



# COMMITTEE ON WORLD FOOD SECURITY

## Thirty-ninth Session

Rome, Italy, 15-20 October 2012

### MULTI-YEAR PROGRAMME OF WORK (MYPOW) AND PRIORITIZATION OF ACTIVITIES FOR CFS

The Committee:

- 1) Adopts the CFS Multi-Year Programme of Work (MYPOW) 2012-2013 acknowledging that the Results Based Framework is a work in progress and it will benefit from further elaboration and the CFS work on monitoring;
- 2) Adopts the principles for selection, prioritization and integration of new work streams in the Multi-Year Programme of Work;
- 3) Endorses the priorities and major work streams for 2012-2013 and suggests that no new major work stream is initiated before CFS 40 (October 2013) unless it responds to extenuating circumstances (e.g. a crises) and is unanimously endorsed by the Bureau.

## I. BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE

1. At its 37<sup>th</sup> session, the CFS approved a draft result-based framework (RBF) including an overall objective and three outcomes<sup>1</sup>, in accordance with previous recommendations of the Committee<sup>2</sup> and based on the roles identified for the CFS in the CFS Reform document<sup>3</sup>. In addition, the Committee “requested the CFS Bureau to work with the Secretariat to further integrate the 2012-2013 Programme of Work and Budget (PWB) with the results-based framework with a view to preparing a more detailed and prioritized Multi-year Programme of Work and Budget to be presented to the 38<sup>th</sup> CFS in 2012”.

<sup>1</sup> Results-based Framework for CFS (CFS:2011/10).

<sup>2</sup> CFS Final Reports from 36th session.

<sup>3</sup> CFS Reform CFS:2009/2 Rev.2.

2. A draft Multi-Year Programme of Work (MYPOW) is proposed here, based on this preliminary work and the prioritisation exercise led in an open-ended working group of the Bureau, where activities and priorities were agreed for the biennium<sup>4</sup>. Developed in close collaboration with experts from FAO, IFAD and WFP, it takes a leaf out of the programmes of work of the three Rome-based organisations, as well as similar frameworks of other international organisations and initiatives, while taking into account the CFS model and specificities. It is intended to present and articulate the CFS overall objective, outcomes, outputs and workstreams. It also presents the related budget and identifies key stakeholders and critical risks. In addition, the MYPOW proposes a basis to support alignment of CFS priorities with its overall programme framework as well as tools for measuring the progress and impact of the CFS work.
3. The MYPOW should allow an improved reporting to the governing bodies of the three Rome-based institutions: it will assist FAO, IFAD and WFP to ensure that their work and the work of CFS are aligned with respective objectives. It should contribute to an increased collaboration of the three Rome-based institutions.
4. This MYPOW, prepared on a biennial basis, is a living document: adjustments and/or revisions may be included after the CFS annual plenary session, warranted by CFS decisions.

## II. CFS OVERALL OBJECTIVE, OUTCOMES AND WORKSTREAMS

*CFS Overall Objective: Contribute to reducing hunger and malnutrition and enhancing food security and nutrition for all human beings*

5. The CFS, as a central component of the evolving Global Partnership for Agriculture, Food Security and Nutrition, constitutes the foremost inclusive international and intergovernmental platform for a broad range of stakeholders to work together in a coordinated manner towards the elimination of hunger and ensuring food security and nutrition for all human beings.
6. The CFS is assisted by a High Level Panel of Experts (HLPE) for regular inclusion of structured food security and nutrition-related expertise to better inform the CFS and help create synergies between world class academic/scientific knowledge, field experience, knowledge from social actors and practical application in various settings. The HLPE will utilize and synthesize available research/analyses and add value to the work performed already by numerous agencies, organizations, and academic institutions, among others. Given the multidisciplinary complexity of food security, the effort is aimed at improving communication and information-sharing among the different stakeholders. The HLPE products will focus on better understanding current food insecurity situations and look forward toward emerging issues.
7. Three interlinked outcomes are established for CFS in order to achieve this overall goal: coordination at global level, policy convergence, and strengthening of national and regional food security and nutrition actions. Specific indicators should enable annual reporting on results.

### **Outcome A: Enhanced global coordination on food security and nutrition questions**

8. The CFS role of global coordination is to provide an inclusive and evidence-based platform for discussion and coordination to strengthen collaborative action among governments, international and regional organizations, CSOs, the private sector and other relevant stakeholders, in a manner that is in alignment with country needs.
9. This role is conducted mainly through discussions at the CFS Plenary session, including examination of food security and nutrition initiatives and frameworks, and inter-sessional activities

---

<sup>4</sup> Using as a general guide the Programme Committee format as given in PC 108/INF/3; Annexes – include the Prioritization Matrix.

that support the work of the Committee. The outcome considers not only coordination within CFS, but also the way CFS works with other important global and regional fora and initiatives. Coordination can also serve to encourage a more efficient use of resources and the identification of resource gaps.

### **Outcome B: Improved policy convergence on key food security and nutrition issues**

10. The CFS role in policy convergence is achieved through the formulation of policy recommendations, the development of international strategies and guidelines and other policy frameworks, based on best practices, lessons learnt, inputs from the national and regional levels and expert advice and opinions from different stakeholders. Policy convergence will include greater integration and coherence horizontally (among countries, organizations, stakeholders, etc.) as well as vertically (from local to global levels and vice versa).

11. The HLPE provides a key supporting role by providing evidence-based information and state of the art knowledge in support of the policy discussions.

12. This outcome is further supported by the development of a CFS communication strategy that will aim to sensitize the decision-makers to the CFS recommendations and by the CFS Chair's attendance to key fora.

### **Outcome C: Strengthened national and regional food security and nutrition actions**

13. It is crucial that the work of the CFS is based on the reality on the ground. It will be fundamental for the CFS to nurture and maintain linkages with different actors at regional, sub regional and local levels to ensure on-going, two-way exchange of information, share of best practices and lessons learnt among these stakeholders during intersessional periods.

14. The role of the CFS in facilitating support to national and regional food security and nutrition plans (i.e. policies, programmes, other actions, etc.) includes support/advice on development, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of plans to eliminate hunger and achieve food security and nutrition, based on the principles of participation, transparency and accountability. Progress on this outcome will also be a function of the responses provided by CFS to countries and regions and of the adoption of advice, tools, methods and frameworks that support coordinated responses resulting from CFS actions.

## **III. WORKSTREAMS (AGREED BY CFS PLENARY)<sup>5</sup>**

### **15. Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security (VGGT)**

The overall purpose of the VGGT is to serve as a reference and to provide guidance to improve the governance of tenure of land, fisheries and forests with the overarching goal of achieving food security for all and to support the progressive realization of the right to adequate food in the context of national food security. The VGGT have been adopted by the CFS Special Session of 11 May 2012.

### **16. Responsible agricultural investment principles (rai)**

The overall purpose is to offer policy guidance and a common understanding for all governments, international organizations, investors and other stakeholders to ensure that investments in agriculture have a positive (or at least neutral) impact on food security and nutrition. To ensure consistency and complementarity with the VGGT, a two step process is initiated after endorsement of the VGGT, starting with the development of terms of reference that include the scope, purpose, intended recipients

---

<sup>5</sup> See Annex 1: Guidance Note on Selection and Prioritization of CFS Workstreams.

and structure of these principles, as well as the format of the consultation process, taking into account existing frameworks.

#### 17. **Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition (GSF)**

The overall purpose of the GSF is to provide a dynamic instrument to improve coordination and guide synchronized action by a wide range of stakeholders in support of global, regional and country-led actions to prevent future food crises, eliminate hunger and ensure food security and nutrition for all human beings. The initial version of the GSF is intended to consolidate previous, already agreed decisions and recommendations of the CFS, to reflect common denominators in some areas not yet contemplated within the CFS by leveraging existing frameworks, as well as to highlight, for further development, areas and gaps in policy convergence which may be addressed in future versions of the GSF. The GSF will be flexible so that it can be updated and adjusted as priorities change.

#### 18. **Policy discussions based on the HLPE's studies and reporting on the state of implementation of past policy recommendations**

The overall purpose is to promote policy convergence through multi-stakeholder discussions in the CFS on crucial issues. The basis for these discussions will usually be a study from the HLPE. A system for the follow-up and monitoring of implementation of the CFS recommendations on policy convergence will be established. The following topics have been or will be addressed by the CFS:

- Food Price volatility - 2011
- Smallholder-sensitive investments in agriculture - 2011
- Gender, Food security and nutrition - 2011
- Climate change and food security - 2012
- Social protection and food security - 2012
- Constraints to smallholder investment - 2013
- Biofuels and food security – 2013

#### 19. **Addressing food insecurity and undernutrition in protracted crises: High Level Expert Forum (HLEF) and Agenda for action**

The overall purpose of the HLEF is to provide an open space for consultation and policy dialogue to increase a common understanding of determinants of resilience, in order to appropriately deal with food security and nutrition in countries in protracted crises. It will strengthen the collaborative efforts of all stakeholders as well as identify suitable responses. A tentative outcome could be an “Agenda for Action for Food Security in Countries in Protracted Crises”.

#### 20. **Food Security and Nutrition (FSN) terminology options paper**

The overall purpose is to improve understanding and coordination among stakeholders and to provide a standardized and consensual terminology. An options paper will be developed on the meaning and different uses, if any, of the terms “Food Security”, “Food Security and Nutrition”, “Food and Nutrition Security” and “Nutrition Security”.

#### 21. **Mapping Food Security and Nutrition Actions at Country Level**

The overall purpose is to support national and regional institutions in mapping food security and nutrition actions to improve the alignment of these actions with resources as well as the coordination of these actions. Mapping refers to profiling actions (policies, programmes, strategies, plans and projects) that support food security and nutrition objectives and charting the linkages of these actions to domestic and donor resource flows, implementing institutions and beneficiary population groups. Mapping approaches, methods and tools are needed to improve the capacity to make well-informed decisions about how best to design and implement food security and nutrition actions and allocate resources to achieve food security and nutrition objectives.

#### 22. **Communication**

The overall purpose is to increase awareness about the CFS itself and about its outputs: guidelines, frameworks, tools, etc. This will be achieved through the implementation of the communication

strategy to be further developed, the presentations made by CFS representatives in different fora at international, regional and national levels, and the diffusion of CFS outputs via CFS members and participants.

#### IV. KEY STAKEHOLDERS AND TARGET AUDIENCE

23. Key stakeholders include all CFS members and participants as defined in the Reform document:

- Member countries;
- UN agencies and bodies with a specific mandate in the field of food security and nutrition such as FAO, IFAD, WFP, the HLTf (as a coordinating mechanism of the UN Secretary General) and representatives of other relevant UN System bodies whose overall work is related to attaining food security, nutrition, and the right to food such as the Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food, the Office of the UN High Commissioner on Human Rights, WHO, UNICEF, UNDP, Standing Committee on Nutrition (SCN);
- Civil society and non-governmental organizations and their networks with strong relevance to issues of food security and nutrition with particular attention to organizations representing smallholder family farmers, artisanal fisherfolk, herders/pastoralists, landless, urban poor, agricultural and food workers, women, youth, consumers, Indigenous Peoples, and NGOs whose mandates and activities are concentrated in the areas of concern of the Committee;
- International agricultural research systems, such as through representatives of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) and others;
- International and regional Financial Institutions including World Bank, International Monetary Fund, regional development banks and World Trade Organization (WTO);
- Representatives of private sector associations and private philanthropic foundations active in the areas of concern to the Committee.

24. The target audience includes:

- Policy-makers who can take into account CFS methodology, tools and frameworks in the design of national or regional food security and nutrition laws, strategies, plans or programmes;
- Local partners (CSOs, private sector, investors, donors, international and regional organisations...) and the international and regional organisations or initiatives as well as local authorities collaborating with CFS that can also use the methodology, tools and frameworks developed within CFS;
- Ultimately, the populations suffering from hunger, food insecurity and malnutrition

## V. RESULT-BASED FRAMEWORK<sup>6</sup>

NB: This chapter is work in progress and should not be considered as finalized. The following table is only a proposal that will be discussed and further refined by the OEWG on Monitoring after the 39 CFS.

Overall Objective				
Contribute to reducing hunger and malnutrition and ensuring food security and nutrition for all human beings				
Outcomes	Indicators (questions)	Assumptions and risks	Lead entity & partners	Frequency of measurement & reporting
A. Enhanced global coordination on food security and nutrition questions	<p>Are CFS members and participants satisfied with its coordination role? Are all CFS stakeholders categories equally satisfied?</p> <p>Does CFS collaborate with other key international and regional initiatives (e.g. ECOSOC, G20, G8, Rio+20, UN General Assembly, MDG / SDG process, UNFCCC, AU, CAADP and other regional partnerships, etc.)?</p>	<p>1. Food security and nutrition issues remain high in the international political agenda.</p> <p>Risk indicator: Final reports of key international meetings and conferences (ECOSOC, G20, G8, Rio+20, UN General Assembly, MDG / SDG process, UNFCCC, AU, CAADP and other regional partnerships) do not mention food security and nutrition issues or do not consider them as priority issues.</p> <p>Mitigating strategy: evidence-based communication and advocacy; demonstration of linkages with other key areas.</p>	Independent panel of evaluation and CFS stakeholders	<p>Once every two biennia</p> <p>Evaluation report presented at the CFS session closing the 4-year period</p>

### <sup>6</sup> **Definitions:**

- **CFS activities:** concrete actions undertaken by CFS for each workstream.
- **Outputs:** specific/direct deliverables produced through activities.
- **Intermediate outcomes:** consequences of the use of the outputs in the near-term, that must occur in order to fully reach the outcomes.
- **Outcomes:** the changes and benefits that result from the intermediate outcomes in a longer-term perspective.
- **Overall objective:** the higher-level impact that is ultimately sought and that the intervention will contribute to achieving.

	<p>How many high-level events (including side-events to international or regional conferences) does the CFS organise per year?</p> <p>Is the CFS-like model to discuss food security and nutrition issues (multi-stakeholder and cross-sectoral) replicated in other fora, especially at country level?</p>	<p>2. CFS members and participants remain committed to sharing lessons and expertise and coordinating their actions for food security and nutrition within the CFS framework.</p> <p>Risk indicator: Lack of participation in CFS meetings and negotiation sessions / Lack of representation of some categories of stakeholders.</p> <p>Mitigating strategy: All categories of CFS stakeholders have the possibility to voice their ideas and all proposals are welcomed; possible concerns and sensitivities are timely addressed.</p> <p>3. CFS has a good reputation and is recognised by international actors as the main international body for dealing with food security and nutrition issues. The international community remains committed to providing resources according to needs identified and planned activities incorporated in the CFS work programme.</p> <p>Risk indicator: Decreased interest in CFS model and activities among the international community and donors / Lack of visibility and legitimacy of CFS / Some key issues related to food security and nutrition are dealt with by other actors/fora, with no collaboration, consultation or reporting to CFS / CFS planned activities cannot be implemented by lack of funding.</p> <p>Mitigating strategy: Systematic networking, communication, fund-raising and advocacy efforts towards donor community.</p>		
B. Improved policy convergence on key food and nutrition issues	Are CFS achievements and recommendations communicated and	1. CFS achievements and successes are well communicated among a large audience.	Independent panel of	Once every two biennia

	<p>advocated efficiently?</p> <p>Have CFS members and participants integrated CFS policy recommendations in their strategies and actions? Have they taken into account the GSF?</p> <p>Have CFS policy recommendations been integrated in national and regional policies, strategies and programmes for food security and nutrition?</p>	<p>Risk indicator: Some key stakeholders in the food security and nutrition area are not aware of CFS achievements and successes.</p> <p>Mitigating strategy: Systematic networking, communication and advocacy efforts on CFS achievements and successes among a large audience.</p> <p>2. Subjects for HLPE reports and following policy discussions are in line with priorities on the international agenda and timely and comprehensively treated.</p> <p>Risk indicator: Lack of high-level participation in HLPE consultation processes and roundtables where reports are presented</p> <p>Mitigating strategy: Ensuring that selected subjects for HLPE reports have been identified as key priorities in other international fora and result from a consensus of all CFS stakeholders.</p> <p>3. CFS stakeholders are engaged towards taking into account CFS recommendations and ensuring use of its methodology, tools and frameworks.</p> <p>Risk indicator: Loss of momentum after the adoption/endorsement of CFS recommendations and tools / Implementation or follow-up activities are not organised or implementation is delayed.</p> <p>Mitigating strategy: Implementation of CFS recommendations is presented to the CFS.</p>	<p>evaluation and CFS stakeholders</p>	<p>Evaluation report presented at the CFS session closing the 4-year period</p>
--	--	--	--	---



<p>C. Strengthened national and regional food security and nutrition actions</p>	<p>Is CFS often sought after by countries and regions for facilitating support to the design and implementation of their food security and nutrition plans, programmes and strategies?</p> <p>Have CFS members and participants strengthened their food security and nutrition actions in the field (including for monitoring and evaluation) and have increased related resources, as a result of CFS activities?</p> <p>Are national and regional stakeholders satisfied with the use and impacts of CFS methodology, tools and frameworks?</p>	<p>1. Countries and regions remain committed to tackle food security and nutrition issues.</p> <p>Risk indicator: Lack of interest for CFS methodology and tools (no requests for support sent to CFS or relevant IO) / No willingness of countries to provide resources and own follow-up actions.</p> <p>Mitigating strategy: Ensuring early involvement and endorsement from governments of CFS recommendations and tools and demonstrating clearly their benefits (possibly by implementing first in pilot countries) / Co-provision of adequate financial, human and material resources.</p> <p>2. Countries and regions monitor the actions resulting from the implementation of CFS recommendations, tools and frameworks and share related results, directly or indirectly, with CFS.</p> <p>Risk indicator: No reporting on the implementation of CFS recommendations, tools and frameworks at national and regional levels.</p> <p>Mitigating strategy: Encouraging use of already existing monitoring frameworks / Inclusion of elements for guiding monitoring in all CFS recommendations, tools and frameworks.</p> <p>3. Resources are provided to implement CFS recommendations in countries and regions in a coordinated manner</p> <p>Risk indicator: National and regional stakeholders have limited capacity and funding to</p>	<p>Independent panel of evaluation and CFS stakeholders</p>	<p>Once every two biennia</p> <p>Evaluation report presented at the CFS session closing the 4-year period</p>
--	---	--	---	---

		<p>implement CFS recommendations, tools and frameworks / there is a lack of coordination to implement CFS recommendations at country- or regional level.</p> <p>Mitigating strategy: Increased donor coordination in the support to countries and regions, pooling of resources as appropriate / Increased high-level dialogue with concerned governments and stakeholders / Regular meetings held with partners to check on progress and evolution of the situation.</p>			
1. Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National food Security (VGGT)				→ Contribution to outcomes A, B and C	
Intermediate outcome	Indicators	Monitoring level(s)	Means of verification	Lead entity & partners	Frequency of measurement & reporting
1.1 The VGGT are incorporated by countries into their national frameworks and taken into consideration in the implementation of related activities by all stakeholders.	<p>Number of governments that have incorporated the VGGT into their national frameworks.</p> <p>Target:</p>	National	Reports of the Steering Committee on the implementation of the VGGT	Steering Committee on the implementation of the VGGT	<p>Once a year</p> <p>Reported at each CFS plenary session</p>
Output	Indicators	Monitoring level(s)	Means of verification	Lead entity & partners	Frequency of measurement & reporting
1.1.1 The VGGT are developed and endorsed.	<p>The VGGT are endorsed by the CFS.</p> <p>Target: VGGT are successfully negotiated and endorsed by CFS in 2012</p>	Global	CFS decision report on the endorsement of the VGGT	CFS OEWG on the VGGT (Chair: USA)	<p>Once</p> <p>Reported at the CFS plenary (extraordinary) session of 11 May 2012</p>

Activities					
1.1.1.1 Development of the VGGT (using consultations)					
1.1.1.2 Negotiation and endorsement of the VGGT					
2. Responsible Agricultural Investment principles (rai) (tbc)					→ Contribution to outcomes A, B and C
Intermediate outcome	Indicators	Monitoring level(s)	Means of verification	Lead entity & partners	Frequency of measurement & reporting
2.1 Agricultural investments are realised in conformity with the CFS rai principles.	Percentage of agricultural investments that respect the CFS rai principles. Target:	National	TBD	TBD	TBD
Output	Indicators	Monitoring level(s)	Means of verification	Lead entity & partners	Frequency of measurement & reporting
2.1.1 The consultation and negotiation processes for rai are successful.	Number of participants, by category, taking part in the rai consultation process. Target: The rai principles are endorsed by CFS Target: rai endorsed by timeframe TBD	Global	Reports of consultation meetings and records of on-line consultations. CFS decision report on the endorsement of the rai	CFS OEWG on the rai (Chair: Switzerland)	Once Reported at the CFS plenary session following the endorsement of the rai
Activities					
2.1.1.1 Agreement on the terms of reference of the rai process					
2.1.1.2 Consultations about the rai principles					
2.1.1.3 Negotiation and endorsement of the rai principles					

3. Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition (GSF)				→ Contribution to outcomes A, B and C	
Intermediate outcome	Indicators	Monitoring level(s)	Means of verification	Lead entity & partners	Frequency of measurement & reporting
3.1 The GSF is used by stakeholders (especially CFS members and participants).	Percentage of stakeholders using it to develop food and nutrition security actions. Target:	Global, Regional & National	Questionnaire-based survey	CFS Secretariat	Once a year Reported at each CFS plenary session
Output	Indicators	Monitoring level(s)	Means of verification	Lead entity & partners	Frequency of measurement & reporting
3.1.1 The GSF is developed and adopted.	The GSF is adopted by the CFS Target: GSF adopted in the CFS 39 (October 2012)	Global	CFS decision report on the endorsement of the GSF	CFS OEWG on the GSF (Chair: Brazil)	Once Reported at the 39 CFS plenary session
Activities					
3.1.1.1 Development of the GSF (using a task team and consultations)					
3.1.1.2 Negotiation and endorsement of the GSF					
4. Policy discussions based on the HLPE's studies and reporting on the state of implementation of past policy recommendations				→ Contribution to outcome B	
Intermediate outcome	Indicators	Monitoring level(s)	Means of verification	Lead entity & partners	Frequency of measurement & reporting
4.1 CFS policy recommendations are taken into account by stakeholders when formulating policies and strategies related to food security and	Percentage of CFS policy recommendations. taken into account in	Global, Regional & National	Policies and strategies	CFS Secretariat & other CFS Stakeholders	Once a year, before each plenary session

nutrition.	national policies and strategies related to food security and nutrition Target:				Reported at each plenary session
Outputs	Indicators	Monitoring level(s)	Means of verification	Lead entity & partners	Frequency of measurement & reporting
4.1.1 HLPE reports are pertinent, in line with the CFS request, and subjects are comprehensively treated.	Percentage of CFS stakeholders indicating satisfaction regarding the HLPE reports (quality and timeliness) Target:	Global	HLPE reports Questionnaire-based survey	HLPE SC CFS Secretariat	Once a year, at the meeting presenting the HLPE reports Reported at each plenary session
4.1.2 Concrete recommendations are agreed in the policy discussions within CFS.	Percentage of CFS stakeholders indicating satisfaction with the CFS debates and their conclusions. Target:	Global	Questionnaire-based survey + reports of the CFS and policy round tables	CFS Secretariat	Once a year, at the meeting presenting the HLPE reports Reported at each plenary session
5. Addressing food insecurity and undernutrition in protracted crises: High Level Expert Forum (HLEF) and Agenda for action				→ Contribution to outcome A, B and C	
Intermediate outcomes	Indicators	Monitoring level(s)	Means of verification	Lead entity & partners	Frequency of measurement & reporting
5.1. The understanding of food insecurity in countries in protracted crisis is improved.	Percentage of participants in the HLEF indicating satisfaction Target:	Global	Questionnaire-based survey	CFS Secretariat	Once, at the end of the HLEF Reported at the CFS 39
5.2 An 'Agenda for Action' is implemented in countries in protracted crises by stakeholders	Number of countries where the Agenda	Global, Regional &	...	...	...

	for Action is implemented. Target:	National			
Outputs	Indicators	Monitoring level(s)	Means of verification	Lead entity & partners	Frequency of measurement & reporting
5.1.1 A High-Level Expert Forum is organised to improve the understanding of food insecurity in countries in protracted crisis.	A high-level expert forum is organised to improve the understanding of food insecurity in countries in protracted crisis with a broad-based participation, including eminent experts from the different disciplines and regions. Target : HLEF in September 2012	Global	Report of the HLEF	HLEF Steering Committee / CFS Secretariat	Once, at the HLEF Reported at the CFS 39
5.2.1 An 'Agenda for Action' is developed and endorsed.	Validation of the elements for an "Agenda for Action" and of the way forward to prepare it. Target: Consensus on these elements	Global	Report of the CFS 39	CFS Secretariat & other CFS Stakeholders	Once Reported at the CFS 40
<b>Activities</b>					
5.1.1.1 Preparation and organisation of the HLEF					
5.1.1.2 Presentation of its report at the CFS 39 and decision on a process to develop an agenda for action					
5.2.1.1 Development of the agenda for action					
5.2.1.2 Agreement on an agenda for action in CFS					
<b>6. Food Security and Nutrition (FSN) Terminology Options Paper</b>				→ Contribution to outcome A	
Intermediate outcome	Indicators	Monitoring level(s)	Means of verification	Lead entity & partners	Frequency of measurement & reporting
6.1 The agreed standardized	Percentage of statements and documents		International statements and UN	CFS Secretariat	Once a year

terminology is generally accepted and used in global and regional organisations, initiatives and fora.	of key international and regional fora using the agreed terminology. Target:	Global & Regional	documents		Reported at each plenary session
<b>Outputs</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Monitoring level(s)</b>	<b>Means of verification</b>	<b>Lead entity &amp; partners</b>	<b>Frequency of measurement &amp; reporting</b>
6.1.1 Overall understanding of the terms 'Food Security', 'Nutrition Security', 'Food Security and Nutrition' and 'Food and Nutrition Security' by CFS stakeholders is improved.	Percentage of CFS stakeholders understanding the terms in the same way after discussion. Target:	Global	Questionnaire-based survey	CFS Secretariat & Task team on terminology	Once, after CFS 39 Reported at the CFS 40
6.1.2 Chosen terminology is harmonized throughout CFS/UN documents.	Percentage of CFS/UN documents where terminology is harmonized. Target:	Global	CFS documents	CFS Secretariat	Once Reported at CFS 40
<b>Activities</b>					
6.1.1.1 Development a terminology option paper					
6.1.1.2 Presentation and discussion of the terminology option paper					
6.1.1.3 Agreement on one of the option included in the terminology option paper					
6.1.2.1 Harmonization of terminology throughout CFS/UN documents					
<b>7. Mapping of Food Security and Nutrition (FSN) Actions at Country Level</b>				→ Contribution to outcome A and C	
<b>Intermediate outcomes</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Monitoring level(s)</b>	<b>Means of verification</b>	<b>Lead entity &amp; partners</b>	<b>Frequency of measurement &amp; reporting</b>
7.1 Capacity of countries and regional organisations for mapping	Percentage of countries and regional organisations having expressed interest	Regional, national	Questionnaire-based user survey	Mapping task team	Once a year Reported at each

actions for food security and nutrition is strengthened.	in FSN action mapping that are effectively engaged in FSN action mapping. Target:				CFS plenary session
7.2 Cross-sectoral and multi-level coordination of actions for food security and nutrition in assisted countries is improved.	Percentage of users involved in FSN coordination satisfied. Target:	National	Questionnaire-based user survey	Mapping task team	Once a year Reported at each CFS plenary session
<b>Output</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Monitoring level(s)</b>	<b>Means of verification</b>	<b>Lead entity &amp; partners</b>	<b>Frequency of measurement &amp; reporting</b>
7.1.1/2 A platform for mapping and sharing information on food security and nutrition actions, accessible and meeting users' needs, is developed.	Percentage of users who judge the platform accessible and meeting their needs. Target:	Global, Regional & National	Questionnaire-based user survey	Mapping task team	Once Reported at each CFS plenary session
<b>Activities</b>					
7.1.1/2.1 Development of the web-based platform					
7.1.1/2.2 Testing of the platform in pilot countries					
<b>8. Communication</b>				→ Contribution to outcome B	
<b>Intermediate outcomes</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Monitoring level(s)</b>	<b>Means of verification</b>	<b>Lead entity &amp; partners</b>	<b>Frequency of measurement &amp; reporting</b>
8.1 The CFS model is promoted	Number of international, regional or national for a where the CFS is presented and promoted. Target:	Global, Regional & National	Number of meetings where the CFS model is presented	CFS Chair and Secretariat	Once a year Reported at each plenary session



<p>8.2 Advocacy for the CFS instruments (tools, recommendations, guidelines and frameworks...) is organised</p>	<p>Number of press releases, events and communication initiatives that advocate for the implementation of the CFS instruments (VGGT, GSF, rai principles, recommendations of the policy round tables, terminology, mapping tool...).</p> <p>Target:</p>	<p>Global, Regional &amp; National</p>	<p>Events and communications initiatives records (included press releases) + information shared by CFS stakeholders</p>	<p>CFS Secretariat &amp; other CFS Stakeholders</p>	<p>Once a year Reported at each plenary session</p>
---	---	--	---	---	---

## V. GANTT CHART: PRIORITIZATION OF WORKSTREAMS

TEXT TO BE INSERTED

NOT FOR TRANSLATION

## VI. BUDGET

Core budget	Donors / Funding sources	Budget (USD)			
		2012	2013 <sup>7</sup>	Total 2012-2013	Funding gap
Core staff and technical support	FAO/WFP/IFAD core budgets	1,200,000	1,200,000	2,400,000	tbd
Publications	FAO/WFP/IFAD core budgets	300,000	300,000	600,000	tbd
Interpretation	FAO/WFP/IFAD core budgets	275,000	275,000	550,000	tbd
Support of CFS engagement at regional/global initiatives	FAO/WFP/IFAD core budgets	75,000	75,000	150,000	tbd
National and regional invitees to CFS (38th, 39th, 40th)	FAO/WFP/IFAD core budgets	65,000	65,000	130,000	tbd
Other (tbd)	FAO/WFP/IFAD core budgets	60,000	60,000	120,000	tbd
Core budget sub-total		1,975,000	1,975,000	3,950,000	tbd

<sup>7</sup> Subject to cost increases for inflation and pending decision on the CFS Secretary modalities.

Voluntary contributions for Workstreams funding	Donors / Funding sources	Budget (USD)			
		2012	2013	Total	Funding gap
1. Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security (VGGT)	EU	262,000	0	262,000	0
2. Responsible Agricultural Investment principles (rai) - estimated 2 million over 2013/2014	tbd	0	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
3. Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition (GSF)	EU, Brazil	383,000	0	383,000	0
4. Supports the realization of the HLPE reports requested by CFS as inputs to policy discussions	HLPE Trust Fund	815,000	815,000	1,630,000	400,000
5. Addressing food insecurity and undernutrition in protracted crises: High Level Expert Forum (HLEF) and Agenda for action	EU, other TFs	263,000	tbd	263,000	tbd
6. Food Security and Nutrition (FSN) terminology options paper	TFs	15,000	tbd	15,000	tbd
7. Mapping of Food Security and Nutrition Actions at Country Level	FAO, TFs	170,000	tbd	170,000	tbd
8. Communication	tbd	tbd	tbd	tbd	tbd
Workstreams sub-total					
Civil Society Mechanism (CSM)	Donors / Funding sources	Budget (\$US)			
		2012	2013	Total	Funding gap
Support to CSM activities	EU, Brazil	1 000 000	1,500,000	2,500,000	1,500,000

---

CSM sub-total	1 000 000	1,500,000	2,500,000	1,500,000
---------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------

## **VII. MONITORING AND EVALUATION**

25. The CFS work on monitoring and evaluation will be further developed with the OEWG on Monitoring (Ref CFS 2012/39/11). This will include how to measure the success of the CFS reform process. One proposal is to evaluate the success of the CFS work once every two biennia, based on outcome indicators and the results of the CFS activities. The evaluation report should be presented at the CFS session closing the 4-year period and related recommendations used to update and possibly reframe the MYPOW and subsequent workstreams.

## **Annex 1 - Guidance note on Selection and Prioritization of CFS Workstreams**

### **A. Prioritization of already agreed CFS workstreams**

26. Prioritisation has been carried out by the OEWG. For each key workstream, the degree of urgency and priority, the time demand for involved stakeholders and a preliminary timetable for implementation have been preliminary identified. A Gantt chart (Annex/Section XX) has been developed on this basis. It presents milestones for each agreed workstream on a timeline and indicates based on a colour code the degree of priority for implementation and the related workload for the CFS Bureau and Secretariat. The Gantt chart is integrated in the CFS MYPOW and will be frequently updated to reflect changes in the planning of the workstreams.

### **B. Informed selection of future CFS workstreams**

27. During CFS Plenary session, identification of potential future CFS major workstreams can be done when many members or participants at the CFS plenary session express an interest in them. The discussions in the CFS Plenary should pay due attention to the outcomes of other international meetings (e.g. FAO Regional Conferences, other UN meetings...) and/or the topic should have been identified by the HLPE as an emerging issue to be tackled by the CFS.

28. The CFS Plenary should decide to undertake new major workstreams on the basis of agreed criteria. Proposed criteria for the selection of workstreams:

- a) there is a consensus among CFS Members that the issue should be addressed within the CFS framework;
- b) the CFS is best placed to carry out the proposed workstream, taking into consideration its mandate and added value;
- c) the proposed workstream contributes to the achievement of the CFS overall objective through one or several of its three outcomes;
- d) the same proposed workstream has not been carried out in the past or is not carried out at the same time by other actors with comparable mandates. Convergence with other existing frameworks is ensured and duplication avoided;
- e) there is enough time, resources and background knowledge to implement the proposed workstream.

29. Should a proposed workstream meet all above criteria, then it could be agreed at the CFS Plenary. In case several workstreams meet the criteria, criteria e) could help prioritize among them. The CFS Plenary will take the ultimate decision, based on consensus. If deemed necessary, the CFS Bureau can also decide to start a workstream (see below) and to present it to the next Plenary session.

### **C. Integration of new workstreams in the CFS MYPOW**

30. Based on the VGGT, GSF and rai model, a two-step process is proposed for a new major workstream to be included in the CFS MYPOW:

- Step 1: if meeting all selection criteria, the workstream is proposed to the CFS Plenary session on Year Y for endorsement. If the CFS Plenary decides to start this workstream, Year Y+1 is spent to develop ToRs for the workstream, including scope, roadmap with timeline and milestones, expected outputs and related activities with indicators (following the RBF model), responsibilities for implementation and monitoring, and planned budget (expected costs and sources of funding). A template will be developed for easy reference. Potential costs induced for the development of ToRs in Year Y+1 (meetings, consultations...) are supported by the CFS budget, as much as feasible.

- Step 2: ToRs are presented to the CFS Plenary session on Year Y+1 for approval. Once approved, the workstream is integrated in the CFS MYPOW, including sources of funding/resources, then, implemented and monitored.

31. The two steps can be merged if the CFS Bureau decides that the proposed workstream needs to be implemented rapidly or if its scope does not necessitate one-year preparation process. Short ToRs for the new workstream, including elements developed above, should be prepared and presented to the Bureau in Year Y for decision of launching the new workstream. A presentation is also made at the next Plenary session. Once approved, the workstream is integrated in the CFS MYPOW, implemented and monitored.

#### **D. Proposed workstreams for 2013**

32. Proposed workstreams for 2013 are the following:

- Policy discussions based on the HLPE's studies (Constraints on smallholder investment and Biofuels and food security) (agreed at CFS 37);
- Responsible agricultural investment principles (rai) Step 2 (to be decided at CFS 39);
- Development of an Agenda for Action on food security and nutrition in countries in protracted crises (to be decided at CFS 39);
- Food Security and Nutrition (FSN) Terminology Options Paper (follow-up if needed, to be decided at CFS 39);
- Mapping of Food Security and Nutrition (FSN) Actions at Country Level (on going, mainly within the task team).

33. Monitoring and reporting on the state of implementation of past policy recommendations, updating the MYPOW and the GSF according to CFS 39 recommendations, communication and preparation of the Plenary session will also be implemented.

34. Due to the current workload and taking into account time and resource constraints of the CFS Secretariat, Bureau and Advisory Group, it is recommended that no new major workstream is initiated before CFS 40 (October 2013). The 39th Plenary session should however take a decision on the themes of HLPE's studies for 2014 taking into account related time requirements.