in food markets**, so as to ensure an effective flow of food from farmers to consumers. Governments may require support to formulate appropriate policies for private sector involvement that bring sustained benefits to poorer producers and consumers.
- **Build capacity for international financial markets to better meet needs of lower-income countries** through development of price and weather-risk transfer instruments, which can reduce the fiscal impact of responding to a food crisis by shifting the risk to financial markets. Scale up successful pilot activities that link lower-income countries to futures and options markets, commodity exchanges, weather-indexed bond markets and weather reinsurance markets. This scaling up should include intermediation support from international financial institutions. Countries should be assisted to develop the necessary institutions, legal and regulatory framework, as well as the expertise to use these markets to their own best advantage.

⁴⁵ The CSD decided at its 17th session that market access for agricultural products should be substantially improved, the parallel elimination of all forms of export subsidies and disciplines on all export measures with equivalent effect should be ensured, and trade-distorting domestic support should be substantially reduced, in accordance with the mandate for the Doha Round and the Hong Kong Declaration on the Doha Work Programme. Special and differential treatment for developing countries shall be an integral part of all elements of the Doha Round and shall enable them to effectively take account of their development needs, including food security and rural development.

⁴⁶ Paragraph 13 of the Doha Declaration sets out the objectives of the negotiations on agriculture as follows: substantial improvements in market access, reductions of — with a view to phasing out — all forms of export subsidies, and substantial reductions in trade-distorting domestic support. Special and differential treatment for developing countries is to be an integral part of all elements of the negotiations and “non-trade concerns” are to be taken into account.

3. SUPPORTING INFORMATION AND ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEMS

Outcome 3.1: Strengthened information monitoring and accountability systems

78. Well-functioning information, monitoring and accountability systems are important for a) revealing the current status of agriculture development, food and nutrition security and the enjoyment of the right to food, b) identifying the magnitude of needs among different livelihood groups, and c) encouraging greater effectiveness, accountability, transparency and coordination of responses to these needs. They help decision makers in government, civil society and the international community to ensure that such responses are minimizing risks to the most vulnerable and accelerating progress towards reduced hunger, better food and nutrition security and the realization of the MDGs.

79. There are four principles applicable to these systems. One, they should allow decision makers to be accountable. Two, they should include participatory assessments that involve all stakeholders, including the most vulnerable. Three, they should be simple, accurate, timely and understandable to all, with indicators that capture impact (including unexpected outcomes). Four, they should not duplicate already existing systems, but rather build upon and strengthen them. Ideally, information systems also promote learning, thereby leading to more use of evidence in the discussion and making of policy.

80. Much information collection, analysis and monitoring work is already underway at community, country, regional and global levels. Systems are being strengthened and harmonized so that they capture developments in all aspects of food security (including availability, accessibility, stability of the supplies and their utilization) within the context of the five Rome Principles. Most national authorities, in collaboration with regional and global entities, are already documenting (or “mapping”) food and nutrition security activities in this way. In addition, the reformed CFS is considering tools to support national food and nutrition security mapping, so as to cover current food and nutrition security situations, dietary diversity and food consumption indicators, the status of strategies for agricultural development and food and nutrition security, as well as current and planned investments.

81. Significant attention is given to countries which are at high risk of food and nutrition insecurity. This may be because they a) exhibit limited capacity for responding to food insecurity and poverty; b) have a high prevalence of undernutrition, especially child undernutrition; c) have high food and fuel imports compared to total imports, exports and international foreign reserves; d) have relatively large and increasing urban populations; e) already experience high inflationary pressures and a politically unstable environment; f) have populations that spend a significant proportion of household income on food and are otherwise vulnerable to becoming food insecure; g) are increasingly exposed to extreme weather effects of climate change; and (h) lack appropriate policies to address these issues. National authorities may need support to measure, analyse and monitor vulnerability and to track risks and response capacity. This will enable them to reduce the likelihood of policies and actions that could adversely affect their populations and those of neighbouring countries.

82. National authorities are primarily responsible for the realization of the right to food for people in their countries. International organizations and non-governmental groups should assist national governments to establish a dialogue on accountability for the extent to which their people realize their right to food and to establish monitoring systems.⁴⁷ When such accountability systems are used to monitor responses to food shortages they should reveal any discrimination and exclusion with regard to access to food and any mismanagement of food assistance (e.g. corruption, hoarding, clientelism, etc.). An increasing number of

⁴⁷ UN Charter Art. 1(3) states that the purpose of the United Nations is “[...] to achieve international co-operation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without discrimination [...]”.

countries are introducing systems for monitoring the degree to which programmes encourage progressive realization of the right to food through institutional mechanisms for accountability — including: a) policies and strategies for food and nutrition security for all, b) a legal framework to back up such policies and strategies, c) mechanisms for multisectoral coordination of implementation, d) mechanisms for information, monitoring and analysis, and e) redress mechanisms through which individuals can seek remedies in case of policy failure.⁴⁸

Elements of the Action Framework

Outcome 3.1: Strengthened information monitoring and accountability systems

Actions:

- **Implement systems that track and review the implementation of national policies strategies, and legislation relevant to food and nutrition security.** Review systems should cover the legal obligations of government, the responsibilities of other stakeholders and the entitlements of beneficiaries, as well as the institutional mechanisms for participation, coordination, monitoring and redress. They should also cover mobilization and use of resources and should be developed and implemented in a participatory manner. They should examine the extent to which policies and strategies include clear allocation of responsibilities, precise timeframes and benchmarks. They will contribute to a framework for identifying problems with service provision (e.g. corruption, hoarding, clientelism or exclusion of marginalized groups) and monitoring realization of the right to food .
- **Improve further the coordination of information systems on food and nutrition security** to facilitate a comprehensive analysis. There are several initiatives underway to synchronize overlapping information systems and provide a systematic understanding of countries at-risk and their needs and trends across the dimensions of poverty, vulnerability, production and trade. This information needs to be updated and comparable with other national and international programmes, and linked to decision makers and stakeholders such as smallholder farmers.
- **Continue to carry out comprehensive food and nutrition security assessments, monitoring and evaluation** in some of the most vulnerable countries, including an analysis of all factors, policies and trends that may impact food price levels and transmissions, local food availability, consumption, access and utilization. Where necessary, investment in surveillance and early warning systems should be increased. The country's commitment and capacity to implement the required actions should also be assessed, while capacity development initiatives should be designed where needed.
- **Undertake integrated analysis and monitoring of the impacts of shocks on food and nutrition security.** The analysis should determine how many people are affected by food and nutrition insecurity and indicate which groups are most affected by shocks (age, gender, livelihood and geographical area) and how many people are concerned. Analysis and monitoring should be based on data collected through a variety of sources, capturing households' incomes, expenditures (food and non-food), food availability, food sources, food consumption and dietary diversity patterns, and coping mechanisms. Impact of policy responses on households' coping strategies, including the expected impact of international trade measures on the diet and health of the affected populations should also be considered.
- **Conduct nutrition assessments** and set up a nutritional surveillance system, focusing on vulnerable groups, such as pregnant and breastfeeding women, children under the age of two, the elderly and those suffering from infectious diseases. Assessments should account for nutritional deficiencies that have a range of causes, including: a) insufficient availability, access to and consumption of quality foods, b) lack

⁴⁸ See Briefing note 01, May 2010, "Countries tackling hunger with a right to food approach", UN Special Rapporteur on the right to food, available at http://www.srfood.org/images/stories/pdf/otherdocuments/20100805_briefing_note_01_en_ok.pdf.

of adequate care, hygiene, water and sanitation, and c) increased exposure to diseases. An analysis of the implementation of essential nutrition interventions, their quality and efficiency, is also required. Linkages between food and nutrition security assessment and decision-making at policy and programme level should be strengthened.

- **Review contingency plans and strengthen preparedness and early warning systems** that take account of risks, impact, capacities and response mechanisms, and focus attention on the food-processing sector and consumer behaviours.
- **Put in place remedial mechanisms** — including administrative and judicial mechanisms — through which individuals or groups of individuals can seek remedies in case they cannot enjoy their entitlements (e.g. intended programme not reaching those most vulnerable). Access to such recourse mechanisms, especially by the most vulnerable and marginalized, should be facilitated and necessary assistance should be provided.

C. ACHIEVING UCFA OUTCOMES

83. The effort to overcome the underlying causes of food and nutrition insecurity will require years of sustained effort by a broad range of stakeholders along the line of the Five Rome Principles for Sustainable Global Food Security

- a) support for country-led processes;
- b) ensuring a comprehensive approach to food and nutrition security;
- c) strategic coordination of assistance;
- d) supporting a strong role for multilateral institutions;
- e) sustaining a robust commitment of financial resources.

The implementation of these principles requires political commitment, new policies, improved capacity, careful investments, and can only be secured through collective advocacy and action by all the stakeholders together.

84. The HLTF has helped the UN System work in synergy on a comprehensive approach to food and nutrition security by supporting actions on the full range of the CFA outcomes to

- a) make the most effective contributions to food and nutrition security in countries;
- b) advocate for the funds needed both for urgent action and long term investment;
- c) inspire a coordinated engagement by multiple stakeholders;
- d) improve accountability of the international system.

85. Progress on these efforts is documented in the Annual HLTF Progress Report available at www.un-foodsecurity.org; this was reviewed by stakeholders as the CFA was updated between January and May 2010. Several lessons have been learned: primarily that strong multi-stakeholder partnerships are needed at country, regional and global levels. Such partnerships should represent the interest of the population groups that are most affected by food and nutrition insecurity, and should be characterized by synergy of working and close cooperation. They should embody the organizing principle of subsidiarity and perform tasks appropriate for their level of action that cannot be performed effectively at another level. They are critically important at the country and regional levels. To support these partnerships, the CFA in its updated form should be translated into an operational, comprehensive tool that is actionable at the local and regional level.

1. PARTNERSHIPS AT COUNTRY LEVEL

86. A comprehensive approach to food and nutrition security requires the selection of optimum policies and well-designed activities on several fronts at the country level, with a focus on sustainable agricultural production, procurement and distribution, nutrition support and safety net strengthening. Within governments, each of these areas is associated with one or more ministries; outside governments there is generally a multitude of stakeholders — donors, HLTF organizations, NGOs, CSOs, private sector, development banks and other entities — with a varying degree of involvement and expertise in one or more of these areas. Meaningful civil society participation has contributed to concrete results at country level and the accountability of different partners. It is critical that all stakeholders work together as partners and coordinate their activities towards common objectives.

87. The importance of establishing strong multi-stakeholder partnerships for agricultural development, food and nutrition security at the country level is reflected in the five Rome Principles, which can only be brought to life through joint, coordinated action. Such partnerships are most effective when there is strong national ownership. A country-led food and nutrition security strategy can help identify individual and joint roles of the various stakeholders along each of the four dimensions of food and nutrition security: availability, stability, access and utilization. The process of forming such a strategy, carried out in a transparent, consultative and participatory way, can itself become an important force towards forging such partnerships,

and identify roles and opportunities for NGOs, producers' and consumers' organizations and other partners to contribute in line with their comparative advantages.

88. Regarding the multilateral system, a broad and inclusive partnership, based on the UN Resident and Humanitarian Coordinator and World Bank Country Director systems and other established country-level mechanisms, is a key factor for achieving improved food and nutrition security outcomes. Therefore, the agencies comprising the HLTF have committed themselves to a more unified approach, more concerted action and strengthened coordination with multi-year resource commitment at the country level for improved food and nutrition security in all of its aspects. Where appropriate, HLTF member agencies plan together, draw upon shared resources, synergize their actions, and use common approaches to monitor and report on progress. They build upon the lessons learned from initiatives such as the "one-UN" pilots, "MDGs achievement funds", and the CAADP Roundtables, to function more effectively.

89. National Poverty Reduction/Development Strategies, United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks (UNDAFs) and, where available, national food and nutrition security strategies, can serve as organizing frameworks for coordination. Modalities for coordination will vary from country to country, but would typically be characterized by close and systematic joint action to address both the needs of vulnerable people and the drivers of vulnerability and food and nutrition insecurity, in support of governmental plans. Close and more systematic cooperation on their assessments and planning efforts, and systems for regular consultation and sharing of analysis will help strengthen the partnership in ways that support national priorities, fill gaps, and avoid duplication.

90. The following work and coordination modalities can be adapted to each individual country context, making full use of — and strengthening if necessary— the systems and capacities that are already in place, while ensuring the participation of non-institutional actors:

- **Reflect joint working in country level partnerships.** These partnerships will encompass food assistance, food and nutrition security, sustainable agricultural development, other livelihood-support activities that increase and diversify household incomes of the poor, trade and other economic issues, and will be led by national authorities, bringing together civil society, including farmer/producer and consumer organizations, women farmers, urban poor, private sector,⁴⁹ scientific and research bodies, regional and international organizations, and development banks. They should involve in a coordinated manner relevant government departments, including the ministries for finance, planning, agriculture, natural resources, environment, health and education as well as key social and sectoral actors, with clear, visible and accountable political leadership. To ensure efficiency and sustainability, the work of partnerships should be consistent with the principles of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and the Accra Agenda for Action.
- **Undertake regular assessments.** Stakeholders that agree to coordinate should establish joint assessments and ensure that they are planned, discussed and analysed collaboratively, in a way that will help establish understanding of underlying causes of food and nutrition vulnerability and insecurity, immediate and longer-term consequences, and an appropriate mix of short- and longer-term policy and programme options. These assessments could build upon those already developed within the country's existing institutional, planning and budgeting processes (e.g. Poverty Reduction Strategies, UNDAFs, National Development Plans, national food and nutrition policies and strategies, sectoral plans) and engage the broad range of stakeholders so as to benefit from their knowledge, skills, expertise, suggestions and support.

⁴⁹ Responsible for the movement of nearly all food from the farmer to the consumer and for the supply of most farm inputs, the private sector can play a major role in promoting food and nutrition security. However, the sector often works in a fragmented way and does not partner well with government and other stakeholders. Private sector companies need to consider promoting greater collaboration amongst themselves, such as by establishing associations of the entire food chain (inter-professional commodity associations).

- **Build on and strengthen existing mechanisms and programmes.** Partnerships should avoid, where possible, creating new approval, reporting or coordination mechanisms, and add value by bringing together existing constituencies working on the relevant issues. The partnerships should ensure the participation of those stakeholders addressing cross-cutting issues, including gender, human rights and nutrition, and also finance, planning and trade.
- **Consolidate actions to avoid overlaps, fill gaps and attain objectives.** The wide range of actions — ongoing or planned — by stakeholders should be coordinated as much as feasible into a shared standard implementation framework, with identified roles and responsibilities for all actors that will help reach the food and nutrition security goals. This framework will provide all stakeholders a clear view of their roles in achieving country-specific objectives, improving coordination of support, and identifying unmet needs.
- **Engage with the private sector through value chain “apex organizations”.** Given that much of food production, processing, transportation, export and retailing involve businesses, partnerships designed to improve food and nutrition security work best if they engage the private sector. Given that different businesses generally have discrete objectives, care will be needed to encourage an integrated approach that pursues sustained improvements in food and nutrition security and — at the same time — reflects their collective interests as businesses. This means bringing together farmers, traders, processors, transporters, exporters, retailers and other business interests through value chain “apex organizations”. As well as working together for food and nutrition security, they can foster dialogue among public and private actors, including consumers, and coordinate both investments and services (in infrastructure, finance, production, storage, transportation, processing, services, marketing and research). In this respect, it is necessary that value chain apex organizations are equipped with technical teams, and are able both to improve the efficiency of food chains and contribute to policy dialogue with government and other partners.
- **Review existing monitoring and evaluation mechanisms (and install new ones if required) to track food and nutrition security outcomes.** Partnerships should build upon and strengthen existing tracking, monitoring and evaluation mechanisms, established within national development, poverty reduction, agriculture, food and nutrition programmes. Budget monitoring and MDGs reporting processes are fundamental to ensure adequate tracking of key food and nutrition security indicators, especially among the most vulnerable populations. In this regard, partnerships should ensure adequate national capacity in the area of food and nutrition security statistics and information systems, policy analysis and formulation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. This could be done by: (i) providing cutting-edge knowledge, methods and tools; (ii) facilitating knowledge exchange and lessons-learning among peers; (iii) reviewing practical mechanisms to implement policy changes; and (iv) team-building among key stakeholders, including development partners.
- **Promote effective public communications.** This will ensure that partnerships’ analysis, strategy and proposed actions are understood by the wider public, in particular those whom the actions are intended to assist. Civil society partners within partnerships will seek to ensure that collective effort yields the expected benefits — reaching specified people in the quantities and qualities intended. Communications should highlight expected impact of trade, fiscal and other macroeconomic policy measures on poverty and communities.

91. *Contributions by the UN System:* The UN and the Bretton Woods institutions work together within the HLTF which is chaired by the United Nations Secretary-General with the Director-General of FAO as Vice-Chair. These institutions are committed to supporting the country-led processes outlined above. They will help catalyse effective coordination, action and accountability at the country level, mobilize international financial support, ensure sound information management, promote the design of sustainable and comprehensive national plans for food security and dedicate resources and skilled personnel to support

national assessments, actions and monitoring. The Coordination Team of the HLTF is tracking country situations, measures planned and taken by the government and the international community in response to food insecurity through the development of country-reports and fiches published on its website www.un-foodsecurity.org.

92. *Synergized external assistance*: In addition, HLTF member institutions are ensuring that their own country support frameworks and existing coordination mechanisms fully facilitate and reinforce their commitments to help address food and nutrition challenges within the framework of the UCFA. Adjustments are being made to policies, programme design, financial and technical resources, as well as to relevant assessment and monitoring frameworks to reinforce accountability in supporting country-level results. Annex C highlights actions of the HLTF members in support of countries to respond to immediate consequences of some of the current food and nutrition challenges, and to address simultaneously underlying causes and contribute to improved food and nutrition security in the longer term.

2. PARTNERSHIPS AT REGIONAL LEVEL

93. The HLTF is engaged with the regional organizations as they expand their role in responding to food and nutrition insecurity. HLTF engagement with regional bodies is based on an acknowledgement of two important dimensions of their role: (1) political incentive and technical guidance to promote responses at country level and (2) building regional markets and pooling risks and responses of their membership.

94. Political groupings such as the African Union and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) have developed policy frameworks⁵⁰ that provide a conceptual basis for the development of national policy and practical guidance on inclusive planning processes. These processes are essential for building the partnerships needed at country level for food and nutrition security. There is strong coherence between these regionally-owned frameworks and the CFA, especially on the will to develop a comprehensive approach to food and nutrition security issues.

95. Regional partnership platforms, such as the CAADP Partnership Platform, provide space for dialogue among regional groupings, governments, donors and UN agencies. They facilitate common agreement on shared principles and proposed actions and pave the way for improved alignment of policies. They also offer opportunities for monitoring and evaluation of performance and tracking governments' expenditures and aid flows, hence stimulating a better coordination of donors, regional multilateral development banks and UN agencies for coherent supports to countries.

96. Beyond the critical policy support they provide to member governments, Regional Economic Commissions are developing regional policies to address the cross-border dimensions of food and nutrition security and build strong regional markets. The rationale for regional policies for food and nutrition security is based on the strong intra-regional complementarities between ecology, production and consumption. It is also based on the need for shared management of trans-boundary resources (such as rivers and river basins, aquifers, pastoral lands and marine resources). The regional food and nutrition security policies focus on regional investment for fostering national efforts and tackling specific regional issues such as the lifting of intra-regional trade barriers, reinforcement of regional value-chains, harmonization of information systems and coordination of monitoring systems for food emergencies. Given the historical institutional and political fragmentation of many sub-regions, convergence and synergies of plans of actions of national and regional stakeholders might be challenging. However, some regions have been developing coordination mechanisms with all stakeholders that ensure alignment and coherence of the technical and financial contributions by international aid, regional banks, regional technical agencies and regional platforms of farmers' and CSOs.

⁵⁰CAADP of the African Union or Convergence Matrix of Programs and Activities on the Implementation of Food Security of the ASEAN.

97. The HLTF and regional groupings are working together to reinforce synergies at the different levels of engagement (country, sub-regional, regional and global levels) and to strengthen the participation of civil society, farmers' organizations and private sector in these processes. The HLTF is facilitating the convergence of different regional and sub-regional efforts to establish clear regional food and nutrition security policies with ownership of all concerned.

98. The HLTF is encouraging the provision of greater support for regional economic integration processes and the use of regional entities as effective intermediaries in the development of policies and plans for addressing food and nutrition security challenges.

3. PARTNERSHIPS AT GLOBAL LEVEL

99. *Global Partnership for Agriculture, Food Security and Nutrition (GPAFSN)*. The concept of a partnership — embracing multiple stakeholders, mobilizing significant new resources and drawing on the advice of an expert scientific panel — emerged during 2008, and was proposed by the French President at the High Level Conference on Food Security and Climate Change in Rome in June of that year. The African Union, the European Union and the G8 committed to support it. After the 2008 G8 Summit, Japan chaired an expert group on global food security to develop principles for the partnership. Some nations favoured a formally constituted entity; others wanted an informal arrangement bringing together interested parties around a common cause. At the January 2009 High Level Meeting on Food Security for All, in Madrid, participants indicated that any formally constituted entity should be assembled through an intergovernmental process. During 2009 and 2010 the Partnership has evolved as the amalgam of convergent initiatives on agriculture and food and nutrition security.

100. *Governance of global efforts to address food and nutrition insecurity*. In November 2009, the FAO Conference endorsed the reform of the CFS as a central component of the evolving GPAFSN. Conference agreed to extend its inclusiveness beyond Member States to representatives from intergovernmental bodies and organizations, private sector bodies (and foundations), development banks and other stakeholders within civil society (including farmers' and labour organizations). A programme to revitalize the CFS (*see paragraph 14*) was agreed at the World Summit on Food Security in November 2009.⁵¹

101. *Ensuring a sound scientific base for sustained improvements in food and nutrition security*. The CFS will be able to draw on a HLPE on Food Security and Nutrition that offers authoritative and credible guidance to stakeholders on issues which do not enjoy international consensus. This is expected to lead to more informed policy debates and to improve the quality and effectiveness of international and national policy decisions — for example, regarding means to address the continuing volatility of food prices, supporting communities to adapt their farming systems to changing climate, the place of agricultural practices that depend on inputs of seeds and fertilizers, and ways to help smallholders access and protect their tenure rights, especially when external interests seek to acquire their land for their own purposes. A group of fifteen world class experts was appointed to the HLPE Steering Committee in September 2010. At the same time, the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) is being reformed so that it responds better to the interests of farmers in poorer countries and delivers new insights and technologies that benefit them. The United Nations Standing Committee on Nutrition (UNSCN) has been established by the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) of the United Nations to harmonize standards, policies and action of the UN System and other stakeholders in nutrition. The UNSCN is now reforming its working processes and governance so that the core global functions can be delivered more efficiently, in links with relevant initiatives, including the Renewed Efforts Against Child Hunger (REACH) and that to implement the Framework for Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN).

⁵¹ See <http://www.fao.org/cfs/en>

102. *The significance of the L'Aquila Joint Statement on Global Food Security.* The funds committed at the 2009 L'Aquila G8 Summit represented a dramatic increase in the amount potentially available for investment. More importantly, the statement agreed by the heads of state of 26 countries and 14 representatives of regional and international organizations spelled out a novel approach that called on the multiple stakeholders in the Global Partnership for Agriculture, Food Security and Nutrition to work with synergy, flexibility and trust, despite the challenges they each face with current strictures on development assistance. This approach was reaffirmed at the 2009 World Summit on Food Security, including the five principles of the L'Aquila Joint Statement renamed as the "Five Rome Principles for Sustainable Global Food Security".

103. *Putting the L'Aquila Joint Statement into practice.* Different stakeholders have been trying to make the L'Aquila Joint Statement operational. Their effort is described as the L'Aquila Food Security Initiative (AFSI). This has meant:

- Harmonization of donor practices in line with the five Rome Principles, while recognizing that they have their own ongoing programmes;
- Establishing a mechanism for tracking the L'Aquila pledge as one element of the wider development assistance funding for food and nutrition security, making space for the full range of donors to be covered by this tracking, and maintaining the focus on comprehensive actions to improve food and nutrition security;
- Maintaining the engagement of the CFS in this effort at global level while encouraging involvement of the full range of stakeholders at country and regional levels;
- Supporting countries as they map the agriculture, food and nutrition situation and establish who is doing what with a view to improving coordination and effectiveness while sustaining the comprehensive approach (and seeking to build viable linkages between work on food and nutrition security);
- Assisting all stakeholders with the development of investment strategies, plans and programmes (based on policy agreements such as compacts);
- Monitoring results so as to ensure ongoing mutual accountability at the global, regional and national level.

104. *How different elements fit together.* The CFS provides the highest level of global governance on food security. It is an intergovernmental committee that incorporates representation from civil society, the private sector, foundations, development banks, the research community and the UN System. It explicitly encourages such interactions at regional and national level. The CFS is due to consider developing a process to prepare a Global Strategic Framework (GSF) for food security and nutrition. CFS members have called for a framework that reflects their collective interests and is to be developed through a democratic and participatory process. The GSF is intended to be a document negotiated and agreed upon by Member States. It will be flexible so that it can be adjusted as priorities change and will build on other frameworks such as the UCFA (which is the guiding strategic document for the HLTF and has not been negotiated), the CAADP, and the Voluntary Guidelines to Support the Progressive Realization of the Right to Adequate Food in the Context of National Food Security. The IAASTD and the five Rome Principles will also be considered. The UCFA of the HLTF is a living document and will be updated again, as necessary, once the CFS Global Strategic Framework has been completed.

105. *Increasing accountability for food and nutrition security.* The AFSI group is a selection of nations, regional bodies and intergovernmental organizations that are committed to supporting national food and nutrition security efforts in line with the five Rome Principles and in close cooperation with the CFS. The AFSI group committed to track their support and be fully accountable for its impact. This accountability will reflect the principles agreed in the CAADP Mutual Accountability Framework developed in 2010. The HLTF, as a time-limited mechanism to stimulate more coordinated and effective action on all dimensions of food and nutrition security by the UN System, will work in support of the CFS and of the AFSI group. Some HLTF

members and the HLTF Coordinator are part of the CFS Advisory Group which helps the CFS Bureau take its work forward and contribute to the functioning of the CFS as a whole.

4. SYNERGIZED WORKING AND COOPERATION

106. *Regional value chains* have the potential of expanding markets by providing incentives for private investors to make long-term investments in agro-processing and agribusiness. They also provide a context for governments to jointly address institutional and other constraints to regional investment and trade in commodities. Regionally-integrated value chains could also be important for expanding markets, both for inputs and outputs, including for smallholder farmers, who are often at a disadvantage in terms of accessing these markets.

107. *South–South cooperation* offers real opportunities for the transfer of policy experiences and technologies necessary for boosting agricultural productivity in developing countries, and also opens up investment and market opportunities on a more level playing field than currently exists for many producers. There is much to be gained from the exchange of experience and knowledge between countries and communities seeking to develop their agriculture and food and nutrition security systems, especially if they face similar challenges. The exchange is most likely to involve the transfer of technology and exchange of expertise. It usually involves technical cooperation and training for capacity building — it involves producer organizations and cooperatives as well as national and regional institutions. A number of countries are emerging as active partners on technical and economic development cooperation in developing regions, especially in Africa. These countries include Brazil, China, Cuba, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, South Africa, Turkey, and several countries in the Middle East. For example, the Brazilian Agriculture Research Corporation (EMBRAPA) has developed over 9000 technologies for Brazilian agriculture, improved productivity and food supply, whilst striving to conserve natural resources and adaptation to climate change. It is also actively engaged in sharing its experience with other developing countries in Latin America and Africa.

108. An important rationale for South–South cooperation is the similarity of soil, climatic and ecological conditions among some groups of developing countries. Where countries have successfully developed agricultural technologies specifically for small-scale farmers, and have designed and implemented the right policies to help raise investments in the rural sector, mechanisms need to be devised to share these experiences with other developing countries. At the same time, South–South cooperation in agriculture can help promote a diversity of experiences that could well be the single most important ingredient for achieving sustainable agriculture, particularly in small farmer settings.

109. *Triangular cooperation* exists when South–South cooperation is supported through partnerships with donors who provide financial and/or technical assistance. It is regarded as the “third generation” of cooperation, and for many it represents a promising field with great and still largely untapped potential. FAO’s Special Programme for Food Security (SPFS) and the Japan International Cooperation Agency’s programme on research are examples of triangular cooperation. The NERICA project (New Rice for Africa) resulted from the cooperation between several African countries and research centres, backed by donors (e.g. Japan, FAO and the African Development Bank). It led to the creation of new drought-resistant and high-yield rice for Africa, and is an illustration of the potential of triangular cooperation for future consideration.

110. *Decentralized cooperation* has an enormous impact on food and nutrition security in many nations — and prevents many local level and national crises. It is most effective when coordinated with others under the leadership of national authorities. There is scope for decentralization of all cooperation — so that it occurs between farmer organizations, small-scale enterprises, local governments and CSOs — whether North–South or South–South. Local authorities are working together on new dynamics for development and contributing to the different aspects of food and nutrition security by supporting development stakeholders, structuring professional organizations, pooling expertise and political commitment and strengthening capacity-building.

5. INVESTING IN FOOD AND NUTRITION SECURITY

111. Realization of the outcomes in this Updated CFA requires a combination of policy adjustments, efficient programmes, and domestic financing (from public and private sources). Some countries require and seek international assistance for the pursuit of both immediate and long-term outcomes. In 2008, the food price crisis focused attention on the need to catalyze, monitor and coordinate financial flows in support of food and nutrition security from the myriad different sources. As the HLTF agencies highlighted in their various studies and appeals, realizing the outcomes of the UCFA requires mobilizing additional funding from all key stakeholders — private and public. It also requires that available resources are invested effectively and consistently to country-led priorities developed through national and regional processes such as CAADP compacts or Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs). Furthermore such investment plans should also clearly be sensitive to social and environmental aspects and should ensure coherence, alignment, accountability and transparency of international assistance. While the overall amount of available public finance from domestic and international sources remains of paramount concern to many stakeholders, there is increasing recognition that the sources of these funds, the conditions under which they are available, the amounts actually committed, their alignment and the way the funds are used and accounted for are all important issues in determining the results achieved in relation to long-term food and nutrition security. Transparency on all these elements of both domestic and international financing is of vital importance as a contributor to trusting relations between the partners that support investments in food and nutrition security.

112. The estimated amount of funding required varies significantly but there is general agreement on the need to reverse and compensate for the rapid decline in investment in agriculture, food and nutrition security over the past 25 years. Estimates of the total financing needed reflect different objectives, funding periods and potential sources of funds.⁵² In addition, many of these estimates have not included the costs of developing and implementing improved and more sustainable nutrition programmes and safety nets as an inherent component of the food and nutrition security agenda.⁵³ Accordingly, while these estimates are helpful in demonstrating the magnitude of the increase in resource flows required to support food and nutrition security, they need to be complemented by assessments of the sources, direction, terms and uses of the funds relative to the priority areas highlighted by the UCFA.

113. Although it is advisable that the shares of national budgets that contribute to food and nutrition security increase, ODA clearly has an important role in coordinating and accelerating planning and implementation of food and nutrition security investment plans. The fight against undernutrition and hunger cannot afford to be constrained by the current revenues available to developing countries, particularly in the context of additional shocks, such as the financial crisis and increased climate variability. Accordingly, ODA is critical to support key public investments highlighted in the UCFA, including safety nets, infrastructure, research and extension and capacity strengthening. In terms of progress in mobilizing ODA resources, available statistics demonstrate that following a long period of decline, investment in agriculture is increasing, though it remains well below historic levels and there is scope for improving the targeting vis-à-vis food and nutrition security needs. After bilateral and multilateral ODA to agriculture fell to a 30-year low in 2002, it has been increasing at an average annual rate of 5 percent in real terms from 2002 to 2007, raising actual annual flows from approximately \$4 billion in 2002 to over \$6 billion in 2007. Figures for 2008 and 2009 are expected to indicate even faster increases, albeit from a drastically low base. While two thirds of this assistance went to poorer countries, with Sub-Saharan Africa receiving 31 percent and South and Central Asia 23 percent, the aid is not well targeted on the countries with the highest rates of undernutrition.

⁵² For example, annual agricultural investment requirements vary from \$16 million (IFPRI) to as high as \$500 million (FAO) depending on whether the focus is on meeting MDG1 by 2015, or eliminating hunger by 2025, and whether the investments of farmers and other local private sector are included in the estimates.

⁵³ The total financing needs to scale up priority nutrition interventions has been estimated to be US\$ 11.8 billion per annum, of which US\$ 1.5 billion is expected to be borne by private household resources. This leaves a total financing gap of US\$ 10.3 billion to be raised from public resources (both national and global) to support the scale-up. (Scaling Up Nutrition: What will it Cost?, World Bank, 2009).

114. In terms of most recent commitments to respond to food and nutrition insecurity, \$22 billion was pledged at the L'Aquila G8 Summit in July 2009, \$6 billion of which is expected to be additional funds.

115. Several initiatives are improving both the mobilization and coordination of ODA in support of food and nutrition security. The Global Food Crisis Response Program (GFRP) is a \$2 billion initiative launched by the World Bank in 2008 to mitigate the initial shock of high food prices on vulnerable groups. The European Union's Food Security Facility has already committed €1 billion to projects worldwide, working through the UN, the World Bank and NGOs. Other emergency responses were initiated by the full range of bodies within the HLTF. The Global Agriculture and Food Security Programme (GAFSP) is a Fiduciary Intermediary Fund established at the World Bank launched on 22 April 2010.⁵⁴ To date, firm pledges to GAFSP amount to approximately \$880 million (with contributions from Canada, Ireland, the Republic of Korea, Spain, and the United States of America, as well as the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation). The GAFSP seeks to help countries in their quest for the long-term growth and sustainability of the smallholder farms. There have been increased contributions to FAO, WFP, IFAD and other agencies, funds and programmes within the HLTF and these have brought benefits to millions of food insecure households (for example total confirmed contributions to WFP rose from \$3 billion in 2007 to \$5 billion in 2008 and \$4 billion in 2009). All these collective initiatives complement actions supported through bilateral donor funding. However, the funds available still fall short of the overall needs.

116. FDI is also an important source of investment financing that is complementary with public investment-focused ODA, but needs to take place in a context that ensures consistency with national food and nutrition security objectives. Given that most agricultural, and many safety net activities are inherently in the private sector, direct foreign investment flows are an important source of transfer of know-how as well as financing. Available data regarding international private investment flows from the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) indicate a more rapid increase in private FDI in developing country agriculture, though this is largely in the processing sectors. From 2002 to 2007, FDI increased from approximately \$15 billion to \$60 billion. Almost 90 percent of this investment was in food and beverage processing and marketing, which underscores the continuing importance of smallholders' own investments and domestic private and public sector financing for primary production. To date, only one initiative has already been developed that aims at increasing food and nutrition security relevant FDI investments.

117. The sustainability of public efforts to secure food and nutrition security for all depends primarily on developing countries' own public expenditures. In terms of sectoral financing from developing country governments, while data is limited, there is a consensus on increasing the share of public expenditures focused on agriculture and food security. Under CAADP, following the Maputo Declaration, African states have set the goal of targeting 10 percent of public expenditures to agriculture, a goal which around 20% of countries have achieved to date. These commitments have also generated increased interest amongst stakeholders in-country to better understand and participate in the setting of budgetary priorities and investment plans and monitoring of their impacts.

118. The most significant source of financing now and in the future will be private sector investments within developing countries themselves, including their smallholder farmers.⁵⁵ While the withdrawal of State support for many aspects of agricultural services has stimulated an increased role for the local private sector, this remains grossly inadequate due to the absence of complementary public services and know-how and, in some cases, enabling policy environment. The State has therefore a critical role to play in ensuring sound policies for the provision of these services.

⁵⁴ The GAFSP includes a private sector window to be implemented by the International Finance Corporation to complement its Public Sector Window. The GAFSP private sector window will deploy instruments and form partnerships to help increase productivity, improve market access, support innovation and development of new ideas in financing and technology, reduce information asymmetries between small end-users of capital and financial institutions, and reduce risks associated with financing smallholders/companies in the agribusiness sector. The allocations to this window by the donors are still to be determined.

⁵⁵ FAO estimates that about 75 percent of the investment required to eliminate hunger by 2025 will have to come from developing country private sector.

ANNEX A

TOPIC BOXES

This annex provides Topic Boxes to highlight particular actions, programmes or concerns relevant to a comprehensive response to food and nutrition insecurity.

FOOD ASSISTANCE

Topic Box 1 Local Food Purchase

Internationally-sourced food can be costly and ill-timed, particularly if trans-shipment is required. Food and cash assistance provided from regional and national sources is likely to be less costly, more rapidly mobilized and capable of more flexible use than assistance which draws on international food stocks or funding. Moreover, regional and local food purchases bring substantial economic benefits to traders, millers and the broader farming community in developing countries, as long as practices are adopted that ensure quality and safety standards and avoid price spikes and hardships to nearby consumers.

The challenge remains to have smallholder farmers benefit from local food purchases. Possibilities include direct purchases from farmer groups, forward contracts, and purchases of processed foods. All of these options require strong partnerships among stakeholders such as traders, processors, national governments, the UN System, NGOs, research and financial institutions, and bilateral donors. They also require capacity-building initiatives to enable farmers and other market actors to engage in complex marketing activities.

In the short term, using local purchases to promote smallholder agriculture requires substantial start-up investment and technical expertise. In the long term, these costs may be offset by the benefits of increased local food availability and sustainable food and nutrition security among farming communities.

Enabling smallholder farmers to respond to the demands of food assistance programmes may turn the threat of high food prices into an opportunity for producing surplus food and raising the family income.

Topic Box 2 Fisheries, Aquaculture and Food Security for the Poor

The most common use for fisheries resources is food. Fisheries and aquaculture resources are now producing a record quantity of food and other benefits for humanity. The proportion of global fish production used for direct human consumption is now over 77 percent — a significant rise of the last decades, with consumption of fresh fish outstripping other fish products such as canned fish. Fish landed not used for direct human consumption is reduced to fishmeal and oil.

For poor people who are highly dependent on fish in their diets, insecurity with regard to fish food supplies may mean they are exposed to the possibility of real harm. When fish supplies are short and prices go up, poor consumers are forced to shift to inferior foods, and their already monotonous diets become even less varied, putting them at risk of missing important micronutrients.

- Over 500 million people depend — directly or indirectly — on fisheries and aquaculture for their livelihoods.
- Aquatic foods provide essential nutrition for 3 billion people and at least 50 percent of animal protein and minerals to 400 million people in the poorest countries.
- Fish products are among the most widely-traded foods, with more than 37 percent by volume of world production traded internationally.

With so many poor people highly dependent on fish, it is a matter of concern that per capita supply in some of the poorest countries in the world has been decreasing. For example, in the decade from 1978–1980 to 1988–1990, fish

food supply per capita in Africa decreased by 2.9 percent and in South America by 7.9 percent. There were decreases in per capita supply of more than 25 percent in Benin, Bolivia, Burundi, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominica, the Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Iraq, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mali, Nicaragua, the Niger, Nigeria, Saint Lucia, Sierra Leone, the Sudan, Suriname, the Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay, Yemen, and Vanuatu. Climate change is also bringing huge challenges to this resource, production and livelihood system (already in crisis in many areas from overfishing and poor management) and the broad development and food security threats are increasingly well recognized and a priority for local, national and international action.

SOCIAL PROTECTION

Topic Box 3

Food and Nutrition Security for the Urban Poor and Balanced Regional Growth

Increasing urbanization is a crucial dynamic for food and nutrition security. The urban poor (about 1.2 billion slum dwellers, and growing by nearly 30 million every year) generally meet most of their nutrition needs in markets, and are therefore especially susceptible to losses in income and increases in the price of food, energy and other essentials. Even under normal conditions, the urban poor are often not capable of producing or purchasing the nutritious food or household energy they need.

The projected increase of the global population by 3.4 billion by 2050 presents a formidable challenge for food production: the expectation that most of this increase will be in urban areas introduces additional complications due to the conversion of agricultural land, competition for water and the escalating use of energy, all of which tend to raise the price of food. At the same time, the diet of the urban poor, based on cheap and easy-to-prepare foods makes it harder to achieve adequate levels of nutrition.

Measures to enable the urban poor to access sufficient nutritious food must include support for developing livelihoods — whether through jobs or self-employment — that generate stable and sufficiently high income streams. Food and cash transfers, including food-/cash-for-work or training, together with school feeding, based on efficient and effective targeting methodologies, need to be given priority. The use of voucher-based systems may be readily applicable in most cities and towns, giving incentives to private sector investment and increased demand for locally produced food. Municipal governments need to be brought more centrally into building strategies to tackle urban food and nutrition insecurity. However, the high population density of urban areas, and the concentration of the poor in well-defined locations may make it easier to extend coverage, and also facilitate the actions of NGOs and other civil society actors.

Any long-term strategy to deal with food and nutrition security needs to encompass more effective strategies to promote sustainable urbanization. A paradigm shift in design and urban planning is needed to:

- Reduce the distance for transporting food by encouraging local food production within city boundaries and in immediate surroundings;
- Invest in transport infrastructure such as rail, trunk and feeder roads to bring agricultural produce to markets in order to raise local farm productivity;
- Reduce the need for energy-intensive transport through better land-use planning and more compact and complete cities and communities;
- Provide a more balanced approach to regional development, including promoting secondary towns as rural economic growth nodes, accompanied by investments in infrastructure to stimulate local economic development and enhance agricultural marketing, credit and input distribution systems;
- Promote energy-saving cooking techniques and cheap alternative cooking fuels in urban areas to reduce the demand for fuel-wood and charcoal, thereby improving the sustainability of agriculture in rural areas;
- Invest in health, sanitation and education infrastructures to enable the urban population to contribute to national development and economic growth.

Topic Box 4 Social Safety Net Programmes

The most common forms of social safety net programmes are food transfers, production inputs, workfare, vouchers, and cash. Providing food or inputs directly to families should happen only when markets are functioning poorly and transport and storage remain cost-effective. Where markets are limited and private suppliers are unwilling to invest in distribution infrastructures without some assurance of demand, voucher-based systems can provide effective incentives for greater private investment. In countries and areas where markets and banking systems operate reasonably well with outreach to people even in remote areas, cash transfers may be the preferred option, given their generally lower administrative costs and the increasing ease of wireless banking.

Unconditional transfers provide in-kind assistance, vouchers or cash. Other programmes link the provision of assistance to complementary social and productive services, such as school attendance, prenatal screening, immunization completion, or participation in public works.

In assessing and developing social safety net programmes, countries and their development partners should engage in:

- *Mapping* — identifying and monitoring population groups and their respective vulnerability levels;
- *Fine-tuning beneficiary targeting* — matching programme approaches with the needs and context of defined population groups, and assessing program effectiveness;
- *Ensuring equity in treatment of beneficiaries* — designing programmes that are fair in terms of providing similar levels of benefits to households/individuals who are at the same level of vulnerability (horizontal equity) and/or belong to the same category of population (elderly people, for example), whilst also providing more generous benefits to those beneficiaries who are worse off (vertical equity);
- *Cost-effectiveness* — balancing the need to minimize inclusion and exclusion errors in targeting with the need to keep administrative costs at the lowest possible level consistent with having the desired programme impacts;
- *Safeguarding incentive compatibility* — avoiding significant distortion of normal incentives which households face regarding employment or other key decisions for poverty reduction.

Topic Box 5 Social Protection, Productive Employment, and Decent Work

The extension of various forms of social protection as a means of mitigating food and nutrition insecurity is essential for reducing vulnerability. The concept of decent work includes the right to social protection but also refers to productive employment and enterprise development, a floor of basic rights at work of which social protection is but one, and the right to participation through social dialogue. Agriculture is a sector where “decent work deficits” are particularly apparent. Women are particularly disadvantaged. Three quarters of the world’s poor live in rural areas and most earn their living from agriculture. However the returns they derive from their labour are often insufficient to meet their basic needs.⁵⁶

The rights deficit for rural workers is equally well documented:

- Many rural workers are denied their basic human right to freedom of association, and few workers are covered by collective bargaining agreements;
- Social security and other social protection measures often exclude agricultural workers, although agriculture is one of the most dangerous industries to be employed in;
- Women and youth are often disadvantaged by inequalities and discrimination concerning their access to and control over productive resources;
- Seventy percent of child labour takes place in agriculture;
- Forced and bonded labour in agriculture still exist to a considerable extent;
- Agriculture is heavily dependent on migrant, seasonal and temporary workers, and other forms of precarious work which render agricultural workers extremely vulnerable, often constituting a poverty trap.

⁵⁶ILO report “Promotion of rural employment for poverty reduction”, 2008, available at http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_norm/---relconf/documents/meetingdocument/wcms_091721.pdf

Productive employment — and, more broadly, decent work — can help addressing food and nutrition insecurity in a sustainable manner. The food price crisis of 2008 witnessed the further erosion of already inadequate incomes, leading to increased poverty and hunger. Social protection is an important means of addressing the hunger/poverty nexus and is directly related to the promotion of productive employment: workers, when provided with at least some guarantee of income, whether in cash or kind, are more likely to engage in initiatives that can increase their earning capabilities.

SMALLHOLDER FARMER FOOD PRODUCTION AND VALUE CHAIN

Topic Box 6 Sustainable Food Production Systems: Soil Fertility, and Integrated Soil, Land and Water Management

Increases in food production should not be achieved at the expense of environmental sustainability. While there is scope in some developing countries for bringing new land into cultivation and intensifying land use through irrigation, these options are costly, have potentially adverse environmental consequences, and are not feasible on the scale required to resolve the massive problem of accelerated soil productivity decline. There are a number of good farming practices affordable to smallholders that help to increase production efficiency, provide control of pests and diseases and ensure food safety. These provide ecosystem services beyond agricultural production, for example, carbon sequestration or rainwater infiltration into soils to minimize runoff and water pollution, and reconversion of dry land into fertile soils. Any programme to increase food production will necessarily target existing agricultural areas — both rain fed and irrigated — to increase soil fertility in situ, and to promote good land, crop, livestock and forestry management practices. To this end, a soil fertility strategy in support of poverty reduction and food and nutrition security has inherently a long-term perspective of 15 to 20 years and would comprise, *inter alia*:

- policy measures that include land tenure, access and use of land and trees and resource pricing;
- technical solutions for suitable cropland and high potential grazing land that empowers farmers, including women, and pastoralists to better manage soils and water through extension and new and proven practices (see below);
- prioritized research programmes and participatory research and knowledge transfer focusing on soil and water conservation, sustainable land management and integrated soil and plant nutrient management that promote the efficient use of plant nutrients and reduce environmental impact;
- improved smallholder farmer knowledge of and access to organic and inorganic fertilizer.

Conservation agriculture (CA), sometimes called agro-ecology, combines agricultural practice and effective use of ecological knowledge and direct seeding into crop residues. As it is based on reduced soil tillage and crop rotation it helps to increase water retention and plant nutrient exchange capacity, both of which are imperative for soil health and sustainable production. It is energy efficient, since there is less tillage that requires tractors or animal traction, and not fertilizer intensive, since nutrients are more efficiently recycled. However, CA involves more weeds due to minimal tillage, higher incidence of pest and insect infestations as chemical use is minimal, and limited land use intensification.

Other sustainable farming practices include the water and soil conservation techniques such as the “assisted natural regeneration” in agro-forestry, low-cost indigenous techniques such as shallow infiltration pits (also called *tassa* or *zai*), which nurture seedlings and encourage forestation, and other water-harvesting techniques, such as stone bunds and semi-circular bunds (*demi-lunes*).

One of the major outcomes of these ecologically friendly technologies is the enhancement of nature-based inputs from pollinators such as bees and increased genetic diversity.

Topic Box 7

Development of Private Sector Market Linkages with Smallholders and the Rural Poor

Allowing smallholders and the rural poor to supply products and add value in agricultural supply chains will help both to increase overall food supply and to improve rural incomes. Improving terms of trade in favour of agriculture, combined with historic under-investment in the sector, suggests that there are significant untapped opportunities with high economic returns if constraints to access to finance and know-how can be overcome.

Arrangements which benefit smallholders and rural labourers, as well as generating sufficient value to interest downstream investors are multiplying. Increasingly, these are being developed in the context of “value chain” or “filière” analysis, which identifies the costs and value-added along the entire supply chain, and assesses the institutional and social relationships at key points in the supply chain. The value-chain approach also provides an effective means to coordinate private and public efforts, including physical investments, access to information and services, capacity-building and public policies.

Successful market integration arrangements with smallholders and rural labourers have been developed by the private sector, NGOs, development organizations and governments, often working together. Key characteristics of success include:

- Trust between actors, supported by improved communication, including the development of stakeholder bodies and transparency in areas such as product grading, weighing and pricing;
- Enabling environments that facilitate commercial transactions and value-added activities (e.g. in “growth corridors”);
- Increasing smallholder access to markets to improve incentive to producers;
- Better understanding of value chains by farmer organizations and labourers so they can find opportunities to add value and negotiate more effectively;
- Targeting supply chains for goods and services traditionally produced by the poor, women and youth and improving inclusiveness of farmer groups and other rural organizations;
- Improving rules and regulations to enable more financing within the value chain;
- Facilitating direct linkages between smallholder farmers and rural labourers and international marketers and processors of organic and fair trade products;
- Supporting agribusiness companies in corporate social responsibility;
- Integrating sustainable soil and water management practices to support improved quality and productivity.

While the number of market integration activities that benefit all key actors in the supply chain is increasing, these opportunities will not be available to all smallholders or rural labourers right away. Efforts need to be complemented by food and nutrition security and rural safety nets to assist the most vulnerable.

Topic Box 8

Large-scale Land Acquisitions

Land is a critical economic asset in all societies. It defines power relations among individuals, families and communities, determines the formation of individual and collective identity, and underlies organization of social, cultural and religious life. Secure access to land, water and forest produce increases people’s resilience in the face of hunger and poverty. It enables them to invest in productive activities and to manage natural resources. Those with insecure rights of land tenure typically constitute the poorest and most vulnerable communities in any society.

Population growth, high food prices, the impact of climate change, globalized food systems, and growing demand for both agro-fuels and animal feed lead to fierce competition for arable land and associated resources. Countries dependent on food imports seeking to secure their food supplies face uncertainty and market volatility, and set out to invest in arable land overseas. These demands on land place very high pressures on land tenure systems.

There has been a sharp increase in the trend to acquire or control of large tracts of agricultural land and associated resources within developing countries. Agro-enterprises and extractive industries, private equity and other financial institutions, government-linked companies including sovereign funds, and individual companies or entrepreneurs seek to invest in land. Because they lack a voice in negotiations, local stakeholders — such as small-scale farmers and

members of rural communities, pastoralists and indigenous people — often remain “invisible” in these deals. Skewed land distribution, insecurity of land tenure (resulting from dualism between statutory and customary rights), issues related to land privatization and the breakdown of collective farming, and degradation of natural resources, civil unrest or even violent conflicts may influence the way in which such deals are made. Large-scale acquisition of land in agriculture-based economies may lead to displacement of populations, the undermining of human rights, increased corruption, reduced food and nutrition security and environmental damage. It has resulted in loss of livelihoods or opportunity for land access by vulnerable people, nutritional deprivation, social polarization, political instability and violent conflicts.

There is a broad-based consensus that public and private investment in agriculture and agro- and food industries is critical for increasing global food supply, improving food and nutrition security and the development and diversification of rural economies. Considering the risks associated with large-scale land acquisition, orienting investments towards adding value to existing systems of production is an optimal way to increase returns to investment. Opportunities for FDI include food storage, processing, marketing, production support and quality improvement, as well as building better linkages to markets. Investment in production is likely to yield greater returns than the purchase of land per se. Investments in existing systems of production contribute to economic development and poverty reduction, as they do not have the polarizing effect of denying people equitable and secure access to land.⁵⁷

Initiatives have been launched to facilitate the search for transparent and win-win arrangements between investors and rural communities and help mitigate risks. These have included improvements in the governance of land and tenure over natural resources, as well as principles and good practices to guide investment in agriculture.⁵⁸

In January 2010, FAO, IFAD, UNCTAD and the World Bank agreed to seven “Principles for Responsible Agricultural Investment that Respects Rights, Livelihoods and Resources” (also called the “Responsible Agricultural Investment (RAI) Principles”)⁵⁹ which apply to all agricultural investments (not only to land):

1. Existing rights to land and associated natural resources are recognized and respected.
2. Investments do not jeopardize food and nutrition security, but rather strengthen it.
3. Processes for accessing land and other resources and then making associated investments are transparent, monitored, and ensure accountability by all stakeholders, within a proper business, legal and regulatory environment.
4. All those materially affected are consulted, and agreements from consultations are recorded and enforced.
5. Investors ensure that projects respect the rule of law, reflect industry best practice, are viable economically, and result in durable shared value.
6. Investments generate desirable social and distributional impacts and do not increase vulnerability.
7. Environmental impacts due to a project are quantified and measures taken to encourage sustainable resource use while minimizing the risk/magnitude of negative impacts and mitigating them.

The UN Special Rapporteur on the right to food has recently concluded⁶⁰ that in the vast majority of large-scale investments, there are ways to benefit both the investor and the producer (in terms of creation of infrastructure, marketing opportunities, and access to credit) without any change to the rights over the land. One option is that the producers become contract farmers. If, however, large-scale land transfers are to take place, he has proposed an additional set of core principles and measures for both host States and investors. These are: 1) the investment negotiations should be conducted in a transparent and participatory manner; 2) any shifts in land use should only take place with the free, prior and informed consent of the local communities concerned; 3) the conditions of shifts in land use or evictions should be regulated by law in accordance with the relevant international human rights standards;⁶¹ 4) the local population should benefit from the revenues generated by the investment agreement; 5) in countries facing

⁵⁷ Deninger, K., “Land policies for growth and poverty reduction”, World Bank Policy Research Report, 2003.

⁵⁸ Building on the experience of the International Conference on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development (ICARRD) and the Right to Food Guidelines, FAO has launched a process to prepare “Voluntary Guidelines to Govern Land and Other Natural Resources” to be completed by 2012 with the objective to provide practical guidance to States, civil society and the private sector on responsible governance of tenure of land and other natural resources. FAO, “Towards Voluntary Guidelines on Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land and other Natural Resources”, 2009.

⁵⁹ FAO, IFAD, UNCTAD and the World Bank, January 2010.

⁶⁰ A/HRC/13/33/Add.2, Annex December 2009.

⁶¹ For example, the “Basic Principles and Guidelines on Development-based Evictions and Displacement” (A/HRC/4/18, Annex I), and General Comment No. 7 of the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, on forced evictions (HRI/GEN/1/Rev.9; Vol.I), pages 38–43.

high levels of rural poverty and in the absence of employment opportunities in other sectors, host States and investors should promote labour-intensive farming systems; 6) host States and investors should cooperate in identifying ways to ensure the modes of agricultural production which respect the environment; 7) the obligations of the investor should be defined in clear terms and be enforceable; 8) investment agreements with net food-importing countries should include provision for some sales on local markets (the proportion depending on prices of food commodities on international markets); 9) a participatory impact assessment should be conducted prior to the completion of the investment negotiations; 10) consultation with indigenous peoples to obtain their free and informed consent prior to the approval of any project; and 11) protection of human and labour rights of waged agricultural workers by law, consistent with the applicable International Labour Organization (ILO) instruments.

Because of the political sensitivity and lack of transparency around international land transactions, reports of land-related investments are often unreliable and based on low-quality data. Various promising initiatives aimed at improving the knowledge base, and deepening analyses of this issue, have recently been launched.⁶²

Topic Box 9 **Rehabilitate Rural and Agricultural Infrastructure**

Rehabilitation, as well as building and modernization, of selected rural and agricultural infrastructure can help accelerate agricultural productivity growth. More and better use of irrigation systems can raise yields. Stronger linkages of farmers to markets can increase tradable agriculture, help raise farm profits, and overall economic growth. Improved storage infrastructure can further reduce farmers' risks and vulnerability, and improve food security. Strengthening of public institutions and involvement of the private sector can improve investments and effective operations and maintenance on rural and agriculture infrastructure.

Improving irrigation and water resource management is vital to raising crop yields and household income, and to meeting higher food demands while offsetting the potential negative impacts of climate change. By 2050 the world will have to produce enough food to feed two to three billion additional people and, without further investment, climate change could reduce yields by as much as 20 percent in developing countries. While only 20 percent of the world's farmed area is irrigated, it produces 40 percent of the value of agricultural production in developing countries. Irrigation will continue to be an important source of productivity growth, especially in Sub-Saharan Africa and parts of Latin America that still have large untapped water resources for agriculture. In other regions where the scope for expanding irrigated agriculture is limited, more effort is needed to increase water use efficiency and productivity by addressing the policy, technical, and governance aspects of agricultural water use. Investment is needed in both physical infrastructure (e.g. irrigation canals and water capture) and institutional support (e.g. water users' associations, river basin management authorities and hydrological data capacity).

Rural transport networks that better link farmers to markets can reduce transport and transaction costs, raise prices that farmers receive, and increase tradable agriculture. In the poorest countries, transport costs can represent 50–60 percent of total marketing costs. This means bulky food staples are uncompetitive to produce for export, even in good years, and expensive to import in bad years. This leaves many local food markets, particularly in Africa, especially vulnerable to weather shocks that lead to lack of food availability or, in the best case, to high local staple food price volatility. Investment is needed in constructing and rehabilitating rural access or feeder roads to connect farmers to markets.

Storage and market infrastructure can reduce post-harvest losses and wastage, and improve quality and safety standards. Investment is needed in post-harvest infrastructure, such as storage for households and community storage where this is appropriate, larger-scale silos and warehouses, small-scale processing and drying equipment, pack houses and cold storage facilities. Investment in infrastructure that improves the safety and quality and quality of food — such as testing laboratories and livestock quarantine facilities — also helps add value. Investment in rural and agricultural infrastructure has also strong multiplier effects in terms of development of rural non-farm activities that are an important source of income and safety for rural households.

⁶² Including the International Land Coalition (global), le Hub Rural (West and Central Africa), LandNet (Africa), AGTER (Association pour l'Amélioration de la Gouvernance de la Terre, de l'Eau et des Ressources Naturelles) (global).

Topic Box 10

Reducing Post-harvest Losses

A significant quantity of the food produced in developing countries is lost after harvest. This aggravates hunger and means that expensive inputs such as fertilizer, irrigation water and human labour are wasted. For cereals alone, one estimate is that in Sub-Saharan Africa post-harvest losses lead to \$4 billion in foregone incomes annually. More significantly, post-harvest storage conditions can lead to a loss in market opportunity and nutritional value through reduction of food quality and safety. Consumption of unsafe food, notably food contaminated with aflatoxins, can result in adverse effects on the health of populations. In certain cases it is more cost-effective and environmentally sustainable to reduce post-harvest losses than to increase production through more intensive farming or expanding the area under cultivation. Post-harvest loss reduction can improve food quality and safety whilst enhancing supply-chain efficiencies, rural income generation and employment.

The causes of post-harvest losses are manifold: harvesting at an incorrect stage of produce maturity, poor harvesting techniques, excessive exposure to rain, drought or extremes of temperature, contamination by micro-organisms, spillage, damage from inappropriate tools, chemical contamination or rough handling (including heat build-up) during harvesting, loading, packing or transportation, and inadequate and insecure storage facilities. Additionally, much produce is wasted because farmers, lacking reliable market information, produce more than the market requires or do not meet the quality or safety standards of the market. Food losses contribute to high food prices by removing part of the supply from the market. They lead to a waste of resources such as land, water, human labour and non-renewable resources such as fertilizer and energy, which are used to produce, process, handle and transport food that no one consumes.

With adequate investment and training, food losses could, in theory, be drastically reduced. While tens of thousands of people have been trained to handle harvested food properly, investment and training in good practices has to be scaled up. Good practices include training to avoid mycotoxin contamination of grain staples, use of household metallic silos and mechanical drying systems that reduce the risks inherent in sun-drying. Warehouse receipts systems provide professional storage management services to farmers and enable farmers to access new markets and obtain better prices for their produce. However, interventions in one region or country may not work in another. Improvements must take the prevailing socio-economic conditions fully into account.

With the transition to market-driven systems and a greater reliance on the private sector, interventions to reduce post-harvest losses must be considered within the context of commodity value chains, and focus on improving the efficiency of the chain as a whole, rather than disjointed, single-point interventions. The central role of the private sector must be recognized, and post-harvest loss reduction strategies developed that provide economic incentives to all actors in the chain. This needs to be underpinned with an enabling environment that encourages private sector investment and the partnering of the public and private sectors in spearheading growth and development.

The following determinants of success have been identified: strong commitment and support of governments and the donor community; existence of a strong domestic demand for grains and grain products as opposed to imports; strong and trans-disciplinary approaches and institutions that facilitate and drive the participatory development and testing of new technologies. Gender and diversity-sensitive approaches should also be used in planning, selection, implementation and up-scaling of post-harvest loss reduction interventions; and differential approaches are needed depending on whether the principle objective is household food security or commercialization of agriculture.

The AfDB, FAO, the European Commission, IFAD, the World Bank, WFP, United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), and the UK's Natural Resources Institute, as well as some private sector representatives from the grain industry in Africa, have already agreed on the need to develop a community of practice to facilitate the evaluation of innovations and assist in their scaling-up, knowledge management and information sharing on best practices and lessons learned. Such a platform will allow expert knowledge to be channelled into the development agenda and inform investment programmes.

Topic Box 11 **Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs)**

The role of GMOs in longer-term growth in food production is increasingly under discussion. GMOs are the result of transferring one or more genes from one organism to another, e.g. a bacterial gene introduced into plant genetic material. While GMOs use is expanding, and promises significant improvements in yields and resistance to crop losses from pests, drought and salinity, it also raises a number of concerns, including environmental and health impacts, the consequences for biodiversity in crops and related plants, cost, and relevance of GMOs for small, resource-poor farmers in developing countries.

At the farm level, GMO-based production is tightly regulated in a number of markets. Countries must take care to ensure no mixing of GMO with non-GMO crops bound for these markets. GMO-based hybrid seeds, as is the case for all improved varieties, require farmers to purchase seeds for each cropping season. GMOs require large capital investments and GMO development has generally been oriented towards large-scale commercial agriculture. The result has been very little development of varieties of staple crops such as sorghum, millet or cassava.

Given their increasing use, transparent national and regional frameworks are needed for screening the biosafety and appropriateness of GMOs. For most smallholder farmers, emphasis will, in the short run, remain on transferring existing, underutilized technological options that are relatively low cost and advocate for a family farming model with an agro-ecological scheme, while countries further assess the issues related to GMOs based on growing international experience.

ECOSYSTEMS

Topic Box 12 **Inter-linkages between Food and Nutrition Security and Ecosystems**

Natural resources account for more than 25 percent of the wealth of low-income countries. The management of the natural capital in agricultural ecosystems — alongside financial, social and human capital — is the basis for sustainable development. In many settings this natural capital is not being adequately managed and is rapidly depleting. There is a variety of reasons for this — pollution from external sources, effects of climate change and unsustainable farming practices. Their cumulative effect threatens biodiversity, carbon fixation and storage and — in the long term — food and nutrition security.

The complex challenge of reducing hunger and poverty and increasing agriculture production has recently been at the centre of an international participatory effort to evaluate the relevance, quality and effectiveness of agricultural knowledge, science and technology (AKST) at this regard. The IAASTD recognizes that the AKST approaches are needed, in addition to others, for securing food for all, improving nutrition, health and rural livelihoods, facilitating social and environmental sustainability, and mitigating climate change.

Farmers depend on natural ecosystems. Many of them play an important role in maintaining both ecosystem functions and traditional varieties of crops (and these have important genetic resources). The rural poor rely directly on ecosystem services for clean and reliable water. Ecosystem degradation results in less water for people, crops and livestock; lower crop, livestock and tree yields; and higher risks of natural disaster.

The poor often harvest, process and sell wild plants and animals in order to buy food. Sixty million people depend on herding in semi-arid rangelands which they share with large mammals and other wildlife. Thirty million low-income people earn their livelihoods primarily through fishing, twice the number of 30 years ago. The depletion of coastal fisheries has serious impacts on food and nutrition security (*see Topic Box 2*). Wild plants are used in farming systems for fodder, fertilizer, packaging, fencing and genetic materials. Farmers rely on soil micro-organisms to maintain soil fertility and structure for crop production, and on wild species in natural ecological communities for crop pollination and pest and predator control.

Food and nutrition insecurity threatens ecosystems when it leads to over-exploitation. Low farm productivity leads to depletion of soil and water resources, and pressure to clear additional land. Forty percent of cropland in developing countries is estimated as being degraded. Of more than 17,000 major protected areas, 45 percent are heavily used for agriculture, while many of the rest are islands in a sea of farms, pastures and production forests that are managed in ways incompatible for long-term species and ecosystem survival. Also, land use change, e.g. from native forests to intensive systems (particularly palm oil, livestock systems and soya), deprives local people of traditional varied food sources, reduces biodiversity, impacts climate regulation capacity and alters the economic basis for food provision on local and global scales.

The natural resource base is the key to sustained agricultural livelihoods. Maintaining and promoting the ability of agricultural systems to generate goods and ecosystem services can ensure the sustainability of agriculture under intensification. Soaring prices in 2008 highlighted the vulnerability of agriculture, which is highly dependent on fossil fuels and inputs that are extraneous to the field. Cultivation practices are undergoing a shift from dependency on non-renewable inputs and from chemical-based intensification to forms of biological intensification — such as IPM and CA — that draw on biodiversity and natural resources to increase the productivity of farmlands.

There are recognized environmental and economic benefits in phasing out subsidies for agriculture that impacts the natural resource base. Moreover, there is evidence that investment in environmental management results in increased income generation for the rural poor. Yet transitioning to new production systems needs enabling policy and investment in environments which should be based on four principal criteria: long-term environmental effectiveness, equity consideration, cost-effectiveness and overall institutional compatibility of the policy combinations. Financing plans that allow local resource conservation to pay for itself over time can be developed, but local communities or domestic financial sources are often unable to make the initial seed investment.

INTERNATIONAL FOOD MARKETS AND TRADE

Topic Box 13 Food Sovereignty

Originally coined by the members of La Via Campesina (an international peasant movement), the food sovereignty concept builds and expands on the right to food as a policy framework where ensuring people's food and nutrition security is a national responsibility.

There is no agreed definition of this concept. Food sovereignty is recognized under some national laws. The following three examples illustrate various descriptions of the notion of food sovereignty— with increasing degrees of policy prescription:

- a) *States are able to make their own policy decisions about agriculture and food and nutrition security*
States are able to avoid being subject to any global policy blueprint or internationally imposed model for the design of food and agriculture policies, though they must adhere to international agreements to which they are a party;
- b) *States pursue their own sustainable model for agriculture development*
States adopt policies that encourage sustainable smallholder-based agriculture systems, more equitable relations between producers and merchants in food and value chains, less dependency on oil-based inputs (such as fertilizers) and on genetically modified seeds, and no reliance on international companies promoting these kinds of inputs;
- c) *States protect their own agricultural and food systems from external forces*
States adopt policies with the explicit purpose of protecting the development of agriculture and encouraging self-sufficiency through the use of trade barriers and/or subsidies. Different levels of “protectionism” (or “isolationism”) are advocated by different actors, e.g. some focus on the protection of regional markets (or large national markets), others on the protection of local-level markets.

The first two of these examples, and to some extent even the third example, can be pursued by governments through

making use of the policy flexibilities they have written into the existing trade agreements. The flexibilities may be enhanced by the changes currently under negotiation, including the introduction of a “special products” category for developing countries.

Ensuring people’s food and nutrition security is a national responsibility. National governments implement the policies they deem necessary to ensure food security for their people, but are expected to pay due attention to their international obligations, including coming to the help of those in need. In order to enable countries to adopt suitable policy measures and to achieve food security for their populations, functioning and non-distorting international agricultural markets are critically important. These are vital both to food-importing countries and for developing countries that are investing in agricultural growth.

Topic Box 14 **Agriculture in International Trade Agreements**

Many developing countries have recognized the linkage between national farm support programmes and the conditions of the international agricultural markets, and insisted on the development of a multilateral framework that addressed both actions taking place at national borders and domestic farm support measures. Global trade agreements reflect the realities of an interconnected world, and are designed to limit the damage that could be caused to markets and people if all national government policies were to be based solely on national interests. Much damage resulted during the period 1948–1995 when agriculture trade was only subject to a narrow set of rules.

Developing country interests were critical in framing the WTO Agreement on Agriculture. Clearer rules for sanitary and phyto-sanitary measures have also been agreed in order to ensure that health protection takes precedence over trade interests, while — at the same time — avoiding unnecessary restrictions imposed with the pretext of food safety, or of protecting animal and plant health. An increasing number of developing countries is now actively engaged in negotiating clearer and more specific rules for agriculture trade under the Doha Round of trade negotiations.

The Agreement on Agriculture and the Doha Round of trade negotiations are instances where international cooperation leads to regulation of issues that may not be effectively handled at the national level. They are the outcome of decisions by States to exercise their sovereignty in a manner that gives the greatest scope for food security not only inside their borders, but across the globe.

Topic Box 15 **Inflation and Food Prices**

About 44 percent of total inflation in 2007 could be attributed to food price hikes at end-2007. However, there were significant differences across countries and regions. In Asia food price inflation contributed about two thirds of total headline inflation; in Africa, Latin America, the Middle East and Eastern Europe the contribution was slightly above 40 percent, while for the advanced economies food price increases contributed less than 20 percent to headline inflation.

Food prices were expected to ease gradually in 2008, reflecting expectations of a better harvest in 2008–2009, and to remain flat in 2009. The sharp slowdown of global growth in the wake of the global financial and economic crisis reinforced the fall in food prices, though on average, they remain well above their pre-crisis levels. The present food price cycle is likely to last longer than the usual two to three years, as structural measures to deal with the food price crisis will take time to take effect.

The surges in food (and fuel) prices were large shocks that had to be absorbed and passed on to consumers, with measures to mitigate impacts on the poorest households. Such large shocks also required country-specific macroeconomic policy responses to ensure stability. The most pressing macroeconomic policy issue at the global level at the height of the food and fuel price crisis in 2008 was to ensure that the first-round impact of surging food and fuel prices on inflation did not lead to significant second-round effects and accelerating inflation expectations. The sharp fall in global demand owing to the global economic slowdown has effectively reduced this danger.

As the global recovery gets underway, however, the risk of a resurgence of inflationary pressures should not be underestimated. Many developing countries and emerging market economies have made significant progress in reducing inflation and raising growth rates in recent years. These hard-won gains must not be jeopardized by adoption of inadequate or inappropriate macroeconomic policies. And the fight against a generalized rise in inflation is important for the poor, as they would be most affected.

As governments prepare to withdraw the fiscal and monetary stimulus measures undertaken in response to food price rises, a careful balance between different macroeconomic objectives is needed; consolidating weakened fiscal positions and preserving macroeconomic stability, while strengthening and expanding social protection systems to reduce vulnerabilities and enhance resilience.

INFORMATION, MONITORING AND ANALYSIS SYSTEMS

Topic Box 16

Information Monitoring and Analysis Work Underway

- In Africa CAADP supports the development of country and sub-regional compacts between national authorities, farmers' groups, civil society, private entities, development banks, donors and other interested parties to establish plans for investments in food and nutrition security based on these compacts. Improvement in dietary diversity to close the "nutrition gap" — the gap between what foods are available and what foods are needed for a healthy diet — is one of the general indicators for the overall process of the 3rd pillar of CAADP and FAO is collaborating with other UN agencies, institutions and universities to refine and validate standardized household measures of dietary diversity and household food security in the interest of tracking progress towards improving food and nutrition security.
- Globally, FAO and WFP are aiding the development of detailed national food and nutrition security investment programmes and plans. An important element of this collaborative work by FAO and WFP will be the forthcoming joint FAO/WFP strategy on information systems for food security, based on the recent first joint evaluation of FAO and WFP activities in an area of common interest and collaboration.
- FAO's Global Information and Early Warning System (GIEWS) continues to monitor and assess the food security situation at global, regional and country levels, while providing alerts on impending food crises; key GIEWS outputs include the Food Outlook and Crop Prospects and Food Situation reports and web-based Country Food Security Briefs updated on a bi-monthly basis. A web-based food prices monitoring and analysis tool provides up-to-date information on national and international food prices.
- The World Bank, IFAD and regional development banks offer financial support for sector-wide investment plans and/or for programmes within the national plan through a range of instruments.
- The Global Donor Platform for Rural Development (GDPRD) encourages transparent and predictable donor support for country programmes (in line with the Paris Declaration) and — in Africa — works with CAADP on a framework for mutual accountability that engages both national authorities and donors.
- The OECD's Development Assistance Committee compiles annual reports on ODA flows, illustrating how development assistance is spent in sectors related to food and nutrition security.
- Drawing from the current monitoring and analytical work of various UN agencies, the UN System agencies have established a Global Impact and Vulnerability Alert System (GIVAS), consisting of a Global Impact and Vulnerability Data Platform and a series of Global Alert products to track developments, and report on the political, economic, social and environmental dimensions of a crisis. The GIVAS's added value resides in the compilation of real time data and analysis from a variety of reliable sources covering multiple dimensions of vulnerability, including food and nutrition security.
- The European Joint Research Centre (JRC), FAO and USAID have joined forces to compare and improve their respective food security monitoring and early warning systems and establish the Famine Early Warning Systems Network (FEWSNET).
- The new Integrated Phase Classification (IPC) system facilitates and accelerates the reaction time to food security crises by allowing a common and internationally recognized classification of their severity. The Cost of the Diet (CoD), which is a new tool developed by Save the Children, calculates the cost of the cheapest diet that meets the nutritional requirements of families using just the foods available locally. This data is combined with income and contextual information gathered from the Household Economy Approach assessments.

- The FAO is preparing a user-friendly web platform FS-ATMIS (Food Security Activity Tracking Management Information System) about food and nutrition security actions under implementation or planned at national and regional levels.
- Information on the nutrition situation of vulnerable populations is being collected through national nutrition surveys, often implemented with the support of UN organizations, bilateral donors and NGOs. Data have been collected through the UNICEF Multiple Indicators' Cluster Surveys and the USAID Demographic and Health Surveys. Databases compiling the available information are kept by the WHO and are accessible through the Nutrition Landscape Information System (NLIS).

Topic Box 17

Progressive Realization of the Right to Food: How does it work in practice?

Monitoring is an essential part of the effort to realize the right to food. During the implementation of national strategies on the right to food, the monitoring process enables governments and other stakeholders to assess the impact of legislative, policy and programmatic measures on the enjoyment of the right to food, to track and evaluate the achievements in the progressive realization of the right, to identify the challenges and obstacles affecting it, and to facilitate corrective measures.

To monitor the implementation of the right to food, states should set verifiable benchmarks to be achieved in the short, medium and long term, and develop a set of indicators. Furthermore, to maximize its effectiveness, the monitoring process needs to be based on human rights principles.⁶³ For example, information gathering, management, analysis, interpretation and dissemination should be transparent and conducted with the participation of a broad range of stakeholders, particularly those groups and individuals who are the most affected by food insecurity and the most marginalized.⁶⁴

Various actions can be taken to monitor the realization of the right to food. Reviews of policy, budgets or public expenditure and public monitoring mechanisms (for example, inspection of food safety, nutritional status surveys and land registration) are important administrative mechanisms to this end. Assessments of various kinds, such as impact assessments, offer a way for policymakers to anticipate the likely impact of a projected policy on the enjoyment of the right to food, and later to review its actual impact. Government self-monitoring can be usefully complemented by monitoring by national human rights institutions and CSOs.

The following examples illustrate practical measures taken within countries that facilitate monitoring the realization of the right to food.⁶⁵

- In Kenya, the Food Security Steering Group, a participatory mechanism composed of all relevant actors, has identified urban poverty as one of the key issues to be included in its food security assessments, with a particular focus on informal settlements and slums.
- In Tanzania, the right to food is included in the 2005 National Food Security Policy. In Zanzibar, the Government adopted the Food Security and Nutrition Policy and Programme in 2008, which makes explicit reference to the right to food and provides that the most vulnerable livelihood groups should receive the highest priority for food and nutrition security measures and interventions.
- In Guatemala, a framework law on the right to food was adopted in 2005, based on key principles of a human rights-based approach, including nondiscrimination, participation, transparency and decentralization. It

⁶³ Participation, accountability, non-discrimination, transparency, human dignity, empowerment and the rule of law (termed “PANTHER principles” by FAO).

⁶⁴ See FAO, *Methods to Monitor the Human Right to Adequate Food*, Vol.1, Rome, 2008

⁶⁵ These are just a few examples, and many more countries are taking concrete measures to establish and implement institutional dimensions of the right to food. For more information, see: “Crisis into Opportunity: Reinforcing Multilateralism”. Background document to the second report on the global food crisis, UN Special Rapporteur on the right to food, June 2009 (available from: <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/issues/food/docs/SRRTFsecondglobalfoodcrisisnote.pdf>), Briefing note No.1, “Countries tackling hunger with a right to food approach”, UN Special Rapporteur on the right to food, May 2010 (available from: <http://www.srfood.org/index.php/en/component/content/article/1-latest-news/684-revising-the-cfa-five-proposals-for-the-dublin-consultation>), as well as “The right to food in practice: implementation at the national level”, FAO, 2006 (available from: http://www.fao.org/righttofood/publi_en.htm).

provided for a National Council on food and nutrition security and a Secretariat on food and nutrition security, tasked with implementing the Council's decisions. And it provided the Ombudsperson with a mandate to monitor its implementation and to make recommendations on an annual basis on revisions to relevant policies and strategies. A corresponding national policy and a national strategic plan on food and nutrition security were also adopted.

-
- In India, in 2001, a case was filed before the Supreme Court alleging the occurrence of starvation deaths in one region despite the existence of a national surplus of food grains reserved for emergency assistance. The Court issued a series of interim orders obliging the Government to implement existing food schemes and providing clear and concrete benchmarks for the Government to follow. The Court appointed Commissioners to monitor the implementation of the interim orders by the central and local governments. As a result, for example, the implementation of a midday meal scheme greatly improved and now is nearing universal coverage.

The rights of indigenous peoples, who are among the most vulnerable to food and nutrition security, need special focus. Their risk of hunger and malnutrition is increased as a result of many factors — which may include many years of social, political and economic exclusion accompanied by expropriation and despoliation of their land. The realization of indigenous peoples' right to food depends crucially on their being able to access and control the natural resources on their lands. Hence the importance of indigenous peoples having tenure security over their domains, also by being able to possess the legal titles to their land. Convention 169 of ILO — which concerns Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries (1989) —and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (2007), spell out indigenous peoples' rights, including those in relation to land. The FAO Right to Food Guidelines and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (2007) provides guidance on this point.

Topic Box 18 **Indicators to Assess Access to and Utilization of Food**

To assist a country-specific analysis, illustrative indicators can be used to assess, monitor and evaluate food and nutrition security situations. These indicators include:

- *Structural indicators* that assist in monitoring the right to food and nutrition and reflect the ratification/adoption of legal instruments and existence of basic institutional mechanisms;
- *Process indicators* that outline State policy instruments such as measures undertaken in public programmes, and specific interventions that a State is willing to take in order to give effect to its intent/acceptance of human rights standards and to improve the population's food security and nutritional status;
- *Outcome indicators* that capture attainments, individual and collective, and reflect the status of realization of the right to food and the improvement in food security, health and nutrition.

Gender-based indicators also need to be developed to collect sex disaggregated data in the agricultural sector.

Overview of illustrative indicators for the assessment, monitoring and evaluation of food and nutrition security situations

Structural indicators

- International human rights instruments, relevant to the right to adequate food, ratified by the State;
- Date of entry into force and coverage of the right to adequate food in the constitution and other forms of superior law;
- Date of entry into force and coverage of domestic laws relevant to the implementation of the right to adequate food;
- Number of registered/operational CSOs involved in the promotion and protection of the right to adequate food.

Nutrition

- Presence of a national nutrition policy, strategy and plan of action;

- Presence of a governance mechanism for the implementation of nutrition policy, strategy and plan of action;
- Government budget for nutrition programmes and interventions.

Food Safety and Consumer Protection

- Time frame and coverage of national policy on food safety and consumer protection;
- Number of registered/operational CSOs working in the area of food safety and consumer protection.

Food Availability and Food Accessibility

- Time frame and coverage of national policy on agricultural production and food availability;
- Time frame and coverage of national policy on drought, crop failure and disaster management.

Process indicators

- Number of complaints on the right to adequate food received, investigated and adjudicated by the national human rights institution, human rights ombudsperson and other mechanisms, and the proportion responded to effectively by the government, as applicable, in the reporting period;
- Net ODA for adequate food received/provided as a proportion of public expenditure on food/gross national income.

Nutrition

- Proportion of population below minimum level of dietary energy consumption;
- Proportion of vulnerable population receiving fortified food;
- Proportion of children under five receiving iron supplements;
- Ratio of community health workers/total population;
- Proportion of population with sustainable access to an improved water source.

Food Safety and Consumer Protection

- The disposal rate/average time to adjudicate a case registered in a consumer court;
- Share of public social sector budget spent on food safety and consumer protection advocacy, education, research and implementation of the law and regulations;
- Proportion of food producing and distributing establishments inspected for food quality standards and/or frequency of inspections;
- Number of cases filed/proportion adjudicated under food safety and consumer protection law.

Food Availability

- Proportion of the female-headed households/other vulnerable groups with legal title to agricultural land;
- Arable irrigated land per person;
- Proportion of farmers accessing extension services;
- Share of public budget spent on strengthening domestic agricultural production (e.g. agri-extension, irrigation, credit, and marketing);
- Per capita availability of major food items through domestic production, import and aid (source: food balance sheets);
- Cereal import dependency ratio.

Food Accessibility

- Share of household consumption of major food items for vulnerable population met through publicly assisted programmes;
- Unemployment rate/average wage rate of vulnerable segments of labour force;
- Incidence of poverty in the country;
- Work participation rate among by gender and other vulnerable groups;
- Estimate of access of women and girl children to adequate food within household.

Outcome indicators

Nutrition

- Proportion of underweight children below age five;
- Proportion of adults with body mass index < 18.5;

- Proportion of stunted children below age five;
- Proportion of children below age five with Hb<11 g/dL;
- Proportion of women in reproductive age with Hb<11 g/dL;
- Proportion of children exclusively breastfed below six months.⁶⁶

Food Safety and Consumer Protection

- Number of recorded deaths/incidence of food poisoning related to adulterated food.

Food Availability

- Per capita availability of major food items of local consumption.

Food Accessibility

- Proportion of population below minimum level of dietary energy consumption;
- Per capita expenditure on food for the bottom three deciles of population/vulnerable groups.

⁶⁶ The number of underweight children is currently used as the main indicator of nutritional status of a population. A more accurate description of undernutrition would be given by providing the number of children under five who have a low height for age (stunting). Stunted children may have a normal weight for their age, but have a greater susceptibility to disease and a retarded motor and cognitive development. Ninety percent of the world's stunted children (178 million) live in just 36 countries. The proportion of infants under six months of age who are not exclusively breastfed is a second required addition, as adequate breastfeeding can reduce all-cause neonatal mortality or morbidity by 55–87 percent and provide protection for later chronic diseases. Vitamin and mineral deficiencies are a clear reflection of qualitative inadequacies of the diet and are often a more sensitive indication of the deterioration of nutritional status. The most common condition is iron deficiency anaemia (IDA). IDA in pregnancy is considered responsible for 20 percent of maternal deaths at delivery. The prevalence of IDA in women of reproductive age and in children under five needs, therefore, to be added to the set of monitoring indicators.

ANNEX B

INCREASING INTERNATIONAL CONSENSUS ON BIOFUEL PRODUCTION AND USE

The 2008 CFA included a specific section (B 2.4) that highlighted the need for a consensus on biofuel production and use. That section has now been expanded to cover the whole area of ecosystem management and its link with food and nutrition security. The need for increasing consensus on biofuels is presented as an option to be considered, and taken forward as appropriate, by Member States. The UCFA is a document prepared by a group of 22 secretariat departments, agencies, funds, and programmes from within the UN System; it is not considered appropriate for the UCFA to be presenting this proposal within the body of its text. Hence this annex is offered as a briefing to representatives of Member States.⁶⁷

1. Most recent growth in biofuel production has occurred in the developed countries and emerging economies, predominantly the United States of America, the European Union countries and Brazil.⁶⁸ In the developed countries, biofuels have been promoted by policies supporting and subsidizing their production and consumption. Such policies are now being introduced in a number of developing countries,⁶⁹ where most of the potential for biofuels development is expected.

2. Biofuel policies, in particular targets, subsidies and tariffs in support of biofuel production in all countries, need to be designed carefully, based on assessment of energetic efficiency (that biofuel supplies higher energy than it demands for production), environmental benefits (that they positively contribute to the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions and do not cause harm to biodiversity and water resources) and social benefits (that they help local development, create employment, improve food and nutrition security and do not negatively impact access to land). Where policies are already in place, they require reappraisal in light of the lessons learned during the 2007–2008 food price crisis and longer-term trends that have an impact on food and nutrition security.

3. The steep increase in the use of some cereals as feedstocks for the production of biofuels — triggered by support mechanisms and high oil prices — has contributed to higher food prices. In the longer term the fundamental question is one of competition for land and resources such as water, more than a question of competition for food crops. This calls for bioenergy policies based on land use planning, aligned with other sectoral policies and flanked with regulatory frameworks or certification applied on a project level. Further pressure on food and nutrition security could come from large-scale operations, if they were authorized and run without responsible governance of land tenure (*see Topic Box 8*). Several authorities⁷⁰ have advocated a moratorium on the production of liquid biofuels from agricultural feedstocks to allow time for the development and operation of regulatory structures.

4. Risks and opportunities from biofuels vary with location, crop and pathway choices. Biofuel development could inject new investment, technology and knowledge transfer that could lead to increased agro-ecological productivity, and the engagement of smallholders, with possible food production benefits. In addition, it could spur the development of local businesses, increasing the purchasing power for food on a village level, and improving the handling of food, for example storage and cooking. However, if not properly managed, biofuel development can (through its impact on food prices and land tenure) harm households that are net food-buyers and have weak access to markets.

⁶⁷ More information can be found on <http://www.fao.org/bioenergy/foodsecurity/befs/en/>, as well as: FAO, “The State of Food and Agriculture 2008: Biofuels – Prospects, Risks and Opportunities”, Rome, 2009; UNEP-Global Environment Facility (GEF) targeted research project “Global Assessments and Guidelines for Sustainable Liquid Biofuels Production in Developing Countries”; Report by the International Panel on Sustainable Resource Management “Towards sustainable production and use of resources: Assessing Biofuels”.

⁶⁸ Brazil has pioneered the development of an economically competitive national biofuel sector based largely on sugar cane.

⁶⁹ FAO, The State of Food and Agriculture 2008, op cit.

⁷⁰ Including the UN Special Rapporteur on the right to food.

5. Biofuel production systems that create energy from waste or residues, the cascading use of biomass and integrated food-energy systems,⁷¹ are amongst the lower impact choices. Second and third generation biofuels, which are at various stages of development, are seen to be more efficient in terms of pressure on land and resources, energy yields and greenhouse gas emissions. There will be concerns if unproven or potentially invasive species are introduced, or they lead to increased competition with food crops. Sustainability and impact of proposed biofuel production pathways should always be assessed with care.

6. Biofuel development should be seen as one amongst other energy options to fulfil the needs of the transport and agricultural sectors. Other options include the promotion of energy efficiency (including electrical vehicles), and the use of other types of renewable energy. Given the implications of biofuel policies (including cross-boundary issues and trading practices), some authorities believe that a greater degree of international consensus on policies for biofuel production is needed. This should take full account of food and nutrition security, as well as climate change mitigation and adaptation efforts, other environmental concerns, income generation options, and energy needs at local levels.⁷²

Suggested Actions

- **Agree on a common reference framework for sustainable biofuel development and enforcement mechanisms.** Sustainability principles should be based on an internationally agreed standard that satisfies international trade law requirements, and should take into account environmental, social and institutional factors.⁷³ International biofuel consensus should consider already ongoing processes like the Global Bioenergy Partnership and the Round Table for Sustainable Biofuels.
- **Facilitate the adoption and implementation of biofuel guidelines and safeguard measures** that minimize adverse impacts on global food and nutrition security and the environment. These guidelines can be built on existing good practices to mitigate risks associated with biofuel development in the short and medium term.⁷⁴
- **Reassess biofuel targets, subsidies and tariffs** to reduce pressures on grain and oilseed demand, and food prices, and to harness the potential benefits of biofuels while controlling negative consequences. Phasing out production subsidies, combined with simultaneous tariff reductions, would allow biofuels to be produced from the most efficient feedstock and by the lowest-cost producers.
- **Facilitate private investments in sustainable biofuel production in developing countries** to diversify energy sources and reduce volatility in both food and energy markets, provided that appropriate safeguards are in place for vulnerable groups and key areas of concern. At the international level, the establishment of effective certification schemes can encourage sustainable private investments in biofuel production where national regulatory frameworks are absent or underdeveloped.
- **Promote research and development, knowledge exchange and capacity-building** on biofuel production pathways that limit competition with food, contribute to local development and are environmentally sustainable.

⁷¹ Integrated food–energy systems can be achieved in two ways: by combining food and energy crops on the same plot of land (agroforestry, intercropping), or through “closed loop” systems, whereby the by-product of one type of product is used to produce the other.

⁷² Under the Global Bioenergy Partnership (GBEP), a number of governments and UN agencies are working on science-based, relevant, practical and voluntary sustainability criteria and indicators to guide analysis of bioenergy, and inform decision-making at a national level. To assist decision makers in governments in developing robust bioenergy policy and strategy, a step-wise guidance document has been developed by FAO and UNEP under the framework of UN Energy.

⁷³ This should comprise: ensuring sustainable use of natural resources, particularly land and water, safeguarding biodiversity; reducing greenhouse gas emissions; generating benefits for local communities; promoting food and nutrition security; and undertaking stakeholder consultation in the preparation of biofuels investments.

⁷⁴ These include ex-ante assessments of the impacts of policies or commercial activities that use food crops as feedstock, or change land ownership and use, as well as assessments of impacts of biofuel production on food prices at national levels.

HLTF members, including FAO, IFAD, OECD, UNCTAD, UNDP, UNEP and the World Bank, have carried out useful research and work on this issue, including:

- *Supporting international initiatives and dialogue to establish sustainability criteria for bioenergy at policy and project levels, providing technical expertise and analysis;*
- *Conducting in-depth analysis of effects of biofuel policies; assessing impact of biofuel growth on agricultural commodity markets; quantitative analysis of impact of fuel and food prices on inflation and on food and nutrition security;*
- *Working with major biofuel consumers and producers to eliminate subsidies to allow biofuels to be produced by most efficient producers;*
- *Supporting research into second generation biofuels which could have much lower impacts on food production;*
- *Developing operational toolbox to assist policy makers design to bioenergy strategies;*
- *Assisting developing countries in assessing the viability of their biofuels potential and minimizing the trade-offs with food security, especially for small farmers;*
- *Assisting countries in designing bio-energy strategies that take into account opportunities and trade-offs;*
- *Investing in policy and analytical work on biofuels, trade, subsidies, gender impact, nutrition impacts;*
- *Conducting analytical and policy work on trade-off between food and biofuels;*
- *Assessing the environmental impact of biofuels;*
- *Understanding the possible linkages between biofuel boost and land concentration potential.*

ANNEX C

MAIN ACTIONS BY THE UNITED NATIONS AND BRETTON WOODS INSTITUTIONS TO ADDRESS FOOD AND NUTRITION SECURITY

OBJECTIVE: Improve access to food and nutrition support and take immediate steps to increase food availability

UCFA Outcomes and Actions	Contributing Organizations <i>(alphabetical order)</i>	Indicative Activities Underway
<p>1.1: Emergency food assistance, nutrition interventions and safety nets enhanced and made more accessible</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Ensure that emergency food needs are fully met</i> ▪ <i>Protect basic consumption needs of vulnerable populations</i> ▪ <i>Scale up nutritional support</i> ▪ <i>Support management and prevention of undernutrition</i> ▪ <i>Promote school feeding</i> ▪ <i>Adjust social protection programmes for food prices</i> ▪ <i>Allow free and predictable flow of food assistance</i> ▪ <i>Ensure that local purchases of food and food components for humanitarian purposes are exempt from restrictions</i> ▪ <i>Explore the establishment of efficient and effective humanitarian food reserves</i> ▪ <i>Reach all households with pertinent public information on food assistance, nutrition and hardship alleviation programmes</i> 	<p>DPKO FAO: early warning, emergency response IFAD: emergency response projects IMF: policy advice OCHA: Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) to the effects of current food price crisis UNDP UNHCR: public health and HIV operations UNICEF: support to emergency nutrition security World Bank: Global Food Crisis Response Program WFP: Response to the global food crisis WHO: global health response WHO/FAO: food fortification guidelines</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensuring conditions exist for emergency operators to deliver emergency food assistance and related support; ▪ Assessing existing gaps and constraints and identifying opportunities to integrate and scale up nutrition-related actions in countries; ▪ Advising governments and partners on policies and actions that affect access to food and nutrition security and the realization of the right to adequate food; ▪ Implementing targeted general food distributions to affected populations; ▪ Scaling up internationally-supported safety nets, such as school feeding, supplementary feeding for mothers and children, management of severe and moderate malnutrition, promotion of exclusive breastfeeding and appropriate complementary feeding practices, delivery of primary health care services, promoting food hygiene and safe food supply, employment and cash voucher programmes, resettlement grants for returnees; ▪ Providing a platform for agencies to expand nutrition or food security activities, such as additional take-home rations of nutritionally fortified food for younger siblings of school children; ▪ Support nutrition surveillance schemes and programmes to assess health/nutrition impact of the food-related crises; ▪ Advocating for: greater predictability of financial support for and physical access to food assistance, reduced earmarking and restrictions on aid contributions, exemptions of humanitarian assistance from export restrictions and extraordinary export taxes, unhindered and safe movement of humanitarian food within and across borders; ▪ Exploring the possibility of establishing actual or virtual humanitarian food reserves; ▪ Providing grants to respond to the most immediate, life-saving activities; ▪ Accommodating the increased cost of social programmes and other food crisis related fiscal measures, consistent with macroeconomic stability and sustainability; ▪ Advocating more access to food aid, for more food availability for vulnerable groups including refugees, returnees and displaced persons; ▪ Promoting local-level production of fortified complementary and therapeutic foods; ▪ Strengthening food-based nutrition interventions and nutrition education programmes to address nutrition problems; ▪ Using local food resources (local purchases) to support local agriculture development and ensure acceptability of distributed emergency foods;

<p>1.2: Urgent increases in food availability from smallholder farmer food production</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Provide productivity-enhancing safety nets</i> ▪ <i>Reduce post-harvest crop losses and improve food stocks along the value chain</i> ▪ <i>Remove artificial constraints to domestic trade throughout the food chain in order to link smallholder farmers to markets</i> ▪ <i>Address basic energy needs of smallholders and rural households</i> 	<p>DESA: policy briefs FAO: Initiative on Soaring Food Prices (ISFP), emergency and rehabilitation programmes IFAD: agricultural input support UNDP: small grants World Bank: Global Food Crisis Response Program, Agriculture Action Plan and IFC action plan with private sector WFP: response to the global food crisis and Purchase for Progress (P4P)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Promoting enrichment of local basic foodstuffs; introduce consumer subsidies targeted to poor population groups. ▪ Providing policy analysis and assistance; ▪ Providing financial and technical support for small farmers/net food buyers to increase production and productivity: direct distribution of seeds, fertilizer, provision of vouchers, credit schemes, quality control, use of existing supply mechanisms and strengthening of local financial institutions; ▪ Encouraging increased food productivity through the use of selected seeds/breeds and use of fertilizer and other inputs; ▪ Supporting private sector initiatives to introduce food fortification in basic foodstuffs and the production of ready-to-use therapeutic foods using local resources and taking into account local food habits; ▪ Ensuring availability and accessibility of high nutritional quality products for child nutrition ▪ Considering nutritional impact of subsidies and market restrictions; ▪ Developing quick-response food crop outgrower schemes through public-private partnerships ▪ Strengthening national seed systems and community seed banks; ▪ Supporting rapid interventions to link small farmers to markets, increase access to inputs' markets, and development of market information services; ▪ Launching outgrower schemes with private sector operators for boosting production in the near cropping seasons; ▪ Financing post-harvest support (storage rehabilitation, supply of small-scale silos, small processing equipment, improved storage techniques); ▪ Facilitating logistics arrangements for governments and partners to move agricultural inputs; ▪ Supporting disaster mitigation and contingency planning; ▪ Purchasing food assistance locally in ways that benefit low-income farmers; ▪ Supporting postharvest fisheries to minimize losses and increase benefits derived from value addition.
<p>1.3: Adjustments to trade and tax policies</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Encourage better functioning food markets through improved regional political and economic integration and better functioning environments for trade in food</i> ▪ <i>Immediately review trade and taxation policy options and their likely impacts</i> ▪ <i>Use limited strategic grain reserves</i> ▪ <i>Avoid generalized subsidies for food consumers</i> 	<p>FAO: policy options guide IMF: policy advice OECD: policy advice UNCTAD: short-term responses and policy advice UNDP: policy working papers and small grants World Bank: Global Food Crisis Response Program WTO: implementation of the existing multilateral trade rules, including the Agreement on Agriculture.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identifying the range of possible short-term policy responses and analysis of the advantages and disadvantages of each measure; and advising countries on specific implications; ▪ Advising on trade policy adjustments and trade facilitation measures to reduce the cost of imported food and agricultural inputs; ▪ Advising and assisting in operationalizing improved food import procurement systems to reduce transaction costs, including import financing costs; ▪ Identifying policy options in agricultural trade areas in the context of ensuring food and nutrition security at the country level; ▪ Advising countries on food and nutrition security risks associated with imposing restrictions on trade.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Minimize use of export restrictions</i> ▪ <i>Reduce restrictions on use of stocks</i> ▪ <i>Reduce import tariffs and other restrictions</i> ▪ <i>Improve efficiency of trade facilitation</i> ▪ <i>Temporarily reduce VAT and other taxes</i> 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assisting countries to estimate the fiscal cost of measures taken, and offering advice on how best to accommodate this cost and to assess the net impact of higher food and fuel prices on the balance of payments; and providing balance of payment financing as required; ▪ Assisting countries with assessing impacts and identifying policy options; ▪ Providing more rapid financing in case of shocks to help address balance of payment impact.
<p>1.4: Management of macroeconomic implications</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Hold down core inflation and inflation expectations</i> ▪ <i>Assess the impact on the balance of payments and feasibility/sustainability of a reserve drawdown</i> ▪ <i>Mobilize external support to finance additional food imports</i> ▪ <i>Ensure adequate levels of foreign exchange reserves</i> ▪ <i>Assess and comprehensively cost all fiscal measures taken in response to the rise in food prices</i> 	<p>IMF: diagnostics/policy responses/financial assistance via concessional lending</p> <p>UNDP: policy support</p> <p>World Bank: policy advice/financial assistance</p>	

OBJECTIVE: Strengthen food and nutrition security in the longer term by addressing the underlying factors driving the food crisis		
<p>2.1: Expanded social protection systems</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Strengthen capacity to design and implement social protection policies and programmes</i> ▪ <i>Ensure that special care is taken in identifying and addressing the needs of the most vulnerable</i> ▪ <i>Balance the need to ensure effective coverage of the vulnerable</i> 	<p>FAO: food and nutrition security, improving quality, safety, diversity of foods and diets</p> <p>IFAD: investments in community managed food and nutrition security</p> <p>ILO: policy support and recommendations</p> <p>IMF: policy advice</p> <p>OHCHR</p> <p>UNDP: country paper(s)</p> <p>UNEP</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Financing and technical support for improvement and expansion of social safety nets and development of broader social protection system in an environmentally sustainable manner; ▪ Creating fiscal space to fund social safety nets; ▪ Supporting efforts to advance child-sensitive social protection schemes and systems (including in relation to school-feeding potential); ▪ Reinforcing the functioning of and access to basic social services in health, education and protection; ▪ Advising countries on ways to strengthen national food distribution programmes and safety nets, including through dissemination of knowledge of good practices; ▪ Providing financial and technical support for piloting and supporting programming, procurement, logistics and food fortification innovations; ▪ Promoting the implementation of human rights and good governance principles in the design, implementation and monitoring of social protection measures;

<p><i>with the need to maintain efficient use of resources</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Improve linkages between sectors and between actors</i> ▪ <i>Improve the quality and diversity of foods</i> ▪ <i>Support the implementation of international labour standards</i> 	<p>UNHCR UNICEF: support to nutrition security World Bank: GAFSP WFP's response to global food crisis</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sharing experiences across countries and regions and produce relevant documentation for better advocacy; ▪ Ensuring that refugees and displaced persons are taken into account in all the safety net programmes.
<p>2.2: Sustained increases in food availability through growth in smallholder farmer food production</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Ensure that the macroeconomic, budget, trade and sector policy framework provides incentives for sustainable increases in smallholder production</i> ▪ <i>Stimulate private investment in agriculture with focus on small-scale farming</i> ▪ <i>Enhance secure and equitable access to natural resources</i> ▪ <i>Invest in agricultural research</i> ▪ <i>Improve rural infrastructure</i> ▪ <i>Ensure sustained access to competitive, transparent and private-sector-led markets for food produce and quality inputs</i> ▪ <i>Support development of, and strengthen producer organizations with the participation of women</i> ▪ <i>Strengthen access of smallholders and other food value chain actors to financial and risk management instruments</i> ▪ <i>Improve animal production services</i> 	<p>FAO's food security, food safety and nutrition programmes IFAD: smallholder value chain investments UNCTAD UNDP: diagnostic and policy paper UNEP World Bank: GAFSP, Agriculture Action Plan, and IFC action plan with private sector WFP's P4P (Purchase for Progress) initiative</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increasing funding for international and national agricultural research centres to increase diffusion of “off the shelf” technologies, as well as develop next generation requirements for smallholder farmers; ▪ Providing financial and technical support to countries to scale up seed development programmes, increase early generation seed production, capacity-building with the national seed service, seed policy reform, establishment of farmer seed enterprises, demonstration of improved varieties; increase soil fertility, good agricultural practices, improve extension, support producers' organizations; ▪ Scaling up public-private partnerships and outgrower schemes for boosting food supply; ▪ Working with MDG Africa Initiative to accelerate achievement of MDG 1 within the framework of CAADP and to boost progress towards MDG 7 within the framework of the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) action plan of the environment initiative; ▪ Financing improved production infrastructure and access to markets, bearing in mind issues such as investments in processing, institutional and organizational development and market infrastructure and policies; ▪ Financing rehabilitation of rural and agricultural infrastructure; scaling up ongoing rehabilitation through food- or cash-for-work for small-scale irrigation, market infrastructure, rural roads, soil conservation; ▪ Focusing on transfer and adaptation of techniques and varieties that will benefit smallholder farmers; ▪ Increasing investment and loans to agribusiness and finance services in rural areas; ▪ Supporting land tenure security programmes; ▪ Promoting legal empowerment of poor people; ▪ Advising countries on development of food security strategies which integrate stocks, financial instruments and other options based on country needs and capacities; ▪ Identifying the longer-term policy options for food and nutrition security and also disseminating policy experiences on good practices across countries; ▪ Providing technical and financial support to government and private sector for introducing use of financial instruments for food risk management; ▪ Leveraging private investments through FDI; ▪ Promoting people-centred and human rights-based approaches as reference framework for pro-poor policy making.

<p>2.3: Better managed ecosystems for food and nutrition security</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Strengthen ecosystems monitoring and assessment</i> ▪ <i>Improve natural resource management within agricultural ecosystems</i> ▪ <i>Improve economic and institutional mechanisms to support sustainable management of agricultural ecosystems</i> 	<p>FAO: work on synergies and tradeoffs between food and nutrition security and climate change mitigation and adaptation</p> <p>IFAD: Rewarding the Upland Poor in Asia for the Environmental Services. They Provide (RUPES) and Pro-poor Rewards for Environmental Services in Africa (PRESA) initiatives</p> <p>UNEP/UNDP GEF: adaptation funds and growing support to Payment for Ecosystem Services (PES) components as innovative financing mechanism in a growing number of projects</p> <p>UNDP: work on Institutionalizing PES</p> <p>UNEP: Carbon Benefits Project</p> <p>WRI: Mainstreaming Ecosystem Services Initiative</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Promoting a low energy, productive agriculture source of diversified and nutritious food; sustainable soil fertility, water resources and genetic resources management; ▪ Strengthening the science base of negotiation support materials for appropriate levels of compensation for environmental services; ▪ Financing technical assistance services; ▪ Investing in long-term monitoring of environmental service delivery, under different land management options, including comparisons between natural and managed ecosystems; ▪ Analysing and isolating practices that improve food and nutrition security and resilience to climate change, while contributing to climate change mitigation and improved water management; ▪ Mainstreaming synergetic approaches into national policies.
<p>2.4: Improved performance of international food markets</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Support development of mechanisms for improving emergency access to food through stock sharing</i> ▪ <i>Assess the feasibility of models for the establishment and operation of sustainable, strategic reserves of key grains</i> ▪ <i>Strengthen international oversight and analysis of food commodity and futures markets to improve their transparency and predictability and to limit the scope for speculation to exacerbate price volatility</i> ▪ <i>Promote increased agriculture</i> 	<p>FAO: working papers and policy briefs</p> <p>IFAD: capacity support to farmer organizations for policy and public-private partnerships</p> <p>UNCTAD: working papers and policy briefs</p> <p>World Bank: GAFSP</p> <p>WHO: global analysis of nutrition policies</p> <p>WTO: implementation of the existing multilateral trade rules, including the Agreement on Agriculture; conduct of the Doha Round negotiations</p> <p>WTO/OECD: “Aid for Trade” review</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Expanding work with international private sector on development of financial instruments for risk-based management and mitigation tools/strategies; ▪ Analysing potential influence of financial markets or non-commercial trading activity on commodity price movements; ▪ Pursuing the completion of the Doha Round of trade negotiations to provide an enhanced set of agreed rules for a more transparent and fair international trading system, taking into account the food and nutrition security, livelihood security and rural development needs of developing countries; ▪ Providing assistance to leverage finance for agricultural development from sovereign funds of the South; ▪ Monitoring food and nutrition policies at national level and link to international trade policies ▪ Increasing trade finance, including via targeted initiatives; ▪ Assessing feasibility in given contexts of regional food reserve systems; ▪ Understanding large-scale land deals in the frame of ensuring ‘national food security’ abroad.

<p><i>trade and more open trading environments</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Reduce/eliminate agricultural trade distortions in higher-income countries</i> ▪ <i>Complete the Doha Round of trade negotiations</i> ▪ <i>Ensure additional resources for “Aid for Trade”</i> ▪ <i>Develop trade financing infrastructure</i> ▪ <i>Reduce constraints to enabling environment that encourages private sector involvement in food markets</i> ▪ <i>Build capacity for international financial markets to better meet needs of lower-income countries</i> 		
<p>3.1: Strengthened information monitoring and accountability systems</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Implement systems that track and review the implementation of national policies strategies, and legislation relevant to food and nutrition security</i> ▪ <i>Improve further the coordination of information systems</i> ▪ <i>Continue to carry out comprehensive food and nutrition security assessments, monitoring and evaluation</i> ▪ <i>Undertake integrated analysis and monitoring of the impacts of shocks on food and nutrition security</i> ▪ <i>Conduct nutrition assessments</i> ▪ <i>Review contingency plans and early warning systems</i> ▪ <i>Put in place remedial mechanisms</i> 	<p>FAO IFAD: Agriculture Ministries investment monitoring system support IMF: diagnostics OHCHR UNEP UNHCR UNICEF: support to nutrition security World Bank: GAFSP WFP’s response to the global food crisis WHO: nutrition surveillance and policy monitoring initiatives</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Promoting the methodological harmonization and comparability of food and nutrition security analysis methods, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ Food diversity index ➢ Household Food Insecurity Index ➢ Food Balance Sheets ➢ State of Food Insecurity; ▪ Forecast food and nutrition security developments by detecting first indications of adverse agricultural outcomes through satellite observation and classifying them with the new Integrated Phase Classification system; ▪ Tracking information on food security actions on country level with the web-based Food Security Activity Tracking Management Information System; ▪ Conducting in-depth analysis of causes of food price increases; quantitative analysis of macro-economic impact of fuel and food prices on inflation, balance of payments, fiscal balances; ▪ Conducting in-depth analysis on the impact on food and livelihoods security of food price increases; ▪ Conducting joint assessments of impact of food prices on countries, particularly the vulnerable populations, including refugees and displaced persons, in order to support governments in developing appropriate responses and monitoring the impact of the response and the situation; ▪ Strengthening food and nutrition security and market information systems; and food commodity information and forecasts; ▪ Supporting country-level monitoring of the health and nutritional status of vulnerable populations, and evaluating potential health outcomes of different scenarios; ▪ Collecting information on nutrition situation of vulnerable populations through national nutrition surveys and Multiple Indicators Cluster Surveys and compiling them with the Nutrition Landscape Information System; ▪ Supporting country level monitoring of food markets;

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reinforcing Emergency Prevention Systems (EMPRES) system to improve surveillance and prevention for major plant pests and diseases that may threaten food supply; ▪ Assisting countries to monitor the macroeconomic implications of country policy responses to high food and fuel prices in 2008; ▪ Compiling country information to provide global assessment and monitoring framework; ▪ Providing technical and financial support to assist countries with establishing food security and vulnerability monitoring systems to anticipate potential food crises, improved weather and climate forecasting, adjustment of land use plans and development of contingency plans. ▪ Building capacity of local communities; ▪ Strengthening the capacity of countries to assess risks, examine the feasibility of transferring risk to the financial markets, and implement integrated risk management approaches; ▪ Strengthening countries' capacities to monitor the impact of policy decisions on the realization of the right to food, with a view to promoting policy coherence; ▪ Facilitating monitoring of land-use change, and preparing assessments of ecosystems change and emerging issues that may impact global food security; ▪ Monitoring social protection system impact on the most vulnerable groups through UN Human Rights Council's Universal Periodic Review, Treaty Bodies and Special Procedures mechanisms.
--	--	--



UNITED NATIONS
NATIONS UNIES

High Level Task Force (HLTF) - Coordination Team
Via Paolo di Dono, IFAD 44, 00142 Rome +39 06 5459 2642
Villa La Pelouse, Palais Des Nations, 1201 Geneva +41 22 917 1189
2 United Nations Plaza, New York NY 10017 + 1 212 906 6692
www.un-foodsecurity.org