Internal Procedures
and Methodological guidelines
for the Work of the
High Level Panel of Experts
on Food Security and Nutrition

Approved by the HLPE Steering Committee

3rd version, approved by the Steering Committee

Following the meeting in Buenos Aires (17-19 November 2014)

This document, approved by the HLPE Steering Committee of the HLPE, describes the internal procedures and methodological guidelines implemented by the HLPE. It compiles the operational modalities of work designed by the HLPE during its first three years of activity (October 2010 - October 2013). It aims at describing the way the HLPE works and provides methodological guidelines for the elaboration of the reports. It describes how the different steps of the process are to be organized, clarifying the roles of each of the components of the HLPE and the purpose of the different documents and drafts supporting the write-up of the reports. It explains how duties and responsibilities are attributed at each step of the process. It also covers editorial and communication issues.

It gives operational details to implement the rules and principles governing the work of the HLPE: the CFS Reform Document (approved by the CFS Plenary in 2009), the Rules and Procedures for the work of the HLPE (approved by the Bureau of the CFS in January 2010), as well as the legal texts (FAO General Rules of the Organization/GRO, CFS Rules of Procedures/RoP).

Documenting internal procedures is particularly important to support the work at distance of many involved, as well as to ensure institutional memory and legacy.

Versioning

This document has been first discussed at the 3rd and 4th meetings of the HLPE StC in July and December 2011. A first version of it was published in October 2012, following works at the 5th HLPE StC meeting (June 2012). A second version was published in October 2013, building on the outcomes of the 7th meeting of the HLPE StC in May 2013, notably to complete the note with elements of methodological guidance. The present and third version has been finalized at the 10th meeting of the HLPE Steering Committee in November 2014, among others to precise the functions and activities of the HLPE Secretariat, and to integrate a communication strategy building on a stocktaking on outreach and communication activities.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Boxes

INTRODUCTION

The HLPE has been created in 2009 as part of the reform of the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) *to assess and analyze the current state of food security and nutrition and its underlying causes; provide scientific and knowledge-based analysis and advice on specific policy-relevant issues, utilizing existing high quality research, data and technical studies; Identify emerging issues, and help members prioritize future actions and attention on key focal areas.*

The High Level Panel of Experts on food security and nutrition (HLPE) works as a science-policy interface for food security and nutrition and realizes demand-driven thematic assessments in a short time frame to provide understanding and advice on urgent policy relevant questions.

The HLPE receives its mandate from CFS and reports to it. But it produces its reports, recommendations and advice independently from governmental positions.

To ensure the scientific legitimacy and credibility of the process, as well as its transparency and openness to all forms of knowledge, the HLPE operates with very specific rules, agreed by the CFS.

The project cycle for the reports, in spite of its being extremely time constrained, includes clearly defined stages separating the political question by CFS, its scientific formulation by the Steering Committee, the scientific work of a time bound and topic bound Project Team selected and appointed by the Steering Committee and working under its oversight, external consultations to enrich the knowledge base, and an external scientific review.

The HLPE takes care to closely involve a broad range of experts and to confront diverse scientific points of view at every stage of the process. This is why the process organizes a scientific dialogue between the Steering Committee and the Project Team, as well as, through open electronic consultations, between the HLPE, the experts in the HLPE Roster (there are currently 1200 of them), and all concerned stakeholders.

In the framework of its mandate (see CFS reform document[1]), the HLPE has a very specific mission: preparing "demand-driven" reports on often highly sensitive questions, in a very tight time frame. This is part of the relevance and impact of HLPE's work, but does not go without substantial pressure on all those involved.

Therefore the following is reiterated:

-   The importance of strict planning for the different steps of the project (workshops, writing workshops, e-consultations, Steering Committee meetings, appointment of experts, of reviewers etc…), as well as clear attribution of respective responsibilities.

-   The importance to follow sound methodologies and ways of work to elaborate the report.

-   As decisions on the methods or on the processes have a direct impact on the calendar, the importance of agreeing on them well upfront, at the beginning of the project cycle.

-   The necessity to respect the established calendar, at every stage of the process, in order to ensure enough time for the effective writing of the reports.

-   The importance of quick reaction according to the respective roles, taking into account the delocalized structure of the HLPE.

---

[1] http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/cfs/Docs0910/ReformDoc/CFS_2009_2_Rev_2_E_K7197.pdf

1 HLPE COMPONENTS: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

1.1 HLPE Chair

1.1.1 Duties and responsibilities of the Chair

The Chair of the Steering Committee is responsible of the proper execution of the mandate given to the HLPE[2]. The Chair ensures that the HLPE procedures and decisions taken by the Steering Committee are properly implemented. Working jointly with other members of the Steering Committee, and according to the HLPE Rules and Procedures, the Chair is responsible for the good provision of the work of the Steering Committee, in terms of scoping, planning, organizing, and implementing the HLPE process.

This includes being responsible for:
- The call and selection of Project Teams and their Team Leaders, according to the criteria[3] laid down by the CFS.
- Ensuring that appropriate interaction takes place between the Steering Committee and Project Teams, and the Coordinator, for the different steps of the process.
- The timely production, review, finalization and approval of Reports.
- Facilitating the adoption of the internal procedures and working methods of the Steering Committee and of the Project Teams, as necessary to the implementation of the mandate of the HLPE.
- Ensuring that internal procedures and working methods of the HLPE are compatible with the overall HLPE Rules and Procedures agreed by the CFS Bureau and are adhered to.
- Acting as the liaison between the HLPE Steering Committee and the CFS/HLPE Secretariat, and between the HLPE Steering Committee and the CFS Bureau.

The HLPE Coordinator (see Section 1.6) supports the HLPE Chair in these functions.

The Chair of the Steering Committee of the HLPE is invited to CFS sessions to introduce and present findings of HLPE reports, possibly in conjunction with the Vice-Chair, the Team Leader and/or Lead Author(s). (HLPE Rules and Procedures, paragraph 38)

The Chair can delegate tasks and responsibilities to the Vice-Chair or other StC members. If, within its term, the Chair of the Steering Committee resigns or is unable to fulfill his/her mandate, the Vice-Chair shall serve as acting Chair until a new Chair is designated. (HLPE Rules and Procedures, paragraph 14).

The terms of office of the Chair and Vice-Chair are the same as the term of the Steering Committee of the HLPE, as set by the Bureau of the CFS.

1.1.2 Modalities to designate the Chair and Vice-Chair

The Chair and Vice-Chair of the Steering Committee of the HLPE are designated by a secret vote of the members of the StC, at a simple majority, organized under the supervision of the CFS Chair or his representative, following the procedure described hereafter. The Members of the Steering Committee may decide by consensus prior to the vote, to modify these rules.

1. Members of the Steering Committee who aspire to be Chair shall submit their candidature to the Secretariat before the meeting and until the vote.

---

[2] HLPE Rules and Procedures (HLPE R&P), Art. 5. "*The StC is led by a Chair and a Vice-Chair, who will be responsible for the proper execution of the mandate given to the HLPE by the CFS*". The HLPE Rules and Procedures are reproduced in Appendix 7.

[3] HLPE R&P, Art. 19: *"Project Teams selected by the StC shall reflect the general principles of scientific and technical relevance, regional expertise and balanced geographic representation, as appropriate".*

2. The list of candidates shall be closed just prior to the vote. Each HLPE StC member shall be provided with envelopes and voting slips for the names of the declared candidates. Only the 15 members of the Steering Committee are entitled to vote. Members not attending the meeting shall not be entitled to vote.

3. A voting slip shall be invalid if it contains more than one name, or if it includes the name of a person not appearing in the list of candidates.

4. Voting envelopes will be collected and opened in presence of voting Steering Committee members. A member of the Steering Committee will be designated to count the votes along with a member of the HLPE Secretariat.

5. Candidates shall be elected by a simple majority of the votes cast. The simple majority shall be the next integer above the half of the voting slips received, excluding abstentions, blanks or invalid voting slips.

6. The candidate who obtains a simple majority shall be declared elected. If, in the first ballot, no candidate obtains the simple majority, a second ballot shall be held, which shall be restricted to the two candidates who obtained the highest number of votes in the first ballot, plus any candidate that has obtained the same number of votes as the second candidate.

7. If, in the second ballot, a decision is not reached because two or more candidates have obtained the same number of votes, the ballot shall be repeated. If the situation reproduces, the decision between the candidates shall be made by drawing lots.

8. The procedure applied above (steps 2 to 7) is repeated for the designation of the Vice-Chair. It is assumed that the initial list of candidates to the post of Vice-Chair is identical to the list of candidates for the Chair, at the exception of the newly elected Chair. Before the vote, HLPE StC members can manifest their intention to be added to or subtracted from the list for the election of the Vice-Chair.

1.2 HLPE Steering Committee

1.2.1 Functions and roles of the HLPE Steering Committee

Throughout the HLPE process of production of reports, the HLPE StC has the following main roles:

1) The Steering Committee **appoints** Project Team Leaders and members that are charged to prepare the reports (HLPE R&P, Art. 15, 16 and 17).

2) The Steering Committee **appoints** Review Editors (HLPE R&P, Art. 26) and Reviewers.

3) The HLPE StC, based on the request of CFS, **defines the scope of the reports** and assigns **work plans** to the Project Teams, with due consideration for calendar issues and constraints (HLPE R&P, Art. 21).

4) From the appointment of a Project Team until the finalization and approval of the report, the Steering Committee has an **oversight and guidance role** on the Project Teams (HLPE R&P, Art. 22). The Steering Committee will liaise continuously with the Project Team, through its Leader, on course of the project, for general oversight and guidance (see section 1.2.2).

5) Finally, the HLPE StC finalizes and **approves** the reports. The CFS has defined on what basis it should be done: "*Prior to their publication and distribution, HLPE reports shall be approved by the StC on the basis alone of conformity to the request of the CFS and observation of proper quality standards and the review process*" (HLPE R&P, Art. 32).

The final reports shall be approved to the extent possible by consensus. Dissenting views could be expressed as part of the final report, in the aim to have the report approved by consensus.

Through the process, the exchanges between HLPE StC members as well as with the Project Team remain confidential. This is to ensure maximum degree of liberty of debate in internal works and debates.

1.2.2 Oversight role of the Steering Committee

HLPE reports are not drafted by the Steering Committee: "*The preparation of the draft report is done by the HLPE Project Teams, under the responsibility of their Team Leader and under StC oversight*" (HLPE R&P, Art. 22).

Therefore, during the report elaboration process and towards the completion of the study, posterior to the appointment of the Project Team and up to the approval of the reports, the main role of the Steering Committee is a role of oversight.

Whereas important elements of this oversight function were defined by the CFS, notably the fact that "*the HLPE StC assigns clearly defined mandates and work plans to the Project Teams, with due consideration for calendar issues and constraints*" (HLPE R&P, Art. 21), other aspects were left to be determined internally by the StC.

The "oversight role" of the StC therefore consists in ensuring that the report writing process by the Project Team:
- first, is properly monitored, done in time, and "by the rules", according to decisions taken at StC level;
- second, develops in line with the request from CFS; and
- third, that the final product respects proper quality standards (See Appendix 1) and the fact that the recommendations are tuned to the needs.

This implies, on course of the project, as deemed necessary, regular **guidance** (see below) to be given to the Project Team by the Steering Committee. To that extent, successive iterations called **guidance rounds** (see section 2.2.2) are organized.

Oversight Groups

As the HLPE usually works on several reports in parallel, the *organization* of the oversight and guidance *for a specific study* is for practical reasons attributed to a subset of Steering Committee members, called the Oversight Group.

The Oversight Group has a key role in the continuous StC oversight and guidance of the process.

Importantly, the Oversight Group associates, in the elaboration of the guidance, the entire Steering Committee.

However, the responsibility for the proper and timely organization of the rounds of guidance falls within the Oversight Group and the Oversight Convener. Oversight group members commit themselves to conduct the oversight and attend the teleconferences organized to that effect.

For each specific study, the composition of the Oversight Group is collegially decided at the level of the HLPE Steering Committee, usually during a face-to-face meeting, and validated by the HLPE StC Chair.

Steering Committee members can join any OG at any time, by request to the Chair. Members that are not part of the OG can always attend teleconferences or meetings of the OG.

The OG is tasked, inter alia:
- to ensure the oversight and guidance functions are delivered (see below),
- to prepare decisions that have to be taken collegially within the whole Steering Committee,
- to prepare decisions needing clearance by the StC Chair.

The decision-making matrix in Appendix 7 details the precise role of the Oversight Group at each step of the process.

For each OG, one StC member is appointed by the HLPE StC as "Convener" of the Steering Committee Oversight.

The Oversight Convener reports to the Chair regarding the timely preparation of the Study and has the responsibility to convene the execution of the different steps for the elaboration of reports (see section 2) involving the different components of the HLPE. The Convener is the HLPE StC focal point for the study towards other Steering Committee members and towards the Project Team. The HLPE Coordinator works closely with the Convener in support of these tasks.

The Convener takes care to collegially associate all the StC members in the Oversight proposals or decisions, and to consult and inform the appropriate HLPE components, as deemed necessary according to the respective attribution of roles for each step of the HLPE process as defined in the Table in Appendix 7.

1.2.3 Steering Committee Guidance

The reports of the HLPE are of a very specific nature. They aim to summarize existing science and knowledge, following strict scientific rules, but are oriented towards readers who are neither scientists nor experts in the field covered. They are of a scientific nature but they are "solution oriented" in spite of data gaps, divergences in reasoning, or scientific uncertainties.

They are demand driven, requested by the CFS to shed light and provide recommendations on a controversial and disputed topic, either for scientific or political reasons, most often for both. Most often the scientific and opinion/political terms of controversies are entangled.

The reports have thus to approach the topic in question as part of the broader set of issues interrelating with food security, to disentangle scientific controversies, but also to take into account the expectations, opinions and conceptions of the members and participants to CFS.

This is why the **project cycle** for the reports (described in Section 2), in spite of its being extremely time constrained, includes clearly defined stages separating the political question by CFS, its scientific formulation by the Steering Committee, the scientific work of a time bound and topic bound Project Team selected and appointed by the Steering Committee and working under its oversight, external consultations to enrich the knowledge base and an external scientific review.

The process organizes a **scientific dialogue** between the Steering Committee and the Project Team in order to fulfill the request of CFS.

The guidance given by the StC aims to:

- precise methodological issues in order to attain the high level of quality which is expected of HLPE reports.

- ensure that the report fits the expectations of the CFS. This is of particular importance as the Steering Committee is ultimately responsible in front of the CFS for the relevance of the reports to the initial request. There is often a need to re-center the reports, if Project Teams diverge towards parent topics sometimes too far from the central topic of the report.

- ensure that the report is inserted in a broad and multidisciplinary perspective needed to consider food security issues,

- ensure that the report is easily readable and understandable for non-specialists. The objective of an HLPE report is not to be the ultimate sum of all evidence on a topic, but to highlight the relevant issues and make them intelligible to decision makers.

- ensure that the report contains the evidence needed (including the necessary range of knowledge and related sources) to answer the concerns, expectations, opinions and, sometime to demystify the conceptions of the various members and participants in CFS, as expressed either during CFS sessions, or in the consultations.

- solve progressively three types of difficulties:

(i) Difficulties pertaining to the topic itself, either lack of data, controversies inside one of the disciplines or between disciplines or approaches.

(ii) Difficulties in the articulation between the topic as presented by the Project Team and broader perspectives, especially other disciplines or approaches.

(iii) Difficulties in the articulation of the topic as approached and presented by the Project Team and the request and expectations, opinions and conceptions of CFS members and participants

The guidance given by the StC is organized in guidance rounds, and specific internal documents are elaborated in support of it: notably the guidance notes and the list of items in discussions (see Section 2).

Box 1   Treatment of controversies

Treatment of controversies or of contentious issues is central to the HLPE process.

In the writing up of a report, if controversies on the analysis or on possible advice emerge, the role of the HLPE is not necessarily to force the consensus or to resolve the debate in finding winners and losers, or in arbitrarily or "politically" choosing between one or another option. It is rather to present the controversies, reflect all sides of the debate, disentangle its fundamentals, and explain to the policy makers the underlying competing rationales, and where are the main uncertainties or pivotal points, either in data or reasoning.

The adoption of the final reports will take place following the treatment of identified controversies, if necessary. Such identification, elicitation and treatment of differing views or evidence, shall take place not at the last minute, but well before the time of final approval of the reports. The HLPE process is specifically designed to that aim, starting with the Issues paper (see Section 2).

1.3 HLPE Project Teams

"The preparation of the draft report is done by the HLPE Project Teams, under the responsibility of their Team Leader and under StC oversight" (HLPE R&P Art. 22). Team members work under the direction of the Team Leader. The internal organization of the Project Team, respective allocation of roles, and contributions of team members are to be decided internally to the team, under the responsibility of its Leader, and in a collegial way.

In the elaboration of the draft reports, the Project Team is encouraged to draw its writings on an extensive array of different sources, as needed. "*The HLPE should help create synergies between world class academic/scientific knowledge, field experience, knowledge from social actors and practical application in various settings.*" (HLPE R&P, Art. 2). The Project Team is therefore encouraged to consult and to seek advice and inputs by external experts. In doing so, the Project Team shall ensure that draft versions of reports (except the V0 draft) remain confidential. Appendix 3 applies regarding the modalities to seek and consider contributions to the Project Team, and regarding acknowledgments.

The Project Team has a role up until the end of the report finalization process. After the review, the final editing is done either by the Team Leader or jointly between the Team Leader and the Review Editor(s) under Steering Committee oversight: "*Production of the revised draft report is under responsibility of the Team Leader and the Review Editors, under StC oversight, taking into account reviewers' comments*." (HLPE R&P Art. 27)

As included in their ToRs along with the calendar, Project Teams, through the Team Leader, are requested to regularly give feedback and report to the StC and Coordinator. This is done according to the process described in Section 2.

1.3.1 Project Team Leader: duties and responsibilities

The Project Team Leader is responsible of the timely preparation of the report and for the submission to the StC of its successive drafts and deliverables (see Section 2), under the guidance of the StC.

S/he organizes the work of the Project Team, including distribution and monitoring of tasks devoted to team members.

S/he is consulted for the selection of the team members, of reviewers and review editors.

S/he proposes date and place of PT meetings. S/he can propose the organization of a workshop with external participants.

S/he manages the resources allocated to the project, in close collaboration with the Coordinator.

S/he is the interface between the Project Team and the other components of the HLPE, and especially with the OG Convener and the Coordinator.

S/he proposes to the StC the successive drafts of the reports and related deliverables (Issues paper including an annotated outline, V0, V1, V2 and the pre-V0, pre-V1, pre-V2 versions, see Section 2).

S/he ensures that the guidance of the StC is appropriately followed by the Project Team.

S/he regularly gives feedback to the OG Convener and the Coordinator on the progression of the work and reports any difficulty.

S/he ensures that the input from the e-consultation on the V0 is properly considered.

S/he finalizes, the case being with the review editors, the integration of the remarks of the reviewers.

S/he shall raise ahead of time any difficulties in the writing of the report, including controversies and difficulties in integrating the guidance given by the StC (which shall be inserted in the list of items in discussion, see section 2.2.3).

1.3.2 Appointment of the Project Teams

The Steering Committee, with support of the Secretariat, organizes open calls for nomination for each Project Team. These calls for nominations are published on the HLPE website, transmitted to the CFS through the CFS Bureau and Advisory group, and to the HLPE Roster of experts.

Box 2 depicts the process to select and appoint a Project Team.

In application of the requirements set by the CFS: *Project Teams selected by the StC shall reflect the general principles of scientific and technical relevance, regional expertise and balanced geographic representation, as appropriate* (R&P, Art. 19). While Project Team members do not work as representative of their institution, the Steering Committee shall make all efforts to ensure that the composition of the Project Team covers a broad range of different institutions and working curricula. The composition of the Teams shall make it able to cover the range of topics and issues falling within the scope of the report, as well as the sufficient coverage for regional expertise needed. To that aim the Team as a whole, while being compact for evident management and coordination issues, shall embrace a variety of disciplines and background experiences.

In addition to the fundamental criteria set by the CFS, the HLPE Steering Committee checks each expert against the following additional criteria:

- the willingness and motivation to participate in the work,
- the amount of time the expert can free for the study,
- the capacity to produce the work within the constrained calendar,
- the acceptance of conditions of support to the Project Team (see Box 6, in particular the fact that experts are not remunerated),

- the acceptance of duties and responsibilities (especially important for the Team Leader),
- the understanding by the experts of what is expected from them (especially important for the Team Leader).

The Steering Committee ensures this selection process is completed within a reasonable period of time. At the end of the selection process, all experts having voluntarily applied through the open call, as well as their nominators the case being, are informed of the result of the selection process.

Expected qualities of Project Team Leaders

The Steering Committee selects the Team Leader first. The Team leader is consulted in the finalization of the Project Team, whose finalization remains under the sole responsibility of the Steering Committee.

The choice of the Team Leader is of critical importance, for the following reasons, which add-up to all the criteria mentioned above.

The Team Leader has to have a broad view of the range of topics and issues falling within the scope of the report.

In selecting the Project Team Leader the StC shall keep in mind that such a task, especially in a very tight agenda, also requires very specific capacities. S/he has to accommodate the StC guidance and to translate it into the report in order to fulfill CFS request and expectations. S/he has to put together very different perspectives. S/he must possess the capacity to manage a team of experts from different backgrounds, at distance and under pressure.

S/he must be able to work under high pressure to meet the tight deadlines of the process, the high quality standards, both in terms of output and of process, and because of the high political profile of the request. And s/he must be able to dedicate enough time to it, especially in the final stages of the process.

It requires a Senior Expert, with a broad view of the issues at stake, capacity to replace them in a broader frame, open mindedness, managing capacity, capacity to resist pressure and meet deadlines and very good human relation skills.

It is especially challenging as such Senior Experts are most often already engaged in many other activities and will have to dedicate at certain moments, and especially in the final stages, most of their time to the report.

Box 2   Steps to appoint the Project Team

1. Launch of a call for nomination
2. Secretariat compiles the nominations received
3. Discussion on a short list within the Oversight Group
4. Seeking interest and availability of short listed experts
5. Steering Committee discusses and appoints the Team Leader based on the recommendation of the Oversight Group
6. Steering Committee finalizes the composition of the Project Team

---

1.4 Review Editors and Reviewers

1.4.1 Review Editors

The Steering Committee can decide to appoint Review Editors.

Review Editors are experts that are outside the Steering Committee and outside the Project Team. Their role is (i) to work closely with the Steering Committee and Project Team to prepare the review process,

notably the selection of reviewers, and (ii) to finalize the report (V2) after the external peer review jointly with the Project Team Leader and under Steering Committee guidance and oversight. Review Editors can play an important role to smooth the finalization of the report.

The duties of the Review Editors are to help the Team Leader to finalize the report after reception of the reviewers' comments. The responsibility for finalizing the report is shared between the Project Team and the Review Editors (HLPE R&P, para. 28), under guidance and oversight of the Steering Committee. Modalities for this shall be made clear when the Review Editors are appointed.

Review Editors are particularly senior experts with a capacity to think issues in their complexity, interdependency, and above disciplinary barriers. They are appointed by the Steering Committee on proposal of the Oversight Group and in consultation with the Project Team Leader.

The following process shall be followed (Box 3)

Box 3   Steps to appoint the Review Editors

1. Proposals by the Steering Committee and by the Team Leader
2. Discussion on a short list within the Steering Committee.
3. Seeking interest and availability of short listed experts.
4. Contact of short listed experts
5. Steering Committee appoints the Review Editors and elaborates their ToRs.
6. Secretariat contacts the Review Editors with their ToRs.

1.4.2 External reviewers

The peer review is a key step of the HLPE process.

"*The draft report of a Project Team shall be submitted for external review to experts not involved in the preparation of the report.*" (HLPE R&P, paragraph 26). The selection of the reviewers shall be done as carefully as the Project Team. Box 4 depicts the process to appoint the peer reviewers.

Reviewers are selected by the Steering Committee in consultation with the Review Editors, based on a list of names proposed by the Oversight Group, by other members of the Steering Committee, by the Review Editors, and by the Project Team (HLPE R&P para 27).

Box 4   Steps to appoint the Reviewers

1. Steering Committee, Project Team (and the case being Review Editors) make propositions of names
2. Secretariat compiles the nominations received
3. Discussion on a short list within the Steering Committee
4. Seeking interest and availability of short listed experts
5. Contact of short listed experts
6. Steering Committee appoints the reviewers
7. Secretariat contacts the reviewers with their Terms of Reference.

As per the HLPE R&P, reviewers execute their task in their individual capacity, and not as representative of their respective government, institution or organization. The reviewers shall be regionally diversified. To ensure the HLPE gets a good feedback of the pertinence of the draft HLPE reports, the set of reviewers shall be diversified in terms of work experience, for example, academic, civil society and policy-related experience.

The review shall be evidence and knowledge based (as opposed to a political review or a review based on opinions). As common practice in all scientific publications, reviewers do not get remunerated for their work.

Unless decided otherwise jointly by the HLPE Steering Committee Chair and the reviewers, and to preserve their full liberty of comment and independence, the names of the reviewers do not appear in the HLPE report. However credit can be given to their endeavor to the HLPE by inserting their name, if they wish, in the list of reviewers of HLPE reports published on the HLPE website.

1.5 HLPE Secretariat

Dispositions regarding the essential functions to be assured by the HLPE Secretariat are defined by the CFS Bureau (*Rules and Procedures for the Work of the HLPE*, Articles 39 and 40[4]). It is entirely extra-budgetary funded, through voluntary contributions, including covering human resources.

The HLPE Secretariat provides administrative, logistical and technical, scientific and editorial support to the HLPE Chair, Steering Committee (StC) and Project Teams. The HLPE Secretariat is the part of the CFS Secretariat charged of those activities related to providing appropriate support to the HLPE. It is housed in FAO/AGD, and works in close coordination with the CFS Secretariat and participates in its works when relevant.

The HLPE works with experts spread all over the world, who have other activities, and who cannot continuously work for the HLPE. They need to rely on permanent support to ensure the advancement and continuity of the work. Since the creation of the HLPE, the functions of the Secretariat have progressively evolved in order to provide diversified support to Steering Committee members and Project Teams, among other to ensure the respect of the calendar and the quality of the final products, mobilizing competencies in relation to scientific support and review editing.

The functions performed by the secretariat can be grouped within five main categories:

   I.   Coordination functions.
        Ensure the good coordination, regular, smooth and diligent process of elaboration of the reports, and the coordinated work of all components, as per the agreed responsibilities.

   II. Administrative functions.
        Administration, fundraising, finance and financial reporting, logistics, meeting and travel support, administration of the calls for experts and of the roster of experts.

   III. Technical support functions.
        Assist the Steering Committee, especially in time-consuming, labor intensive steps, but very time-constrained steps of the process, such as for example to process the results of the electronic consultations, or to prepare, for the Oversight Convener, the quick compilation of internal comments of Steering Committee members, preparing draft guidance notes, etc.

---

[4] Rules and Procedures for the work of the HLPE, 27 January 2010. Art .39. *The joint HLPE/CFS Secretariat, located within FAO, shall assist the work of the HLPE StC and its Chair. Its functions include, though are not limited to: i) assist with the preparation of working budget and establishment of trust funds, ii) maintain a roster of experts, iii) organize meetings of the HLPE StC and assist Project Teams, as needed, iv) assist with the preparation of other support documentation, v) liaise as appropriate between the CFS Bureau and the HLPE Steering Committee, vi) maintain a system of communications, including posting of relevant reports and analyses. Art 40. The Secretariat comprises, among others, a senior staff, coordinator of the HLPE, responsible for the day-to-day management and oversight of the project.*

IV. Scientific and editorial functions.

Duties of scientific and editorial nature, performed under the supervision of the Steering Committee, for the finalization on time of the reports, to ensure their scientific and editorial quality, as per the requests of the Steering Committee. These functions are performed by delegation of the Steering Committee, and under its supervision and final control. This typically includes scientific review editing functions, checking whether the subsequent drafts comply with the guidance of the Steering Committee, and, finally the editorial work to implement for the Steering Committee, in a very short time frame, the decisions of the Steering Committee meeting where a report is approved.

V. Publication, outreach and communication functions.

Realization, maintenance and update of the HLPE website, publication of reports and of other official documentation, including translation, as well as outreach activities, organization of the launches of the reports, participation to external conferences, etc.

Box 5   Principal activities of the HLPE Secretariat

(See Appendix 6 "Activities of the HLPE Secretariat" for details)

1) Support the work and the activities of the Steering Committee, of its Chair and Vice-Chair and of the Project Teams

2) Provide day-to-day coordination to the activities of the HLPE.

3) Ensures the regular, smooth and diligent process of elaboration of the reports, from planning to execution and realization.

4) Mobilize resources, manage the HLPE Trust Fund, and plan activities within budgetary constraints.

5) Administrate StC appointment procedures, as well as of those for the selection and appointment of HLPE Project Teams and appointment of peer-reviewers

6) Organize the consultations on the scope and V0 of the reports and prepare for the StC and Project Teams synthesis of them.

7) Support the StC and Team leaders for the preparation of the reports, contribute under the supervision of the StC to their finalization, and ensure their scientific and editorial quality.

8) Coordinate and liaise with the CFS Secretariat and Bureau on HLPE related matters.

9) Inform the Rome Based Agencies, the Academic community as well as stakeholders as appropriate, on the work of the HLPE, contributing to the visibility and impact of the HLPE.

10) Monitor the impact of the HLPE reports.

Principal activities 1, 2, 3 and 8 are primarily linked to the coordination function above. Principal activities 4 and 5 are mostly related to the administrative functions. Principal activity 6 contributes both to the above functions III and V. Principal activity 7 contributes mostly to the scientific and editorial functions. Principal activities 9 and 10 are linked to Publication, outreach and communication functions.

1.6 HLPE Coordinator

The Rules and Procedures for the Work of the HLPE (Art 40) state that "*The Secretariat comprises, among others, a senior staff, coordinator of the HLPE, responsible for day-to-day management and oversight of the project.*"

The HLPE Coordinator reports to the Chair of the HLPE Steering Committee for the preparation of the reports and related works. He leads the HLPE Secretariat, and is responsible for the proper delivery of the Secretariat on its main functions and activities (see Section 1.5 and Appendix 6 "Activities of the HLPE Secretariat"). The Coordinator is responsible for planning, organizing and ensuring the proper execution of the Secretariat's support to the different steps of the HLPE process.

In particular, the HLPE Coordinator ensures day-to-day coordination of the activities of the HLPE. S/he ensures the regular, smooth and diligent process of elaboration of the reports, from planning to execution and realization, within budgetary constraints. S/he ensures the quality of the process and of the products, under the supervision of the StC. S/he ensures the respect of the calendar and takes appropriate measures, under the supervision of the StC.

S/he ensures adequate provision of advice and support to the work of the HLPE StC Chair, Vice-Chair and members of the StC as well as Project Team leaders, for the preparation of the reports, and contributes, under the supervision of the StC, to their finalization.

In a delocalized process that shall run quickly within a tight calendar, experience has shown that it is of the utmost importance:

- to be able to anticipate any logistical matter,

- that as soon as a decision is taken, everyone knows what has to be done and "who does what",

- that the information is circulated (and that someone ensures that it is circulated),

- that someone does the "stock-taking" of progress made, points to issues upfront and anticipates difficulties.

It is also essential to make the link between issues of substance and material issues, and also financial and budget matters.

The role of the Coordinator, in the HLPE Project Cycle, therefore comprises the following, under the authority of the Chair:

- Support to the Chair in ensuring the agreed calendar is respected and mandate is held.
- Ensure that decisions are taken in full compatibility with the available budget.
- Ensure the circulation of information within the StC or with the StC and Project Team, case depending.

- Ensure that the different stages of the process are properly executed and liaise with the people involved (scoping, selection of teams, drafting by Project Teams, progress of work of Project Teams, workshops, e-consultation, selection of reviewers, reviews, final editing etc...).
- Ensure that the different studies follow a streamlined procedure as agreed at StC level.
- Raise alarm when there are unexpected difficulties, of whatever nature.
- Liaise with the CFS Bureau and Advisory Group as necessary.

In order to accomplish these tasks and in support of the HLPE StC Chair, S/he is kept informed and associated to discussions as deemed necessary and is associated to and follows the decision-making process. To that aim, the Coordinator is copied in correspondence, is invited to official meetings of the Project Teams, participates to all meetings and teleconferences of the Oversight Groups and Steering Committee, and is associated in decisions. S/He engages to keep internal matters confidential.

2 HLPE REPORT ELABORATION PROCESS: STEPS, PRODUCTS, RESPONSIBILITIES

Prior to publication, HLPE reports are finalized and approved by the Steering Committee during a face to face meeting, which closes the report elaboration cycle. The final reports shall be approved by the Steering Committee to the extent possible by consensus. Dissenting views could be expressed as part of the final report, in the aim to have the report approved by consensus.

In order to converge efficiently to the final product, and to make the most of the available time, all internal proceeds aim at smooth, transparent and organized exchanges between Steering Committee members and with the Project Team, charged to prepare the different versions of the report.

To that effect, the following process, described in this section, aims inter alia at ensuring that:
- comments from StC members are communicated to the Project Teams,
- appropriate guidance to the Project Team is elaborated in due time by the Steering Committee,.
- differing positions are appropriately treated, progressively resolved or elicitated.

2.1 Report elaboration steps

The following describes these different steps and the internal procedures that have to be followed to ensure their smooth completion.

Box 7   Main steps of the HLPE process

The HLPE process can be divided into the following main 10 steps.

1. CFS elaborates a request to the HLPE, and the HLPE and the CFS agree on a provisional calendar
2. The Steering Committee elaborates a draft scope of the study
3. The draft scope is submitted to open electronic consultation.
4. The StC appoints the Project Team.
5. The Project Team produces an Issues paper submitted to Steering Committee feedback for guidance.
6. The Project Team produces an advanced draft of the report (V0) to be submitted to open electronic consultation
7. An open electronic consultation is organized on the advanced draft V0
8. The Project Team produces a review draft (V1) submitted to external peer review
9. The external peer review is conducted.
10. The Project Team produces a final draft (V2) submitted to Steering Committee approval
11. The Steering Committee finalizes and approves the report
12. The final approved report is transmitted to the CFS Chair, Bureau and Advisory Group. The reports are publicly released
13. HLPE reports serve as input to feed policy debates at CFS

The Secretariat holds and circulates a calendar of main outstanding steps of the HLPE process. The description of the process and roles of the different HLPE components (Steering Committee and Oversight Groups, Project Teams, Reviewers, Coordinator) during these steps are described in this chapter. The attribution of duties and responsibilities is further detailed in Appendix 7 (decision making matrix). The respect by all of agreed deadlines is essential for the HLPE to deliver properly.

2.2 Products and deliverables

2.2.1 Project Team main deliverables

On course of the report elaboration process, the following four main deliverables (see also Box 9) are requested from the Project Teams:

- Issues paper (internal document)
- V0: version published online for e-consultation
- V1: peer review draft
- V2: final draft submitted to the StC for approval

The dates for production of those deliverables are agreed upon from the start of the project.

These Project Team deliverables are elaborated under the oversight and guidance from the Steering Committee (HLPE R&P, paragraph 22).

Issues Paper

Experience has shown the need and usefulness to identify much ahead of the preparation of the report, the main points to be considered, the main points of contentious issues, and ways and means to address them in the report (methodologies, data, examples, references..), etc. In order for the team to work efficiently and to produce a report of the quality and contents expected by the CFS, there is a need to better organize and structure the work of the teams very early in the process, before starting drafting the report. This is the purpose of the Issues Paper.

Box 8   Issues Paper: Content

a. Context, justification of the problem statement and identification of the set of questions to be addressed in the report, based on the scoping consultation.

b. Identification of the main areas of controversies/contentious issues, underlying narratives, competing approaches, etc.

c. On what to build the report? *How to approach bibliography, references. Identification of main examples, main data, main areas for input needed from some key institutions like FAO.*

d. How to build the report? *Elements of methods for the elaboration of the report - possibly if useful, a framework for the report : how to link the questions, the state of the art, what would be the method used in the report to tackle them?*

e. Proposal of a detailed outline.

f. Identification of possible "areas for recommendations": *These are not the final precise recommendations, but at least envisaging where to build the "landing strips" of the report.*

The Project Team makes a first draft of the Issues Paper, which shall have the structure depicted in Box 8. This draft Issues Paper is sent to the Steering Committee for feedback and guidance. When finalized, it then constitutes the terms of reference of the Project Team, and together with the calendar, is the roadmap for the elaboration of the report.

Report's drafts (V0, V1, V2 deliverables)

V0, V1 and V2 are important drafts. Even if it is understood that they are not final reports, it is important that they are in line with the expectations and requirements of the Steering Committee, as the study develops. This is particularly important for the V0, which is released into the public domain. It is not less important for the V1, which goes to the reviewers. Finally the V2 is of utmost importance since it is the draft which is submitted for final approval of the Steering Committee, and therefore the V2 shall be a draft into which close to 100% of the issues have been addressed prior to the approval of the final report by the Steering Committee, during a face-to-face meeting.

Dates of completion and transmission to the StC of the 4 main deliverables are determined at the beginning of the project.

2.2.2 Steering Committee guidance

In a process that runs quickly and in a delocalized way, a particular attention and rigor shall be paid to the way the Steering Committee guidance (see Section 1.2.2 for the Steering Committee roles) is elaborated and conveyed to the Project Team, towards the proper realization of V0, V1, V2.

Such guidance is an adaptable, iterative process on course of the project, which aims at providing to the team proper directives and requirements that the deliverables must meet, and in particular that the report stays focused on the request of CFS and covers all the needed aspects (see Section 1.2.3).

It is based from the judgment the StC exerts on the relevance of a (previously circulated) draft with respect to the initial request from the CFS, and on the alignment of its contents to the expectations of the Steering Committee, the agreed terms of reference of the study, and its compliance with previous sets of instructions/guidance.

It also serves as a basis for a scientific dialogue between the Steering Committee and the Project Team, which shall be useful and inform the finalization of the reports.

The guidance from the Steering Committee takes into account the feedback the HLPE receives from the e-consultations and from the peer review.

Guidance Rounds

Successive iterations called **Rounds of guidance** are organized between the Steering Committee and the Project Team. **A round of guidance starts at the reception of a deliverable (Issues Paper, V0, V1, V2) and stops at the release of the following one**

As there are four main deliverables (Issues Paper, V0, V1, V2), there are also four main rounds of guidance from the Steering Committee. Each includes, following the production of the deliverable, the production of

- written instruction of the Steering Committee within a "**guidance note**",
- a subsequent advanced version of the subsequent deliverable (pre-V0, pre-V1, pre-V2) by the Project Team, as well as a cover message, addressing the guidance received,
- the case being, further refinement/update of the Guidance by the Steering Committee,
- the production of next draft (V0, V1, V2) by the Project Team.

 Box 9 describes how the rounds of guidance are organized.

The **calendar of the guidance rounds** (and time left for the different steps) is elaborated in consultation between the Oversight Group Convener, the Project Team Leader and the Coordinator. It takes into

account (i) the originally agreed dates for the main deliverables (V0, V1, V2), (ii) the time the Steering Committee needs to complete its internal consultations in order to elaborate its guidance notes, (iii) the time needed for the work of the Project Team to implement the guidance, and (iv) the way guidance already given has been followed.

Indicative dates for guidance rounds are elaborated and planned at the start of the project, and are confirmed (and the case being revised) on course.

Guidance Notes

The guidance from the Steering Committee to the Project Team is put in writing in the form of guidance notes (see Box 10), which are collegially elaborated under the responsibility of the Oversight Group, in consultation with the whole Steering Committee (see Box 8). Internal divergences of views, the case being, are properly reflected.

As at the end HLPE reports are to be approved collegially by the Steering Committee, the guidance on course of the project, though falling under the Oversight Group's responsibility:

(i) associates all Steering Committee members;

(ii) is unique and collegial while reflecting when necessary different viewpoints.

The discussion and/or finalization of a guidance note are held electronically within the Steering Committee. The Oversight Group Convener can also organize internal teleconferences, the case being, a face-to-face meeting of the Steering Committee can also serve to discuss guidance to the Project Team.

Box 9   Round of Steering Committee guidance to the Project Team

A round of guidance (see Section 2.2.2) based on one deliverable (N) and towards the subsequent one (N+1) is executed in the following manner:

1. The V_N, is circulated within the Steering Committee for comments (typically one week).

2. The Oversight Convener, with the support of the Coordinator, elaborates a consolidated and organized draft gathering all elements of guidance received. Diverging views of StC members are to be either resolved on a case to case basis or properly reflected in the draft.

3. The consolidated draft is circulated by the Oversight convener into the entire Steering Committee for validation.

4. The Oversight Convener or the Coordinator on her/his behalf sends the guidance note to the Project Team.

5. A follow-up call or exchanges of mails can be organized by the Coordinator between the Project Team Leader and the Oversight convener, to ensure common understanding of issues raised and flag difficulties.

6. The Project Team takes into account the guidance towards the production of the next draft V_{N+1} and prepares a Pre-V_{N+1}, together with a short, concise, reply (cover note) to the Steering Committee, indicating how the points of the guidance note have been addressed in the latest draft (Pre-V_{N+1}) and what are the Project Teams plans (work in progress) for the V_{N+1}.

7. In case of disagreement regarding one item of guidance, the Project Team must flag it, explains its reason in order to resolve the issue in the report. The issue is added to the running list of items in discussion.

8. The Pre-V_{N+1} draft is circulated within the Steering Committee.

9. Given the above (Pre-V_{N+1} and cover note), the Oversight Group decides if remaining instructions to the Project Team towards the finalization of V_N draft are necessary.

A maximum of two weeks shall be provisioned for the completion of steps 1 to 5 (Steering Committee internal work to provide guidance).

Any guidance note is ultimately cleared by the Oversight Group Convener. Sufficient time (with due respect to calendar) and a clear deadline is provisioned for internal circulation of the draft note prior to sending to the Project Team, on behalf of the whole Steering Committee.

Posterior to the sending of the guidance note, the Oversight Group Convener, the Team Leader and the Coordinator can hold a teleconference call to agree on next steps.

Project Team's action on guidance

Following reception of a guidance note, the Project Team is requested:

- To update the draft report, as mentioned in the guidance note. The Project Team is to that aim asked to circulate to the Steering Committee a preliminary version (pre-V0, pre-V1, pre-V2),

- To report to the Steering Committee, in a short cover note, on the Project Team reply to the guidance note, on how instructions are being taken into account, and on the Project Team's further intentions.

The preliminary drafts (pre-V0, pre-V1, pre-V2) are understood as "work-in-progress" drafts and feed two main purposes:

1. Check that the guidance is properly addressed, or on its way to be properly addressed, towards the production of the main deliverable (V0, V1 or V2).

2. Serve the case being as a basis for further guidance.

In any case, pre-V0, pre-V1 and pre-V2 remain internal to the Steering Committee and Project Team,

2.2.3 Running list of items in discussion

To ease the convergence towards the approval of the reports, the Coordinator, in close interaction with the Oversight Group Convener and the Project Team Leader, shall keep track of controversial points still needing elicitation.

To that aim a "**Running list of items in discussion"** is kept up-to-date along with the subsequent versions and drafts of a report. The running list is shared between the Project Team and the Steering Committee.

During rounds of guidance, Steering Committee members as well as the Project Team Leader can request for items to be inserted on the list.

Typically, an item can be inserted on the list:

- by the Steering Committee, if one member feels that one of the Steering Committee's guidance and instruction has not been appropriately dealt with in the report.

- by the Project Team Leader, if s/he feels that s/he is not in position to appropriately deal with an element of guidance of the Steering Committee.

- by the Coordinator, if a point seems to deserve attention.

An item can be removed from the Running list of items by the Coordinator after joint decision of the Oversight Group convener (on behalf of the Steering Committee), the Project Team Leader (on behalf of the Project Team). Typically this is done in a joint discussion between the OG Convener, Team Leader and Coordinator.

The (remaining) list of items in discussion at the date of sending of the V2 serves as a document for the approval meeting.

2.3 Pre-writing steps: Scope of the Study, scoping e-consultation, and Issues Paper

2.3.1 Proposed scope for e-consultation

The Study process starts with an open electronic consultation for feedback and comments on a *proposed* draft scope of the study / consultation text. The Oversight Group is responsible for elaborating the consultation text, which can take various forms as deemed appropriate (list of questions, main directions of study, building blocks, areas of emphasis, areas of recommendations, proposed scope etc...) The convener of the Steering Committee Oversight takes responsibility for writing the very first draft, which is then circulated for comments in the entire Steering Committee. The draft scope is cleared for consultation by the Convener of the Oversight, eventually following a teleconference of the Oversight Group.

2.3.2 Scoping e-consultation

The electronic consultations are run on a neutral platform. They are either directly organized by the HLPE Secretariat, or the HLPE can hire the services of an existing consultation platform, as it has done with the FSN (Global Forum for Food Security and Nutrition), for its two first years. In doing so, it must ensure the platform is neutral, and conveys/channels the electronic consultation *on behalf of the HLPE.* By no mean can the consultation platform take ownership of the texts put into consultation by the HLPE, or on the HLPE steps and process, The Choice of the consultation platform is done at the start of the Study by the Oversight Group, in close consultation with the Coordinator (among others given financial implications). Modalities for the consultations are put in writing with a service agreement between the HLPE Secretariat and the Consultation platform.

All comments received through the e-consultations shall be made public. The consultations are moderated only to ensure that no offending comment is published.

The HLPE does not reply to each of the individual comments received through this consultation. The Secretariat prepares for the Steering Committee and Project Team a synthesis of contributions. The HLPE Steering Committee and Project Team uses the feedback material received for the elaboration of the issues paper (See below) and of the report, as appropriate.

2.3.3 Issues Paper

Given the results of the scoping consultation, the Project Team is requested to elaborate an Issues Paper which, following feedback and guidance from the Steering Committee, will serve as *Terms of Reference* of the Project Team. The contents of the Issues paper, is described in Box 8. It includes a draft annotated outline, elements of methods, and proposals of main areas for recommendations

A round of guidance (see section 2.2) is organized between the Project Team and the Steering Committee to finalize the issues paper, with the support of the Coordinator.

A first draft of the Issues Paper has to be ready ahead of the first meeting of the Project Team. It is a key element for the efficiency of this first meeting. .

The Issues Paper, and the annotated outline of the Report it includes, remain internal to the HLPE. It serves as a basis for the discussion and on the round of guidance towards V0.

Should there be different views on the contents of the Issues Paper, a first version of the "Running list of items in discussion" is elaborated listing those points.

Box 10 Project Team meetings

Kick-off meeting

A kick-off meeting shall be organized as soon as possible after the appointment of the Project Team. This meeting shall serve to agree on final scope, on directions of the study, on a vision for the output of the report and for main messages and/or main fields that should or could be the object of policy recommendations. The agenda of the meeting is proposed by the Team Leader in consultation with team members, and finalized in consultation with the Oversight Convener and the Secretariat.

Such meetings are attended by the Coordinator of the HLPE. The latest guidance note and the latest version of the running list of issues in discussion shall serve as background to the meeting. The Project Team is free, during such a meeting, to organize internal sessions to decide on allocation of tasks and any other internal matters.

Ahead of this meeting, the Convener shall consult with all StC members on the StC position for the different agenda items. The Steering Committee, the case being, can be represented in the meeting itself. The Steering Committee is informed on the outcomes of the meeting.

Writing meeting/retreat

The Project Team can propose to organize, towards the end of the project cycle, a writing meeting.

The decision to hold such a meeting is taken by the Chair after consultation of the Coordinator for budgetary matters. The Steering Committee can be invited to be represented in such a meeting. This decision is taken jointly between the Team Leader, the Oversight Convener and the Coordinator.

The agenda of the meeting is proposed by the Team Leader in consultation with team members, and finalized in consultation with the Oversight Convener and the Coordinator.

Ahead of such a meeting the Oversight Group shall consult all StC members to allow them to make propositions on the agenda items. The latest guidance note and the latest version of the running list of issues in discussion shall serve as background to the meeting. The Oversight Group also reports to the Steering Committee on the outcomes of the meeting.

2.4 Report writing steps: V0, V1, and V2 drafts

2.4.1 Elaboration of V0 (e-consultation draft)

Following the elaboration of the Issues Paper and annotated outline, the Steering Committee shall give instructions on the V0 draft, including format, form and length of V0.

V0 shall be produced by the Project Team according to the HLPE template provided by the Secretariat.

The round of guidance organized towards V0 shall include the sending by the Team Leader of a pre-V0 draft, generally 4-6 weeks before the release of V0, to the Steering Committee.

Two weeks at least prior to the planned public release of V0, the Team Leader sends the V0 to the Steering Committee.

Together with the V0, the Team Leader also proposes a draft cover letter to be publicly released along with the V0, in order to explain the nature and direction of feedback and/or inputs sought through the e-consultation. This cover letter is then finalized by the Secretariat in consultation with the Oversight Convener and the Team Leader.

The Oversight Convener decides in consultation with Oversight Group members, the Steering Committee Chair and Vice Chair, and the Coordinator, if the V0 can be released.

2.4.2 V0 electronic consultation

The V0 is sent to open electronic consultation, usually for a period of three weeks. All comments received are also published online and sent to the Steering Committee and Project Team.

The HLPE does not reply to each of the individual comments received through this consultation. The full proceedings of the consultation is used the elaboration of the report, as appropriate.

The Secretariat prepares for the Steering Committee and Project Team a synthesis of contributions, a line-by-line compilation of comments, a compilation of references, a compilation of examples and case studies.

2.4.3 Elaboration of V1 (review draft)

Following the release of V0, the next step is to finalize a review draft called V1, that will be sent to the external reviewers. The review draft V1 is a near-to-final complete version of the report.

The Oversight convener, with support of the Secretariat, organizes, on the basis of the V0 and the results from the e-consultation, a round of guidance towards the production of V1.

This guidance takes into account the results from the e-consultation on V0. The running list of items in discussion is updated based on the V0 (the e-consultation can also lead to issues being added to that list).

The case being, instructions shall be sent to the Project Team ahead of writing meetings.

The Project Team shall make sure that the pre-V1 includes a draft summary and a list of recommendations.

The Project Team shall ensure that the review draft (V1) is a completed report and includes a summary for policy makers not longer than 5 pages, which will include a list of recommendations, compiling all the recommendations made in the main part of the report. See Appendix 1 for report format issues. . The report might also contain a "supplementary material" section, which will not be translated.

Two weeks at least prior to the planned sending of V1 to the reviewers, the Team Leader sends its draft to the Steering Committee, with a cover note as necessary.

The Oversight Convener decides in consultation with Oversight Group members, the Steering Committee Chair and Vice-Chair, and the Coordinator, if V1 can be sent to the reviewers.

2.4.4 Peer review

At least three months ahead of the review, the Coordinator contacts the reviewers with clear instructions on the nature of the review needed as well as on calendar issues.

Following the clearance of V1 by the Steering Committee, the Coordinator sends the draft to the reviewers.

Reviewer's notes, once received, are compiled by the Coordinator (mentioning the name of the reviewer), and circulated within the HLPE StC and Project Teams. These notes are kept internal to the HLPE.

Name of the reviewers do not appear in the final report, a standard practice. However, in acknowledgment to their endeavor, the Secretariat publishes a list of all HLPE reviewers on the HLPE website. That list does not indicate who reviewed which report.

2.4.5 Elaboration of V2 (draft submitted to approval)

At receipt of the review notes, a last round of guidance is initiated towards V2, including the preparation of written instructions by the Steering Committee.

The Project Team Leader is responsible (the case being with the Review Editors) for finalizing the V2, which is the draft proposed for approval. To do so, the Project Team shall prepare a pre-V2, which is the revised work-in-progress draft as ready at the time of sending, based on the comments received through the peer review and the Oversight Group's consolidated guidance.

Along with pre-V2, the Project Team Leader, and the case being with the Review Editor(s), also writes a brief cover letter indicating how comments from the reviewers were dealt with in that draft,

A teleconference shall be organized between the Oversight Convener, the Review Editor(s) - the case being - the Project Team Leader and the Coordinator on the basis of the pre-V2 in order to resolve remaining issues and, if necessary, provide final guidance to the Project Team and agree on the next steps to finalize V2.

V2 shall be sent by the Team Leader to the Steering Committee at least two week before the beginning of the Steering Committee meeting when the reports are discussed for final approval.

The running list of items in discussion is updated and circulated along with V2. It serves as a basis to prepare the agenda points of the Steering Committee meeting where the report is to be approved,

2.5 Approval and publication of the reports

2.5.1 Approval by the HLPE Steering Committee

The approval of the report shall be done according to the HLPE Rules and Procedures.

The Project Team Leader is invited to present the V2, and in the initial discussion, during the approval meeting. However, the subsequent discussion and final approval take place internally to the Steering Committee only.

The final reports shall be approved to the extent possible by consensus. Dissenting views could be expressed as part of the final report, in the aim to have the report approved by consensus.

2.5.2 Final copy-editing and sending to CFS

If time does not permit to finalize all copy edits and produce a clean version of the approved report during the approval meeting, the Steering Committee agrees on a written list of final changes and copy edits to be made. This list shall be very precise and is to be used by the Coordinator to finalize the copy-editing of the report.

The final copy-edited report is then jointly cleared by the Steering Committee Chair, and sent ultimately to the CFS Chair by the Steering Committee Chair or by the Coordinator on his/her behalf.

2.5.3 Post publication corrigendums on the content of a report.

In exceptional circumstances, following the publication of a report, the HLPE might decide the issuance of a corrigendum.

Eligible corrigendums are those related to evident errors of exceptional nature that could have been addressed given the existing evidence at the time of the writing of the report.

Decision to modify a report, and the content of the relevant modification, is to be taken by the StC collegially.

The corrigendum is to be communicated to the CFS, with a cover letter from the Steering Committee Chair explaining the reasons for the modification. The revised report and the cover letter shall be posted on the HLPE website.

Box 11   List of documents during an HLPE Project Cycle

E-consultation proceedings (scope)

E-consultation summary (scope)

E-consultation proceedings (V0)

E-consultation summary (V0)

Steering Committee documents

Scoping text (e-consultation)

Calendar of the Study

Guidance on the issues paper

Guidance note towards V0

Guidance note towards V1

Guidance note towards V2

Project Team documents

Issues paper, including an annotated outline

V0
(Pre-V0, cover letter)

V1
(Pre-V1, cover letter)

V2
(Pre-V2, cover letter)

Running list of items in discussion

Reviewer's notes

Final approved draft

3 EXTERNAL COMMUNICATIONS AND OUTREACH

3.1 Communication strategy

For a new institution it is always particularly challenging to get visible and recognized, particularly in the international setting which is highly competitive and where the entry ticket is high.

The HLPE is linked to a political decision body, the CFS. This is an advantage but it has precisely first to earn recognition from the CFS and its stakeholders. Outreach and communication are thus first oriented towards CFS, CFS members and stakeholders as well as towards the Academic community and towards donors, both of which are key to the very activity of the panel.

The HLPE Communication strategy takes into account the CFS Communication strategy[5], complementing it by focusing on the specificities of the HLPE, in terms of messages, targets, products and vectors, as detailed in this section.

3.1.1 Messages and objects of communication and outreach: what to communicate?

Four main categories of messages or "objects of communication" can be identified (Table 1):

1. The HLPE as an institution: what it is, what are its roles and missions, its environment.
2. How the HLPE works, the process.
3. The HLPE products: mainly the reports, the note on Critical and emerging issues, but as well some elements of the process, such as e-consultations, scoping texts, V0 drafts and the proceedings, etc.
4. The substance in the products: particular points of the analysis and advice, recommendations on food security, etc.

For each of these categories, communication shall give emphasis, the case being, to the related comparative advantage, i.e., respectively:

- The original specificities and uniqueness of the HLPE as an institution.
- The particularities and qualities of the HLPE process.
- The quality of the HLPE products, systematic approach of a topic in relation to food security and nutrition, etc.
- The innovative policy messages of the HLPE, policy and action recommendations, innovative approaches of an issue, etc.

3.1.2 Targets

Per their mandate, HLPE reports are the main, or rather, unique document to serve as a base to the policy round table discussions in CFS on a topic on which CFS is to take consensual decisions.

In CFS, but also beyond CFS, HLPE reports have a very broad and diverse range of publics: academics and specialists of food security, academics and specialists of the topic treated (most of whom are not food security specialists), decision makers, either in the field of food security or of the treated topic, who are governments officials in various ministries, diplomats, but also staff of various international and national agencies, NGOs, local authorities,… All of them have their own approach to the topic, including often a direct experience and knowledge.

Five main targets for outreach and communication (Table 2) can be identified. Many of these targets are themselves organized, and in this case primary targets/heads of networks can be identified, which can then relay the information

---

[5] http://www.fao.org/docrep/meeting/029/MI007e.pdf

Table 1 Objects of HLPE Outreach and communication

	Object
1	HLPE as an institution
2	How the HLPE works
3	HLPE products
4	Substance in the products

Table 2 Main targets for HLPE Outreach and communication

	Target
1	CFS community and its stakeholders
2	The UN system and international organizations
3	The academic community
4	Specific communities of interest (on various topics)
5	Donors

The general public is not here identified as a priority target, which does not mean that certain communication activities will not target the general public, such as for example TV, newspapers or magazine interviews, when the opportunity presents itself.

3.1.3 Outreach and communication strategies: what messages for which targets?

Different targets are likely to be interested by different kinds of objects/messages. Therefore, communication and outreach can strategically focus on areas:

  i.   where the impact on the activities of the target is likely to be the most important.
  ii. where it is most useful/necessary for the work of the HLPE, either to promote external recognition, or for internal purposes (for instance, the efficiency of the HLPE report elaboration process requires good communication to the academic community and to specific communities of interest before and during e-consultation; likewise, communicating on products is particularly important towards donors).

Given the above targets and objects, outreach and communication activities are driven by two main priority strategies described below.

Institutional strategy

This first strategy regards the HLPE as an institution, in relation to its roles and its recognition by the CFS and other organizations/institutions/actors with three main objectives/priorities:

  1) To make the HLPE, as an institution, recognized by the CFS, and beyond the CFS, as *the* provider of knowledge based advice to CFS and its stakeholders.
  2) To make the HLPE reports recognized as *the* knowledge base for discussion, debate and decision taking *in CFS*, including firming up the place/role of the HLPE in CFS.
  3) And as such, make the HLPE recognized by the RBAs, international organizations and bodies, the scientific community, specific communities and donors, in its role and position as a dedicated scientific body working on food security and nutrition.

Another element of the institutional strategy is to get actors to know better the HLPE internal process, and in relation to CFS. This is not detached from the three objectives above, as it contributes to them.

Table 3 Communicating Objects to Targets. Communication strategies.

		Targets				
		CFS	UN	Academic	Specific communities	Donors
Objects	HLPE as an Institution	◆	◆	◆	X	◆
	HLPE Process	◆	◆	◆	X	◆
	HLPE Products	◆ X	◆ X	◆ X	◆ X	◆ X
	Substance in the Products	X	X	X	X	◆

(◆) Elements of the institutional strategy. X: elements of the issue-focused strategies.

As the institutional strategy concerns mostly promoting the HLPE as an institution, and the HLPE process, it is based on specific products, specifically elaborated. These and the main actions/elements constituting these strategies are described below. Interventions of the members of the StC and particularly of the Chair and Vice Chair also play a key role.

A key dimension of the institutional strategy is to aim at the establishment of the HLPE as the scientific authority on FSN matters.

Issue-focused strategies

All reports address at the same time the "food and nutrition community" (which is quite well structured around CFS), and specific thematic communities which are very diversely organized and structured. Therefore specific, issue-focused strategies are generally fined-tuned for each report.

The primary objective of these strategies is to get the reports known, as well as, of course, their content, analysis, propositions etc. A side effect of this is also that the HLPE gets better known as an institution, and that the specific HLPE process gets better known, but this is not the primary objective.

Main products and tools constituting these strategies are described below.

3.2 Products and tools of communication and outreach

In support of the communication and outreach strategy, the HLPE uses a series of products and tools, developed and vectored by the HLPE Secretariat and/or the Steering Committee.

3.2.1 Core products

The HLPE reports and the "Summaries and recommendations" are the main element serving the communication strategies. Therefore the paramount importance that is given to their quality, their approach, style and format, to address this diversity of publics, and their expectations, as well as their very specific function in CFS which is to serve as the comprehensive base for debates between stakeholders having different points of views.

HLPE reports, as well as the summaries and recommendations, are made available in the 6 UN languages: Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian, Spanish.

In addition, the following other products from the HLPE project cycle can also be seen as important communication products, sometimes in conjunction with another product:

- Text for the call for experts
- Scoping texts
- V0 drafts
- This note on Internal procedures and methodological guidelines
- The Speeches and statements by the HLPE StC or PT (launch, CFS or others)
- The letters and e-mails from the Chair (fundraising, thanks, etc.) – for a targeted communication

3.2.2 Specific products and Report's communication kit

In addition to the core products which are the HLPE deliverables (Section 3.2.1), the HLPE Secretariat and Steering Committee develop a range of specific products:

1. Key elements
2. Flyers on the HLPE
3. Flyers on the process
4. Flyers on the products (reports)
5. Key messages for each report
6. Press releases for each report
7. Powerpoint presentations of the reports
8. Powerpoint presentation on a topic, using HLPE reports
9. Powerpoint presentations on the process
10. Specific web pages or sections of web pages
11. Opinion articles (op-eds) on the HLPE, on the themes of the reports, on broader themes or embracing diverse issues
12. Scientific articles on the HLPE, on the themes of the reports, on broader themes or embracing diverse issues
13. Video ITWs and recordings
14. Radio ITWs and recordings

HLPE Reports' Communication kit

The HLPE produces, for each report, a fully blown communication kit, containing: the report, the summaries and recommendations, a policy brief, a press release, key messages, some key statements from experts, a flyer on the HLPE.

3.2.3 Tools and vectors

One can broadly distinguish five categories of tools/vectors/channels mobilized (to disseminate the above products) in support of the strategies delineated above:

- Physical distribution of paper documentation (hard copies)
- HLPE Website, including live streaming
- E-mail communication (HLPE Roster, CFS)
- Direct face-to-face communication, events (including at CFS and the launch of the reports)
- Newspapers, TV, radio, internet, and social media

Certain tools/vectors are more specific to a product, but some products can be disseminated or information can be given about them, using many different channels. For instance, the HLPE reports are being communicated through the 5 main channels above.

HLPE reports are distributed in hard copies to governments and stakeholders during CFS, as well as at the occasion of main events of relevance worldwide. They are also shipped to HLPE Steering Committee members and Project Team members for their own diffusion. The Secretariat does a specific effort to ensure hard copies are available as necessary.

The website is a part of the CFS website, hosted in FAO. It is regularly updated and the ambition is that it remains the main entry-point for external persons wanting to know about the HLPE work program and products. It serves also as a repository for all products (reports, notes etc.). It is the entry point for all experts (call for experts, consultations), through dedicated applications. The Secretariat does every effort to make the website as attractive and efficient as possible, given the technical constraints of the content management software (typo3) put at disposition by FAO to develop webpages.

The HLPE has a corporate e-mail address cfs-hlpe@fao.org used for all official correspondence, the various calls for experts, the announcements of the steps of the process and release of reports, etc. To communicate officially by mail to CFS members and participants, the HLPE uses the CFS mailing lists (CFS Bureau, Advisory Group), and the e-mail list of Chairs and vice-chairs of the FAO regional groups. This enables to reach the entire network of CFS and FAO constituencies. In addition the HLPE has constituted a mailing list, which is the sum of all previous HLPE Steering Committee members, Project Team members, and peer reviewers, plus all the experts having applied to the Steering Committee, or applied to one of the Project Teams, and of all the contributors to the electronic consultations. As of November 2014, the mailing list counts approximately 2160 names.

In terms of social media, the HLPE uses in practice @CFS_updates as official account to convey HLPE tweets.

3.3 Launch of reports and presentation to CFS

The launch of a report is a full fleshed, key outreach and communication event, mobilizing all the five vectors above, with a wide range of products (reports, summaries, statements, powerpoint presentation etc.). It is mainly directed to CFS and the permanent representations and stakeholders in Rome, and therefore it is generally held in FAO, open to all people willing to assist, including the staff of the Rome based agencies.

At a launch, the summaries and recommendations are available in the 6 UN languages, and the report is made available in hard copies in English.

The presentation of the report is "on behalf of the HLPE", and the powerpoint and speaking points serve as reference for any future presentation. Also, the launch is the occasion to recall the main elements of the process for the given report.

A launch is generally a 3 hours event, with interpretation in the 6 languages, and webcast. The event is generally chaired by the CFS Chair. It provides ample space (2 hours) for questions and answer and discussion. It is a key part of the institutional and topic-bound communication strategies.

As per the usual practice of the CFS, the launch of an HLPE report is the first step of the preparation of the policy discussion towards the CFS Plenary where recommendations will be finalized and agreed upon by CFS.

During the CFS Plenary, it is usual practice that the HLPE report is presented at the start of a policy round table. This is a presentation "on behalf of the HLPE", which as per usual practice, is limited to 15 minutes. This presentation is of special importance and its contents need to be carefully elaborated. Powerpoints and speaking points are ultimately cleared by the HLPE Chair, and the powerpoint and speaking points serve as reference for any future presentation. The Secretariat transmits to the interpretation service in FAO the verbatim speaking points no later than the end of the preceding week before CFS.

3.4 Press releases

In addition, for purpose of appropriate communication with the media, the Steering Committee's Oversight Group is invited to prepare a draft press release, with assistance of the Project Team Leader and of the Coordinator.

The press release, or modifications to be made to its draft, is to be cleared at the level of the Steering Committee at the time of the approval of the report.

If time does not permit to make final copy-edits to the press release during the Steering Committee meeting where reports are approved, the Steering Committee Chair can request the HLPE Secretariat to finalize the press release according to decisions taken, and to circulate it to the Steering Committee in the view of its validation by the StC Chair before issuance.

The Steering Committee shall decide at its meeting on the channel to be used for its release.

3.5 Special exchange seminars

Since the 4th meeting organized in December 2011 in Brazil, the HLPE Steering Committee decided that special exchange seminars should be organized back to back to the meetings of the Steering Committee, when taking place outside Rome (generally at a work base of one Steering Committee member). These seminars enable the HLPE to exchange with local academics, students and researchers, policy makers, civil society and other stakeholders. The topics of discussion can be based on published reports, on the ongoing HLPE work, on themes of interests locally and of relevance to future work of the HLPE. These events are generally co-organized, which is part of the institutional strategy. Co-funding is also generally sought, as far as possible. Simultaneous interpretation is provided as far as possible. To the extent possible, local media is also invited, and "Op-eds" in major local newspaper (eventually co-signed) are to be prepared.

Starting with the International Conference held 20 November 2014 in Buenos Aires, the HLPE will seek to edit or co-edit (with the co-organizer) proceedings.

3.6 Other publications

Agreement to produce and authorship of publications of other nature than the HLPE reports, but directly linked to the reports or to the work of the HLPE, like editorial papers, publications in academic journals, translation of the report in other languages than the UN languages etc…, shall be discussed and decided at the level of the HLPE StC and in consultation with the Coordinator.

Initiative for such a publication can come from anyone involved, including the HLPE Secretariat.

The Coordinator and the Steering Committee Chair are to be informed from the onset of the initiative

The Coordinator is to be associated with the final decision, let alone because it may imply copyright issues, or issues of coordination with other publications or CFS activities.

Decision on authorship and clearance of such publication is to be made at the level of the HLPE StC Chair, who is to be systematically consulted.

3.7 Interventions, presentations, interviews

The HLPE is often solicited to participate at various events to present itself, the way it works or its reports. It is an integral part of its mission, for outreach and impact and to enlarge the interest of the scientific community and stakeholders concerned by food security issues.

In order to maximize the outreach and impact of the reports, Steering Committee members and Project Team members are encouraged to present outcomes of the work of the HLPE in diverse settings (universities, seminars etc...), to respond to invitations to do so, and to reply to media requests.

HLPE Steering Committee and Project Team members are first ambassadors of the HLPE and its reports: they should make the most of their numerous interventions in diverse events, including in teaching, to present on the HLPE reports or findings. In particular, everyone is encouraged in various settings to mention her/his link with the HLPE (HLPE Steering Committee member, Project Team Leader or member.).

Unless previously cleared and endorsed by the Steering Committee Chair, the presenter must however make clear that the communication is made on an ad-personam basis. In such interventions, regarding

the content of the reports, members are invited to use to the extent possible the summary for policy makers, the list of recommendations, and the approved press release.

When invited on behalf of the HLPE, or when invited to present specifically on the work of the HLPE, Steering Committee members and/or PT members should systematically inform, well in advance, prior to the event, the Coordinator and the Steering Committee chair. The Secretariat compiles a list of such interventions which is one of the ways to measure the impact of the reports. The Secretariat, if informed in advance, can provide elements of support to such interventions.

Following the intervention, a copy of the published material shall be sent by the presenter to the HLPE Secretariat, which shall hold a record of such interviews or media papers, which are also circulated internally to the HLPE Steering Committee.

Op-Eds, blogs, web articles on the work of the HLPE posted on the website of a member's own organization can be written at the initiative of a Steering Committee member, a Project Team member.

The practice is encouraged. The HLPE Secretariat is however to be informed. HLPE reports should not be posted on a third party institution website: rather, links to the HLPE website and report should be used.

On a regular basis, as a mean of reporting on impact, the Secretariat requests Steering Committee members and Project Team members to report (briefly) on the occasions on which they have promoted the HLPE and its reports, or used them in their own work, teaching etc..

3.8 Authorship, credentials and copyright

HLPE reports, including the summary for policymakers and the list of recommendations, are published after being finalized and approved by the HLPE Steering Committee. They are published on the HLPE website and made freely available. Steering Committee members and Project Team members are invited to distribute them widely.

As per the rules of the HLPE, the reports are a collective undertaking. An HLPE report is neither a report of the HLPE Steering Committee, nor a report of the HLPE Project Team, but a "*Report of the High Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition*" (HLPE Rules and Procedures, art 33), of which the Steering Committee and the Project Team are two components with different responsibilities. The report is therefore referenced as a report *by the HLPE*. This is aligned with practice in other expert panels like the IPCC where citation also bears with the panel.

Credits are prominently given, in the report, to members of the HLPE Steering Committee and Project Team members – see page 2 of the first reports, as per the HLPE Rules and Procedures.

HLPE reports are copyrighted under the CFS-HLPE (the Secretariat, hosted in FAO, is copyright holder), and therefore the release of a report counts already as a publication. The copyright notice has been carefully drafted with the legal office of FAO, so as to aim at the maximal and free dissemination of the reports.

3.9 Official representation of the HLPE

The task of official external representation of the HLPE lies with the HLPE StC Chair.

Any request to participate to a meeting *on behalf of* the HLPE shall be forwarded to the HLPE StC Chair for prior approval, with cc to the Secretariat.

REFERENCES

CFS reform document (Adopted by the CFS Plenary October 2009)
http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/cfs/Docs0910/ReformDoc/CFS_2009_2_Rev_2_E_K7197.pdf

HLPE Rules and Procedures (Agreed by the CFS Bureau, 27 January 2010)
http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/hlpe/hlpe_documents/HLPE_-_Rules_and_procedures.pdf

HLPE Key Elements
http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/hlpe/hlpe_documents/Official_Docs/HLPE-Key-elements-Online_Feb2014.pdf

HLPE Website
http://www.fao.org/cfs/cfs-hlpe

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 Function, substance and format of HLPE reports

1) Function

Per the mandate, in the CFS, HLPE reports are the main, or rather, unique **document to serve as a base to policy discussions in CFS** on a topic on which there are diverging views but on which CFS is to take consensual decisions.

In order to fulfill this function, and also to be used afterwards, HLPE reports have to be **recognized and accepted as a credible base to start** their discussions, by members (Governments) and participants (civil society, private sector, international organizations) in CFS.

HLPE reports have a **very broad and diverse range of publics**: academics and specialists of food security, academics and specialists of the topic treated (most of whom are *not* food security specialists), decision makers, either in the field of food security or of the treated topic, who are governments officials in various ministries, diplomats, but also staff of various international and national agencies, NGOs, local authorities… All of them have their own approach to the topic, including often a direct experience and knowledge.

The reports have to address this diversity of publics, in their content, approach, style and format.

2) Criteria to be fulfilled in terms of substance

The discussions in CFS, in the bureau and contributions to the consultations enable to identify a set of criteria essential for a report to be accepted and recognized by its users:

- It has to be **global in scope**, covering the breadth of situations and experiences of the various stakeholders; including in terms of regional balance, local, national, global, situations, types of productions… To do so it often proposes a global, conceptual description, in the form of a framework, typology, which can be summarized in a Figure.

- It has to show the scope covered, the **extent and diversity of the knowledge base** and induce the acceptance and buying in of the various stakeholders, draw credible recommendations and show that they can be implemented, in what context and what are the conditions for it. It has to reflect and address the diversity of situations and experiences of stakeholders.

- Here the **diversity of examples** used all along the text is key. It has always been praised by the CFS (example: the Social Protection for Food Security HLPE Report in 2012). This is due to the fact that the CFS is also a place of sharing (good or bad) experiences. Examples have to cover a wide diversity of countries, keeping in mind the concern for a certain regional balance, situations, agricultural productions, technical issues, scales and actors. They can be presented in boxes, paragraphs or as a short mention, with a reference.

- It has to be founded on, and to mention, the **best available references**: important global reports, major review articles, key references which introduced an important point, most recent references, and references considered of major importance either for a specific disciplinary field or for a specific category of stakeholders (often mentioned in the consultations). In so doing it has to be carefully balanced and often to position references in relation to debates, controversies and different points of view, linked to specific intra-disciplinary controversies or to the need of accommodating different disciplinary approaches or different stakeholders' perspectives and points of view.

- It has to **"speak to" both specialists and non-specialists** of food security and of the specific topic. To do so it has to be scientifically sound and up to date and explain clearly even very basic notions. For instance the notion of food security and its 4 dimensions has to be described and explained in almost every report.

- It has to **expose the various points of view, including controversies**, in such a way that all stakeholders can recognize their own position and knowledge, adequately described and in such a

way that it helps others to understand their position. To do so it has to avoid being biased in its presentation of the various arguments and narratives, before proposing an evidence based position, which can, when needed, reflect controversies and diverging views.

- Given the aim of HLPE reports, a focus is expected on the more vulnerable populations and on **gender** issues.

- The importance of **nutrition** and of malnutrition, "hidden hunger", is often neglected in other publications: the HLPE is expected to give proper treatment to all nutritional dimensions and issues.

- The recommendations play a critical role as they are to inform the debate in CFS. They have to be written carefully (see infra). On substance they have often been both innovative and courageous. They are left for the CFS to decide. Two points, pertaining to the very nature of CFS, have to be kept in mind. The first one is that, given its inclusiveness, CFS is very well placed for multi stakeholders processes leading to commonly agreed principles or documents (the best example to date being the voluntary guidelines on land tenure). The second one has to do with other international institutions or processes; with member states still disagreeing on the extent to which CFS could highlight items for other instances or even address them recommendations.

3) Reports formatted to best fulfill their functions

Members of CFS, particularly in CFS Bureau meetings, and various users have made observations on the format of the reports and their summaries to have them the better adapted to their use.

- **Total length** is an important concern. Some have stated that a report should not be longer than 40 or 50 pages, emphasizing that, the longer the report, the less it will be fully read.

- The summary and recommendations are of particular importance because they will be read at a higher decision making level and especially because they will be the main document which will guide discussions in CFS. Importantly, summary and recommendations should be very clearly separated, with zero observations in the recommendations part, and vice versa.

- The **summary** should be self-standing, containing the way the problem has been treated by the HLPE and the main findings and lead to the recommendations. It should not be longer than 5 pages.

- The **recommendations** are of particular, and increasing, importance, since they form the first document used in the process of preparation of the decisions in CFS. They should not be longer than 2-3 pages. The closer they are, in content and format, to what can be discussed in CFS, the easier it will be for the preparation of the discussion box, and the more chances they have to enter the decision box, be adopted and then propagated. They have to be short, operational, clearly addressed at actors, monitorable (to the extent possible) and not to mix issues. The CFS has often expressed that there shouldn't be too many of them; and that the HLPE should rather focus on those which are "catalytic", which would trigger change.

- The **introduction** should very clearly state the issue(s) at stake, their relation to the four dimensions of food security, keeping into account diverse scales (from local to global) and time spans (impacts can be different at short and medium range). This also requires to very clearly articulate the approach adopted by the report including methodological issues and, the case being (generally) different disciplinary perspectives. When appropriate it should also include the major debates and controversies which are framing the points of views of the various stakeholders. It should end by very clearly outlining the main sections of the report and their purpose.

- It should be kept in mind all along the report that most of the readers are not specialists and that they need to be guided through the **outline** not to miss the **purpose** of any section. This can be best served by an introduction and conclusion to each chapter.

- Wording and style have to be carefully crafted all along the text. Not only to avoid antagonizing unnecessarily certain actors but also because the press (and especially the blogs) tend to extract pieces of the reports.

4) Editorial issues

All in all, each report shall be comprised of 4 main parts:

1) Summary for policy makers and list of recommendations (not longer than 5 pages)

2) Main sections of the report (ideally about 40 pages, in Arial 10 simple spacing),

3) List of references

4) Appendices.

It will also contain a Table of Contents, a List of Figures and a List of Tables.

The Project Team is responsible for the appropriate quality of the copy-editing, notably according to the HLPE template provided by the Secretariat.

As Tables and Graphs need to be translated, and therefore edited, Team Leaders are requested to the extent possible to provide Graphics, Figures and Tables in an editable MS compatible format. For Graphics and Tables: please provide with raw data for graphic charts and tables, for example providing the source Excel spreadsheet (data + figure).

Team Leaders are requested to make sure that necessary permission is obtained to use other parties' copyright material in HLPE reports. Particular attention should be paid to Pictures, Figures, Maps and Tables. The Secretariat will provide a permission request form on request.

Appendix 2 Methodological challenges

Experience shows that Project Teams often encounter the same type of difficulties. Lessons learned during the first years of activity of the HLPE can help identify ways to surmount them. To a great extent the present Internal Procedures and methodological guidelines are designed to better help the Project Teams and Steering Committee to address these challenges or recurrent difficulties.

- **Terminology** often gives way to a lot of discussions, beginning by inside the team, then during the consultations. It is often critically important, especially as international processes tend to create concepts and that, by construction, the more widely adopted and used ones are also the ones less clearly defined. Experience shows that the best way to deal with it is to refer to internationally (when they exist) or widely accepted definitions, giving the reference. A special case is when a term or concept is both central for a report, but also key to a field where CFS has a special legitimacy. In such a case an HLPE report has to establish its report based on a definition which it can craft, keeping in mind that it has to cover the worldwide diversity. The best example is probably the notion of "small holder" in the smallholder and investment report.

- Almost all the reports have initially encountered the need to manage the **tension between "conceptual-academic" and more "operational-field" approaches**, or between theoretical frameworks on the one hand, and countries and examples on the other. The 8 first reports have all finally succeeded in synthetizing them (one of the best examples being the Social Protection for Food Security report, and the report on Food Losses and Waste in the Context of Sustainable Food Systems), with, roughly speaking, two different trajectories, either from concept to examples (social protection, smallholders) or from examples to a systematic approach (biofuels). Experience shows that beginning by looking only at the conceptual level can be time consuming and that searching examples at the last minute can be extremely challenging. It would be highly advisable to begin looking for examples at the very beginning of the work of the team.

- HLPE reports have generally to consider an issue in relation with food security, in its four dimensions. This requires a **multidisciplinary approach** and consideration of very different scales; a good example being the smallholder report where investment by smallholders are examined both from a household, microeconomic point of view and inside broad trajectories at regional and country levels, themselves driven by broad macroeconomic and demographic trends. It needs to accommodate a **diversity of methodological approaches**, with their specific focus, in order to draw a complete picture. It may be one of the most difficult and original characteristics of HLPE reports. Achieving it fully requires to properly articulate the different approaches, which could be done as separate sections, looking at a problem from different angles. It always requires organizing a dialogue and synthesis between theses different perspectives.

- Very often the topic to be considered by the HLPE is either an object of **debate, discussion and controversies** (for instance biofuels and food security) or is very dependent on issues which themselves are debated, discussed and controversial (for instance investment for small holders calls for a vision of the very future of small holders). In fact it is often among the very reasons why the topic has been selected by CFS. Experience shows that the sooner the controversial points are identified, including the various positions, points of view and their scientific backgrounds, the easier the work of the team. This is an important point for the Issues Paper. The experience of the Steering Committee and the results of the consultations on the scope and the V0 are here absolutely indispensable.

- **Data** is often a difficult issue. Either it is not available, or not available everywhere, or there is no universally accepted data. Often the selection of a particular data source or data presentation is linked to a specific point of view, and thus could lead to heavy criticism. Here rigorous academic rules are paramount. The various sources of data should be presented and discussed, methodologies explained when needed, all figures properly referenced,

- Most of the time there are huge uncertainties; which is also often among the reasons why the CFS has requested the report. Uncertainties have to be disclosed and explained but they cannot prevent from making recommendations. The report still has to make recommendations.

- All project teams have experienced some difficulties in managing time and most of the team leaders have experienced difficulties in managing their teams; the worst being when some team members forget that HLPE reports are collective works and act as owners of sections.

The **Issues Paper** has been introduced specifically very early in the project cycle in order to clearly identify all these methodological difficulties, to describe them accurately as they are linked to the topic, to explain how the HLPE will deal with them. The Issues Paper is to be useful alongside the whole writing process.

Appendix 3 Inputs to the work of the Project Teams.

As per the HLPE Procedures, the Team Leader is free to organize itself and his/her team to produce the draft reports, in the framework of the HLPE Rules and Procedures and following Steering Committee's decisions, oversight and guidance on content and process, calendar, electronic consultations, review etc…

The HLPE shall use all available and documented forms of knowledge, academic or peer reviewed sources, and other sources as well, as soon as the evidence is documented and publicly available, and the quality of the material assessed and referenced.

For each report, the open electronic consultation on an advanced draft V0 gives the opportunity to the Project Team to receive comments and inputs. The HLPE can use this consultation to seek inputs. It does not reply to each of the individual comments received through these consultations, but uses the feedback material received to finalize its reports as appropriate.

Within this framework, if the Project Team finds it is useful for its own work, and after consultation and in agreement with the Team Leader, team members can make use of research assistants or other resources, under their own responsibility. No commitment can be borne by the HLPE, its Secretariat or its Steering Committee towards research assistants working for Project Team members. Conversely, the only element responsible to the HLPE Steering Committee is the Project Team, through its Leader. Contrarily to Project Team members, research assistants do not appear as authors of the report.

The Secretariat provides, in the framework of the Rules and Procedures, administrative, technical and financial support to the sole Project Team and StC, and not to sub-elements who bear no commitment to the process. As a consequence, the Secretariat is in administrative liaison only with the Project Team members and the Steering Committee members.

Team Leaders and members are entitled to use their position and mandate of members of an HLPE Project Team, to contact any relevant person/expert etc…, directly at their level, in order to invite them to provide some of their own research material, for consideration and possible use in the elaboration of the report. In doing so, it is worth noting that, through these contacts:
- There can't be any prior engagement from the HLPE that the material will be retained in the draft or final study.
- If the material is retained in the final report, the Team Leader must ensure that appropriate authorizations are given with respect to copyrights
- No promise in terms of status (to take the extreme, like "member of the Project Team") can be made. Decision on the membership of the Project Team[6] is a prerogative of the Steering Committee.

Decisions regarding acknowledgments are a prerogative of the Steering Committee and its Chair, and are therefore discussed at this level. The Project Team along with the V2 can propose a list of names to be acknowledged in the Report.

---

[6] A new member can eventually be added to a Project Team on course of the work: such an addition has to be previously submitted to and validated by the Steering Committee, as per the HLPE Rules and Procedures

Appendix 4 Dealing with external requests of different natures

In the process of elaboration of a report, or after its publication, the Secretariat, the Steering Committee or the Project Team might receive requests of different natures *regarding the contents or the process of elaboration of a report.*

For each report, the HLPE process provides two opportunities for open and public comments, inputs and feedback: the consultation on the scope of the report and the consultation on the V0. The HLPE does not reply to each of the individual comments received through these consultations, but uses the feedback material received to finalize its reports as appropriate.

HLPE reports are published following their approval by the HLPE Steering Committee, and subsequently distributed for the CFS to prepare its session and discussions. The HLPE is invited to present at the Plenary sessions at the CFS. The HLPE is therefore providing evidence-based input and advice to the CFS, but does not take part into the subsequent negotiations in the political platform.

For all other requests, the following applies:

Written requests or solicitations (regular mail or e-mail) received by Steering Committee members or Project Team members are to be forwarded by the original recipient to the HLPE Coordinator, that will be charged as appropriate of the proper information of all HLPE members involved.

The Secretariat maintains a record of all correspondence received, and ensures the good information of all Steering Committee members and Project Team members.

The Steering Committee Chair decides, in consultation with the Coordinator and all members involved, of the response, and of the level of response, to be given to the request. Responses are cleared by the HLPE Steering Committee Chair before being sent.

For the sake of transparency, depending on their importance, correspondence received might be posted on the website, as well as the reply by the HLPE. This is done after agreement of the sending party and after decision of the HLPE Steering Committee Chair.

Appendix 5 HLPE Project Cycle

CFS	CFS defines HLPE mandate at plenary level	**1**
StC	StC defines the project's oversight modalities, and proposes scope for the study	**2**
	Draft scope of the study is submitted to open electronic consultation	**3**
StC	StC appoints a Project Team, and finalizes its Terms of Reference	**4**
PT	PT produces a version 0 of the report (V0)	**5**
	V0 is publicly released to open electronic consultation	**6**
PT	PT finalizes a version 1 of the report (V1)	**7**
	HLPE submits V1 to external reviewers, for academic and evidence-based review	**8**
PT	PT prepares a pre-final version of the report (V2)	**9**
StC	V2 is formally submitted to the StC for approval	**10**
CFS	Final approved version is transmitted to the CFS and publicly released	**11**
CFS	The HLPE report is presented for discussion and policy debate at CFS	**12**

Appendix 6 Activities of the HLPE Secretariat

Dispositions regarding the essential functions to be assured by the HLPE Secretariat are defined by the CFS Bureau (*Rules and Procedures for the Work of the HLPE*). The HLPE Secretariat performs a range of activities – detailed below - to support five main categories of functions: (i) coordination functions, (i) administrative functions, (iii) technical support functions, (iv) scientific and editorial functions, (v) publication, outreach and communication functions (see Section 1.6 and Box 5).

The list of activities below is the result of an extensive review, by the HLPE Steering Committee in November 2014, of the work of the HLPE Secretariat. FAO/AGD, hosting the HLPE Secretariat, has recognized that this list effectively serves the purpose of documenting in detail the current roles, functions and activities performed by the HLPE Secretariat, in line with the Rules and Procedures for the Work of the HLPE adopted by the CFS Bureau on 27 January 2010.

The list below is to be seen as a "living list".

Activities of the HLPE Secretariat

1) **Support the work and the activities of the Steering Committee, of its Chair and Vice-Chair and of the Project Teams.**
   a) Ensure that appropriate support is provided to the HLPE Steering Committee.
   b) Provide direct support to the HLPE StC Chair, Vice-Chair and Oversight Conveners.
   c) Ensure that appropriate support is provided to the Project Teams in relation to the different steps of the HLPE process.

2) **Provide day-to-day coordination of the activities of the HLPE**
   a) Coordinate the day-to-day work of the Steering Committee and the Oversight groups and their relation with the Project Teams, as per the HLPE Roadmap and procedures.
   b) Ensure proper and timely internal communication within and between the HLPE Steering Committee and Project Teams respectively.
   c) Provide support to meetings and teleconferences.

3) **Ensure the regular, smooth and diligent process of elaboration of the reports, from planning to execution and realization.**
   a) Ensure that Team Leaders and members, as well as StC new members, have a full understanding of the HLPE processes and requirements.
   b) Prepare the draft HLPE Roadmap for approval of the StC, taking into account the request and calendar of the CFS. The roadmap includes a provisional timetable for the different steps of the expertise process, different phases of the work of Project Teams, electronic consultations, review and publication.
   c) Plan for the execution of the different steps of each project, according to the roadmap.
   d) Ensure that the Oversight group convener is following the roadmap.
   e) Ensure that the rules and procedures are followed, to ensure the quality of the process and of the final product.
   f) Takes appropriate action in case of any problem to enable the HLPE to keep with the calendar or with the process, including by providing additional support as appropriate.

4) **Mobilize resources, manage the HLPE Trust Fund, and plan activities within budgetary constraints.**
   a) Plan for the HLPE budget for each year and each study.

b) Plan and organize the activities in support to the work of the HLPE and to the realization of final products.

c) Ensure the proper execution of the budget.

d) Manage the HLPE Trust Fund, liaise and follow-up with donors.

e) Conduct resource mobilization activities, as appropriate, in liaison with the HLPE StC Chair, the CFS Chair and Secretariat.

5) **Administrate StC appointment procedures, as well as of those for the selection and appointment of HLPE Project Teams and appointment of peer-reviewers.**

a) Ensure the information of the various actors involved in the selection process of the Steering Committee.

b) Ensure that the various stages of the StC appointment process are respected (process, delays).

c) Organize the election of the new StC Chair and Vice-Chair.

d) Organize the call for nomination and support the process of selection and appointment of the Project Team and reviewers by the HLPE Steering Committee.

e) Administrate appointment procedures and contracts.

f) Administrate and maintain the nomination sites and databases (roster of experts).

6) **Organize the consultations on the scope and V0 of the reports and prepare for the StC and Project Teams synthesis of them.**

a) Plan and prepare the consultations and finalize the documentation to be submitted. It ensures proper information of the academic community, including the roster of experts, specific experts communities, as well as of stakeholders.

b) Monitor the consultations and takes appropriate measures in course of the consultations.

c) Prepare for the StC and teams a synthesis of contributions, a line by line compilation of comments, a compilation of references, a compilation of examples and case studies.

7) **Support the StC and Team leaders for the preparation of the reports, contribute under the supervision of the StC to their finalization, and ensure their scientific and editorial quality.**

a) Compile the sections of each draft and ensures the finalization of drafts to be circulated in consultation with the team leader and oversight convener, under the supervision of the StC Chair.

b) Compile and synthetize the comments of the StC for the convener of the oversight group to prepare each round of Steering Committee guidance. Check that former rounds of StC guidance have been effectively implemented, under the supervision of the StC.

c) Provide support to the StC, Project Team and Team Leader in the preparation of the reports: requests for data to RBAs and other organizations (CGIAR centers for instance), finalization of figures, reference check, language editing, coherence and quality controls under the supervision of the StC.

d) Coordinate and monitor final editing, translation, printing and publication on the web of the report.

8) **Coordinate and liaise with the CFS Secretariat and Bureau on HLPE related matters.**

a) Provide support to the CFS Chair, before and during meetings, with respect to HLPE related-items.

b) Ensure appropriate coordination with the CFS Secretariat, including for issues related to the CFS calendar and the agenda and preparation of the CFS Plenary, as well as of Open-Ended groups, when relevant to HLPE matters.

c) Ensure that information and update on the HLPE are regularly provided to the CFS Bureau and Advisory Group, and to permanent representations to FAO.

d) Inform the HLPE of the results of the discussions and decisions in CFS Plenary, of the CFS Bureau and Advisory Group, which are relevant to the work of the HLPE.

9) **Inform the RBAs, the Academic community as well as stakeholders as appropriate, on the work of the HLPE, contributing to the visibility and impact of the HLPE.**

a) Liaise, for each report, with relevant FAO units, and the case being, other Rome based agencies and, the case being, the CGIAR.

b) Provide information on the HLPE towards the academic community and stakeholders, and receive appropriate feedback.

c) Support and/or organize and/or participate to activities contributing to the visibility and impact of the HLPE, and of its reports, targeting as appropriate specific networks.

d) Keep up to date and active the HLPE website.

e) Inform potential bilateral or multilateral donors on the HLPE in the view to raise financial contributions.

f) Organize the launch of the reports as well as the participation of the HLPE to relevant events to present the reports and work of the HLPE.

10) **Monitor the impact of the reports**

a) Maintain a list of interventions of HLPE Steering Committee members, Project Team leaders and members, as well as a list of documents, websites, publications referencing HLPE reports.

b) Devise an approach to assess impacts, for each report. This will be enriched by the results of the monitoring of CFS activities undertaken by the CFS OEWG on monitoring.

Appendix 7 Decision-making matrix for the different steps of the HLPE process.

In the table below, "StC" and "Oversight Group" means "collegial decision" of the StC or OG, ultimately validated by the Chair or the Oversight Convener. Consultations of this kind are typically done in face-to-face physical meetings, tele-conferences or video-conferences, or by electronic means and exchanges of e-mails.

Most of the work of the HLPE is done at distance. The HLPE favors the use of e-mail, teleconferences, videoconferences. The HLPE can also organize, with due consideration to budgetary constraints, meetings of the Steering Committee, and other meetings such as kick off meetings of Project Teams, writing meetings etc....

Decision item	Consultation of	Proposed by	Decided or cleared by	Implemented by or follow-up ensured by	Dates
Steps 1&2 (The HLPE receives request from CFS, Project calendar, Oversight modalities)					
HLPE Calendar	StC, CFS Bureau	Coordinator	HLPE Chair	Coordinator	
Date and place of StC meetings	Coordinator	StC	Chair	Coordinator	
Definition of Project Oversight modalities	Coordinator	StC	Chair	Oversight Group	
Agree on process to select experts, Review Editors, and Reviewers	Coordinator	StC	Chair	Coordinator	
Principle and modalities of a consultation on scope of study	Coordinator (financial implications)	Oversight Group	StC	Coordinator	
Principle and modalities of a consultation on V0 of report	Coordinator (financial implications)	Oversight Group	StC	Coordinator	
Principle and modalities of organization of workshops or write shops as part of the work of Project Teams	Coordinator (financial implications)	Oversight Group	StC	Coordinator	
Step 3 (Draft scope of study and e-consultation)					
Draft scope of study	StC	Oversight Group	Chair	Coordinator	
Selection of date for consultation on draft scope		Coordinator	Oversight Group	Coordinator	

Decision item	Consultation of	Proposed by	Decided or cleared by	Implemented by or follow-up ensured by	Dates
Launch of consultation on draft scope of study			Oversight Convener	Coordinator	
Step 4 (Appointment of Project Team, reviewers and Review Editors)					
Final scope of study	StC	Oversight Group	Chair	Project Team	
Selection of Project Team Leader	Steering Committee	Oversight Group	Chair	Coordinator (information)	
Selection of Project Team members	StC, Team Leader	Oversight Group	Chair	Coordinator (information)	
Letter of appointment of PT Members		Coordinator (calendar,process)	Chair	Coordinator	
Selection of reviewers	StC, Team Leader	Oversight Group and Review Editors	Chair	Coordinator (information)	
Letters of appointment of reviewers		Coordinator	Chair	Coordinator	
Decision to appoint a Review Editor	Team Leader, Coordinator	Oversight Group	Chair	Coordinator	
Selection of Review Editors	StC, Team Leader	Oversight Group	Chair	Coordinator (information)	
Letters of appointment of Review Editors		Coordinator	Chair	Coordinator	
Step 5 (Production of V0)					
Date and place of PT meetings	Project Team, Coordinator Oversight Convener		Team Leader	Coordinator	
Organization of Study workshops with external participants	Oversight Group and Coordinator (financial implications)	Team Leader	Chair	Team Leader and Coordinator	
Modalities (dates, teleconferences etc) for execution by the StC of the round of guidance	Oversight Group	Coordinator	Oversight Convener	Coordinator	

Decision item	Consultation of	Proposed by	Decided or cleared by	Implemented by or follow-up ensured by	Dates
Fixing deadlines for submission of V0 and pre-V0 to the StC	Team Leader	Coordinator	Oversight Convener	Team leader	
Sending of pre-V0 and of V0 to the StC	Team Members	Team Leader	Team Leader	Coordinator	
Running list of items in discussion (pre-V0 and v0)	StC Team members	Team Leader OG	Coordinator (maintenance)		
Step 6 (Open electronic consultation on V0)					
Fixing calendar for consultation on V0 of the report	Team Leader and Coordinator	Oversight Group	Chair	Coordinator	
Launch of consultation on V0 of report	Coordinator Oversight Group StC Chair and Vice-Chair	Team Leader	Oversight Convener	Coordinator	
Step 7 (Project Team finalizes a V1)					
Modalities (dates, teleconferences etc) for the round of guidance	Oversight Group	Coordinator	Oversight Convener	Coordinator	
Fixing deadlines for submission of V1 and pre-V1 to the StC	Team Leader	Coordinator	Oversight Convener		
Integration of remarks from consultation on V0	OG	Project Team	Team Leader	Project Team	
Submission of V1 to the StC	Team Members	Team Leader	Oversight Convener	Coordinator	
Running list of items in discussion	StC Team members	Team Leader OG	Coordinator (maintenance)		
Clearance of V1 (to be sent to review)	Coordinator Oversight Group StC Chair and Vice-Chair	Team Leader	Oversight Group	Coordinator	
Step 8 (Review)					
Integration of remarks of reviewers	OG	Project Team	Review Editors and Project Team Leader		

Decision item	Consultation of	Proposed by	Decided or cleared by	Implemented by or follow-up ensured by	Dates
Step 9 (Project Team finalizes a V2)					
Modalities (dates, teleconferences etc) for the round of guidance	Oversight Group	Coordinator	Oversight Convener	Coordinator	
Dates for submission of V2 and pre-V2 to the StC	Team Leader	Coordinator	Oversight Convener	Team leader	
Clearance of V2 (sent to Steering Committee)		Team Leader	Oversight Group		
Running list of items in discussion		Team Leader OG	Coordinator (maintenance)		
Step 10 (V2 is submitted to the Steering Committee for approval)					
Approval of reports	Review Editor Team Leader	Oversight Group	Steering Committee	Coordinator (copy-editing)	
Response to Reviewers	Oversight Group	Review Editor and Team Leader	Steering Committee	Coordinator	
Press release	Coordinator Team Leader	Oversight group	Steering Committee (Chair)	Coordinator Media office of FAO, no further modification of the cleared version	
Step 11 (Sending to CFS and Launch of the reports)					
Principle, date, and place of venue of a launch of the HLPE reports	Coordinator CFS Bureau Chair	Steering Committee	HLPE Chair, with information of the CFS Bureau. If the launch is requested by CFS, decision of time and date by the CFS Bureau	Coordinator, with support of CFS Secretariat if during CFS	
Format of the launch	Oversight Conveners, Coordinator (financial implications)	HLPE StC Chair and Vice Chair, or any StC member	Steering Committee Chair	Coordinator	

Decision item	Consultation of	Proposed by	Decided or cleared by	Implemented by or follow-up ensured by	Dates
Unforeseen events (any step)					
Any change in the calendar before appointment of Team Leader	Coordinator	Oversight Group	Chair	Coordinator	
Any change in the calendar after appointment of the Team Leader	Coordinator Oversight Group	Team Leader	Chair	Coordinator	
Corrective measures to remedy any possible problem in the elaboration of reports	StC	Oversight Group, Coordinator, Team Leader	Chair	To be determined as appropriate	

Appendix 8 Rules and Procedures for the work of the HLPE

Rules and Procedures for the Work of the

High Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition

(Agreed by the CFS Bureau, 27 January 2010)

Introduction - scope

1. This document defines the rules and procedures governing the work of the High Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition (HLPE), drawing from the principles and terms of reference described in the approved reform document of the Committee on World Food Security (CFS 2009/2 - Rev.1, paragraphs 36 to 48) agreed on 17 October 2009.

2. In line with efforts to revitalize the Committee on World Food Security (CFS), members called for regular inclusion of structured food security and nutrition-related expertise to better inform CFS sessions. This effort should help create synergies between world class academic/scientific knowledge, field experience, knowledge from social actors and practical application in various settings. Given the multidisciplinary nature and the complexity of food security issues, the effort is aimed at improving communication and information-sharing among the different stakeholders in food security and nutrition. Products of this expertise process shall focus on better understanding current food insecurity situations and shall also look forward toward emerging issues. The High Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition, through the CFS Plenary and the Bureau, aims to support CFS members and other stakeholders in designing strategies and programs for addressing food insecurity.

Key functions of the HLPE

3. As directed by the CFS Plenary and Bureau, the HLPE will:
(i)   Assess and analyze the current state of food security and nutrition and its underlying causes.
(ii) Provide scientific and knowledge-based analysis and advice on specific policy-relevant issues, utilizing existing high quality research, data and technical studies.
(iii) Identify emerging issues, and help members prioritize future actions and attentions on key focal areas.

Structure of the HLPE: Steering Committee and Project Teams

4. The HLPE has two main components:
(i)   **A Steering Committee** composed of at least 10 and not exceeding 15 internationally recognized experts in a variety of food security and nutrition-related fields.
(ii) **Project Teams** acting on a project-specific basis, selected and managed by the StC to analyze/report on specific issues.

HLPE Steering Committee (StC)

5. The StC is led by a Chair and a Vice-Chair, who will be responsible for the proper execution of the mandate given to the HLPE by the CFS.

6. By request of the CFS Plenary or Bureau, the HLPE StC has the responsibility to provide scientifically sound, comprehensive, clear and concise written reports/analyses on specific subjects for consideration at CFS Plenary sessions or inter-session meetings or activities.

7. The HLPE is not mandated to conduct new research. To fullfill its mandate, the HLPE uses and synthesize available world class academic and research knowledge, field project works, and practical applications and analyses. This knowledge will be drawn from among the various agencies, organizations, academic and research institutions, and among any other stakeholders involved in food security issues.

8. The CFS Bureau, with the support of the Steering Committee and in consultation with the Advisory Group, shall precisely formulate the nature of the expertise and advice requested by CFS. It shall also include a provisional budget and indicative deadlines for report submission and for CFS plenary discussion, duly considering time required for draft report review, final report translation and organizational matters ahead of CFS sessions.

Working language of the HLPE

9. Working language will be decided by the Steering Committee. Drafting language for HLPE reports will be in a UN Language to be decided by Project Teams. Final documents for CFS Sessions will be made available in the Official UN Languages.

Principles for selection of the StC members, its Chair and Vice-chair

10. The following principle shall apply with respect to the members of the HLPE StC:
(i) They should be internationally recognized experts in their field related to food security and nutrition, and have broad vision and substantial experience in cross-disciplinary expert processes. They should be experienced professionals, holding an advanced university degree, proven record of publications and/or solid background in field/research project management in the area of food security. Most importantly they should have strong experience in managing groups or networks of experts, extensive communication and inter-personal skills, Leadership skills, and, drawing from their inter-national recognition by peers, the capacity to attract and draw expert networks.
(ii) They participate in their individual capacities, and not as representatives of their respective governments, institutions or organizations.
(iii) The composition of the StC shall reflect a balance of technical disciplines, regional expertise and representation.

11. All members of the Steering Committee serve for a 2-year period, renewable once. The Chair and Vice-Chair of the StC are elected by the StC among its members, for a 2 year period.

Procedures for selection of StC members, its Chair and Vice-chair

12. The selection of members of the StC shall be carried out by an ad-hoc selection committee designated by the CFS Bureau and made up of representatives from FAO, WFP, IFAD, CGIAR/Bioversity and from a CSO/NGO. The ad-hoc selection committee shall examine the nominations received by the Secretariat, and submit its recommendations to the CFS Bureau for approval, in accordance with the principles described above.

13. At its first meeting, the newly selected StC shall proceed to the election, among its members, of its Chair and Vice-Chair.

14. If, within its two year term, the Chair of the StC resigns or is unable to fulfill its mandate, the Vice-Chair shall serve as acting Chair until a new election is organized.

HLPE Project Teams

15. To perform assigned tasks, the HLPE StC shall bring together appropriate, time-bound expert Project Teams, called **Project Teams**, led by a **Team Leader**.

HLPE Project Teams' appointment

16. The StC shall appoint Team Leaders, who can be either a member of the StC, or an expert external to the Steering Committee.

17. Team Leaders, if necessary and as appropriate, can submit additional names of contributing authors to participate to the Project Teams. In that case, they submit their proposal to the StC for approval and to the CFS Secretariat for information.

18. To assist the StC in selecting the Project Teams, the CFS Secretariat shall set-up and maintain an online roster of experts, located within the CFS website, and to which CFS stakeholders can nominate experts at any time. The roster shall be accessible to the StC and Team Leaders.

19. Project Teams selected by the StC shall reflect the general principles of scientific and technical relevance, regional expertise and balanced geographic representation, as appropriate.

20. The composition of any Project Team shall be given at the earliest opportunity for information to the CFS Bureau and made public under the CFS website.

HLPE Project Teams' mandate

21. Within the rules and procedures defined in this document, the StC has full responsibility and flexibility in terms of establishing and managing the Project Teams, their working methodologies, and work plan. The StC shall give clearly defined mandates and work plans to the Project Teams, with due consideration for calendar issues and constraints.

22. The preparation of the *draft report* is done by the HLPE Project Teams, under the responsibility of their Team Leader and under StC oversight. To prepare specific sections of the report for which he/she was appointed, the Team Leader, jointly with the StC, can decide to assign **Lead Authors**, chosen among the members of the HLPE Project Team.

HLPE reports

23. HLPE reports will normally be composed of two sections as follows: a short summary for policymakers and a main report. If necessary, supplementary material or annexes might be added to the report.

24. A report is a critical, objective, policy-relevant evaluation and analysis of information, including social knowledge, designed to support decision-making. It applies the judgment of experts to existing knowledge to provide answers to policy-relevant questions, quantifying the level of confidence where possible, and document controversies as appropriate.

25. Sources of technical content, contributing documentation, data and assumptions used in the report should be properly referenced. Non published sources, reporting of field projects, or other non peer-reviewed sources are accepted as relevant information sources, as far as their content is accessible to the HLPE and their quality is reviewed by the Project Team before incorporation in the HLPE report.

Report review process

26. The *draft report* of a Project Team shall be submitted for external review to experts not involved in the preparation of the report. To do so, the StC shall designate, with Secretariat assistance, two Review Editors external to the panel, who will submit the draft report for review to a set of individual experts (reviewers) with significant expertise in the area covered by the report.

27. The list of report reviewers shall be decided by the Review Editors, in consultation with the StC and the Team Leader, with Secretariat assistance, considering the need for a range of views, expertise, and geographical representation of reviewers. Reviewers shall execute their task in their individual capacities, and not as representatives of their respective governments, institutions or organizations.

28. Production of the revised draft report is under responsibility of the Team Leader and the Review Editors, under StC oversight, taking into account reviewers' comments.

Report finalization

29. The Chair, Vice-chair, and members of the StC shall interact on a regular basis, and especially in the final phase of the elaboration of a report, with Team Leaders and their team members. Steering Committee Members can also contribute, as appropriate, to the preparation of the draft report. A virtual workspace shall be made available to the StC and Project Teams, within the CFS web site, for the purpose of communication and working on draft documents.

30. If the Steering Committee has appointed several Project Teams to write different sections of a report, it shall coordinate, with the help of Team Leaders and Review Editors, the finalization of the report, with due consideration for uniform quality standards of the report.

31. If they cannot be reconciled with a consensus, differing views or controversies on matters of a scientific, technical, or socio-economic nature shall, as appropriate and if relevant to the policy debate, be represented and recorded in the report, and appropriately documented.

Report approval and publication

32. Prior to their publication and distribution, HLPE reports shall be approved by the StC on the basis alone of conformity to the request of the CFS and observation of proper quality standards and the review process. The content of final reports do not represent at any stage official views of CFS or its members and participants. After approval by the HLPE StC, only grammatical and/or minor editorial changes can be made prior to publication.

33. Reports approved by the HLPE StC should be formally and prominently described on the front and introductory covers as "*A Report of the High Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition*". Those reports will be made publicly available.

34. The final report should give credit to the Team Leader, to all Lead Authors, and to Review Editors. Contributing Author credits should also be given to other Project Team members provided they have effectively contributed to the report.

HLPE StC meetings, HLPE forums, and HLPE reporting to CFS Plenary

35. The Steering Committee shall normally meet two times per year in Rome and possibly more in extraordinary circumstances to review work methodologies, prepare work plans and finalize products/reports. Extraordinary meetings will have to be approved by the CFS Bureau.

36. Special open-ended **HLPE forums**, where progress on specific ongoing works of the HLPE could be presented to interested parties and CFS stakeholders, could take place, if funding permits, and with assistance of the CFS Secretariat, possibly back to back to CFS plenary sessions. Forum discussions and outcomes would feedback to the HLPE for finalization of its specific work and final report(s).

37. HLPE reports approved by its Steering Committee shall be transmitted within due deadlines by the Chair of the Steering Committee to the Chair of the CFS, and to the CFS Secretariat to handle related organizational matters ahead of CFS plenary sessions.

38. Following its introduction as an item on the agenda by the Bureau and according to the nature and purpose of a project, a report, its conclusions and recommendations could be introduced in CFS Plenary by the Chair of the HLPE StC, possibly in conjunction with the Team Leader and/or Lead Authors of the specific Project Team.

HLPE Secretariat

39. The joint HLPE/CFS Secretariat, located within FAO, shall assist the work of the HLPE StC and its Chair. Its functions include, though are not limited to:
   a)   assist with the preparation of working budget and establishment of trust funds,
   b)   maintain a roster of experts,
   c)   organize meetings of the HLPE StC and assist Project Teams, as needed,
   d)   assist with the preparation of other support documentation,
   e)   liaise as appropriate between the CFS Bureau and the HLPE Steering Committee,
   f)   maintain a system of communications, including posting of relevant reports and analyses.

40. The Secretariat comprises, among others, a senior staff, coordinator of the HLPE, responsible for day-to-day management and oversight of the project.

41. CFS Member States and participants are encouraged to designate focal points to the HLPE/CFS Secretariat for communication purposes.

Financial Support to HLPE Work

42. Budget of the HLPE covers Secretariat Staff, Secretariat functioning costs, Steering Committee meeting travel costs, report translation costs and document printing costs.

43. HLPE funding shall be channeled through a multidonor voluntary trust fund hosted at FAO, to which Member States and other CFS participants are encouraged to contribute.

44. Requests made by CFS to the HLPE should take into due consideration budgetary limitations or additional financing proposals.