



First Draft

**Framework for Action for Addressing Food Insecurity and Malnutrition in Protracted Crisesⁱ
(CFS-A4A)**

Rome, June 2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE	1
OBJECTIVE, PURPOSE, CONTENT, SCOPE, ALIGNMENT AND STAKEHOLDERS.....	2
PRINCIPLES FOR ACTION.....	3
INTRODUCTION	3
PRINCIPLES.....	4
PLAN OF ACTION	11
OBJECTIVES	11
ACTIONS.....	11
IMPLEMENTATION CAPACITIES AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS.....	13
ENDNOTES.....	14

INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND AND RATIONALEⁱⁱ

1. The 36th Session of the CFS agreed that within the global efforts to eliminate hunger and malnutrition, food security and nutrition in protracted crises, “...*require special attention, and that appropriate responses for these countries differ from those required in short-term crisis or in non-crisis development contexts*”.

High levels of food insecurity and malnutrition

2. Food insecurity and malnutrition are particularly severe, persistent and widespread in protracted crisis situations. Based on three measurable criteria proposed in SOFI 2010ⁱⁱⁱ, in 2012 the approximate combined population in protracted crisis situations was 366 million, of which approximately 129 million were undernourished. This was approximately one-fifth of the global total of undernourished people.
3. In 2012, the mean prevalence of undernourishment in protracted crisis situations was 35%, compared to 15% on average in the rest of the developing world.

Key characteristics of protracted crises

4. For the purposes of this document the terms ‘protracted crisis context(s)’, ‘protracted crisis situation(s)’ and ‘protracted crisis (or crises)’ are understood to be interchangeable. These terms include situations of recurrent crises. It is recognised that no universally agreed definition of the terms exists, and that there is a considerable degree of heterogeneity among protracted crisis situations.
5. Characteristics which may define a protracted crisis can include: high rates of malnutrition (stunting, wasting, underweight and micronutrient deficiencies) and high rates of severe food insecurity; vulnerable livelihood systems; multiple underlying causes (which can include recurrent human-made and/or natural disasters, climate change, violent conflict, occupation and insecurity); weak governance; poor agricultural growth; limited public and/or informal institutional capacity to respond to or address critical issues.
6. A protracted crisis may be limited to a particular geographic area of a State, or a territory, and may not affect the entire population. Significant population movements, which may be characterised by Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs), may also be a feature. Protracted crises affect men and women differently. Protracted crises may also have international, regional and trans-boundary aspects and impacts, including the presence of refugees as defined and recognised under applicable international law, who are often in protracted refugee situations. Overall, the total number of people in situations of displacement has increased dramatically in recent years^{iv}.
7. Protracted crises are not one-off, short-lived phenomena. Nor are they temporary interruptions from which affected populations can easily recover. Rather, they represent on-going and fundamental threats to lives and livelihoods of men and women, who often have different coping strategies, from which recovery and future development may become progressively more difficult over time.
8. It is the combination of many (if not all) of these characteristics that make protracted crises distinct from other contexts, necessitating specific policy and operational approaches to address food insecurity and malnutrition.

Implemented policies and actions fail to address food insecurity and malnutrition

9. Evaluations and other sources of evidence (see Appendix C) highlight that certain policies and actions, are frequently ineffective in addressing food insecurity and malnutrition in protracted crises. These include policies and actions which: only have a short-term, narrow focus on meeting immediate food needs; have limited impact on underlying causes and building resilience to shocks; have limited investment to support resilient livelihoods; have poor understanding of specific contexts; are externally driven interventions that can undermine local capacities and priorities; have poor timing or late delivery of responses, in particular humanitarian assistance in response to early warning signals.
10. Key reasons why food insecurity and malnutrition remain protracted in protracted crises include: conceptual and operational weaknesses, policy and institutional divides between humanitarian and development approaches (e.g. building resilient livelihoods falls through the gap between short- and

longer-term approaches); narrow scope of analysis (e.g. a failure to analyse historical trends, existing capacities and underlying causes); lack of commitment to support politically marginal communities and address gender inequalities; and commercial, political and institutional interests.

11. Evaluations have consistently called for a transformation in policies and actions to ensure coherent, comprehensive and context-specific approaches to address food insecurity and malnutrition, which not only meet short-term, immediate food needs but also build resilient livelihoods and food systems and address underlying causes.

Strengthening political commitment to transform policies and actions

12. Not only is it a fundamental human right for everyone to meet their need for adequate food, failure to do so can negatively impact economic growth, peace and stability for all. Comprehensive approaches that manage risk, thereby preventing or mitigating food insecurity and malnutrition not only reduce potential future human suffering and shocks on people's livelihoods, but are also cost-effective^v.
13. The evidence-based 'principles for action' in this document represent a high-level political recognition and consensus on the limitations of many existing policies and actions, and on what needs to be done differently. As illustrated in the 'online resource package', there is sufficient evidence from practical experience to conclude that such changes in approach are possible. There are many examples of good policy and practice by different stakeholders. However, as the continued high rates of malnutrition and food insecurity in protracted crises demonstrate, there is a need for concerted action at all levels.

OBJECTIVE, PURPOSE, CONTENT, SCOPE, ALIGNMENT AND STAKEHOLDERS

Objective

14. The overall objective of the CFS-A4A is to improve the food security and nutrition of populations at risk of, or affected by, protracted crises, by transforming policies and actions in a way that addresses underlying causes, thus contributing to the progressive realization of the right to adequate food in the context of national food security.

Purpose

15. The CFS-A4A:
 - i. Constitutes a framework for mobilising and guiding high-level political commitment by all stakeholders;
 - ii. Promotes multi-stakeholder processes;
 - iii. Informs coherent and comprehensive policies and actions aiming at preventing, mitigating, responding to, and promoting early recovery from, food insecurity and malnutrition in protracted crisis situations;
 - iv. Encourages sharing of lessons learnt between countries and stakeholders and reviews of progress.

Content and Scope

16. The CFS-A4A is voluntary and non-binding.
17. The CFS-A4A should be interpreted and applied consistently with existing obligations under national and international law, including extra-territorial obligations, with due regard to voluntary commitments under applicable regional and international instruments. Nothing in the CFS-A4A should be read as limiting or undermining any legal obligations to which a State may be subject under international law.
18. The CFS-A4A should be interpreted and applied in accordance with national legal systems and their institutions.
19. The ten 'principles for action' propose specific actions to address food insecurity and malnutrition in protracted crises. The CFS-A4A adds value to existing policy guidance by highlighting those principles and actions that are of particular importance in addressing food insecurity and malnutrition in protracted crisis situations. The 'plan of action' proposes actions to be undertaken by different stakeholders in order to ensure that the 'principles for action' are used effectively.
20. The CFS-A4A is accompanied by an 'online resource package'^{vi} with illustrative examples of how the principles can be turned into action (Appendix A); case studies (Appendix B); a compendium of

reference material and evidence underpinning the ‘principles for action’ (Appendix C); and a glossary of key terms (Appendix D). This online resource package provides the basis for establishing an online knowledge-sharing platform.

Alignment

21. The CFS-A4A aims to assist States and other stakeholders in reviewing policies and actions that address food security and nutrition in protracted crises for consistency with existing obligations under international law, including the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international human rights instruments. Such reviews should also be informed by humanitarian principles and CFS policy guidance, including the “Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition” (GSF).
22. The CFS-A4A aligns with a number of broad principles and core values common to all countries and contexts which provide a foundation for action. These include recognizing human dignity; do no harm; respecting culture and custom; non-discrimination; equity and justice; gender sensitivity; and equality; participation and consultation; transparency and openness; empowerment; accountability and rule of law^{vii}. These are in addition to the humanitarian principles of humanity; neutrality; impartiality; and independence.^{viii} The three mutually reinforcing pillars of sustainable development (economic, environmental and social), at the core of the process to prepare sustainable development goals (SDGs) for the post-2015 period, also inform this document.
23. The CFS-A4A will contribute to the achievement of any agreed post-2015 Sustainable Development Goals relating to food security and nutrition in protracted crises by providing guidance to promote coordinated and coherent policies and actions by different stakeholders.
24. The CFS-A4A should ensure that food security and nutrition concerns are comprehensively addressed within broader global, regional and country processes relating to protracted crises. Such processes include strategies and plans for peacebuilding and state-building, sustainable development, disaster risk reduction, building resilient livelihoods, humanitarian response and nutrition, amongst others.

Stakeholders

25. While emphasising the primary responsibility of governments and the central role of country ownership, the CFS-A4A is intended for all relevant stakeholders including, amongst others:
 - i. Food insecure and malnourished protracted crisis-affected communities and affected populations;
 - ii. All governments at all levels, including those of countries at risk of, and affected by, protracted crises, countries receiving refugees affected by protracted crises, and other countries, whose policies and actions may impact on food security and nutrition in protracted crises, including international cooperation and assistance;
 - iii. Intergovernmental and regional organizations, including multilateral/international and regional financial institutions;
 - iv. Civil society organizations;
 - v. Research organizations, universities and extension organizations;
 - vi. Private companies, foundations and financial institutions (both domestic and foreign);
 - vii. Small, medium and large-scale food producers, including family farmers^{ix}, food producer organizations and cooperatives, women and youth groups;
 - viii. Other non-state actors in protracted crisis situations.
26. Any stakeholder group can use the CFS-A4A, noting that each group has different roles and responsibilities. The roles and responsibilities of different stakeholders in developing, implementing and monitoring policies and actions are highlighted within each principle in *italics*. Roles and responsibilities are also highlighted in the ‘plan of action’ section.

PRINCIPLES FOR ACTION

INTRODUCTION

27. The ten ‘principles for action’ are intended to guide the development, implementation and monitoring of comprehensive, rights-based policies and actions to improve food security and nutrition in protracted crisis situations, consistent with the “Voluntary Guidelines to Support the Progressive Realization of the Right to Adequate Food in the Context of National Food Security (VGRtF)”^x. In particular, they should

be used in multi-stakeholder platforms and processes at national, regional and global levels, to develop common policies and plans with which different stakeholders can align their actions.

28. All the ‘principles for action’ are critical for effectively addressing food security and malnutrition in protracted crises. Achieving these principles requires leveraging the relative strengths of humanitarian and development perspectives and approaches.
29. Following each ‘principle for action’ there is box with a statement of the problem, which that ‘principle for action’ is intended to address.
30. The sub-paragraphs provide further guidance, relating to the main principle, on actions to be taken or avoided by different stakeholders. They emphasize existing international obligations and existing CFS policy guidance relevant to food security and nutrition in protracted crises as well as providing additional guidance specific to these contexts.

PRINCIPLES

Principle 1

31. **Comply with existing international humanitarian and human rights obligations and be informed by CFS policy guidance, in actions both within and outside of national borders.**

Food insecurity and malnutrition in protracted crises are often a consequence of actions or inactions by stakeholders, within and outside of national borders, in violation of international human rights and humanitarian law and in contradiction to CFS policy principles and guidance.

- (i) Existing international humanitarian and human rights obligations and CFS policy guidance are relevant in protracted crisis situations and *all stakeholders* should ensure that their policies and actions are consistent with these laws and principles.
- (ii) *States*, as primary duty bearers, should fulfil their relevant human rights obligations under international law in order to ensure the progressive realization of the right to adequate food^{xi}. Policies and actions should be people-centred and coherent with the relevant international instruments as described in the VGRtF, and are equally applicable for refugees and IDPs as for other people.
- (iii) Policies and actions should not contribute to food insecurity and malnutrition in other countries.
- (iv) In armed conflicts, *States* and *other stakeholders* should comply with international humanitarian law and humanitarian principles, which supplement the protection granted by human rights law^{xii}. Other branches of international law (e.g. refugee law, economic law, environmental law) also contain norms that are relevant for the right to food in protracted crises.
- (v) Security Council Resolution 1325 on Women, Peace and Security, and the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) should be complied with in order to ensure gender equality and women’s empowerment for food security and nutrition are addressed in protracted crisis situations.
- (vi) National governments that have signed the 1951 Refugee Convention are obliged to protect refugees on their territory and treat them according to internationally recognized standards.
- (vii) *States* and *other stakeholders* should enable humanitarian actors to carry out their work in accordance with the four humanitarian principles (humanity, neutrality, impartiality and independence)^{xiii}. *Governments* and *local authorities* should ensure access to crisis-affected populations by humanitarian actors for the purpose of providing humanitarian assistance. The concepts of ‘do no harm’ and Accountability to Affected Populations (AAP) should also guide humanitarian action.
- (viii) *States* and *other stakeholders* should use CFS policy guidance to inform their policies and actions, including the CFS “Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition” (GSF) and the “Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security” (VGGT).
- (ix) In situations where national governments and authorities are unwilling or unable to ensure the right to food for all citizens, *the international community*, through the UN system, has a responsibility to

support national and local stakeholders who are committed to the progressive realization of the right to adequate food.

Principle 2

32. Strengthen, as appropriate, country-owned, multi-stakeholder platforms and processes for the development, implementation and monitoring of policies and actions.

In many protracted crisis situations, the people and communities most affected by food insecurity and malnutrition are not included in decision-making. This is particularly the case for women, boys and girls. There is often inadequate coordination between stakeholders, both external and internal actors, and a lack of coherence with national plans and capacities.

- (i) *National governments* are primarily responsible for the food security and nutrition of their citizens. *National governments* should establish and lead high-level, multi-stakeholder, multi-sectoral platforms and processes for coordinating the development, implementation and monitoring of policies and actions. *All relevant stakeholders*, representing both men's and women's interests and needs, should have equal opportunity to participate in relevant platforms and processes. Where governments are not in a position to lead such processes, other national stakeholders committed to food security and nutrition for all should take the lead.
- (ii) Decisions about priorities, policies and actions should be made by *national stakeholders*^{xiv}, with priority given to the people and communities most affected by food insecurity and malnutrition.
- (iii) National civil society organisations and private sector entities should be invited to participate in national multi-stakeholder processes through their own autonomous and self-organised national mechanisms, as appropriate. *National governments* and *cooperation partners*^{xv} should promote and support, as necessary, the participation of organisations and networks of affected people and communities, including, for example, traditional leaders, community-based organizations, cooperatives, small-scale producer organisations, representatives of refugees, IDPs and host communities and women's groups, including displaced women, ethnic minorities, and those from rural areas.
- (iv) *Cooperation partners*, coordinated by national mechanisms, should undertake support and facilitation roles. Support should be provided in ways that align with national food security and nutrition policies and plans developed, as appropriate, through multi-stakeholder processes.
- (v) In some protracted crisis situations, some stakeholders may be responsible for human rights violations that worsen food insecurity and malnutrition. *Cooperation partners* should identify and align their policies and actions with the priorities, strategies and actions of local and national stakeholders who are committed to food security and nutrition for all.

Principle 3

33. Ensure and support comprehensive evidence-based analyses.

Food security and nutrition analyses in protracted crises are often narrowly focused on food availability and peoples' ability to meet their immediate food needs. This fails to adequately account for multidimensional political, economic and institutional causes, or the livelihoods, coping strategies and resilience of affected populations. This contributes to narrow, short-term policies and actions, which focus on meeting immediate needs but fail to protect and promote resilient livelihoods and food systems, do not address underlying causes and, in some cases, may exacerbate and prolong crises.

- (i) *National governments* and *other stakeholders* should ensure that comprehensive, food security and nutrition analyses are integrated into broader poverty, fragility, risk and humanitarian assessments.
- (ii) Comprehensive analyses should examine:
 - the underlying determinants of food insecurity and malnutrition (including global and regional policies and actions impacting on national and sub-national food security; the role and interests of external governments and other actors; the national and local political, institutional and security contexts, including the distribution of power and wealth, public policies and regulations, local institutional and organisational capacities; local and national markets);

- the resilience and sustainability of livelihood strategies and food systems (including the vulnerability context such as shocks, hazards, seasonality, livelihood assets of men and women, including refugees and displaced populations, and their strategies and coping strategies, household resilience to natural and human-induced shocks);
 - the abilities of men and women to meet food, nutrition and other basic needs (including food and income security; health and nutritional status).
- (iii) Comprehensive analyses should be:
- country-owned and inform policies and actions coordinated through national platforms and processes;
 - multi-stakeholder, including the communities, men and women directly affected by food insecurity and malnutrition, including refugees and displaced populations;
 - based on coordinated assessments;
 - routine in order to monitor changes over time;
 - draw on all available information from different sources;
 - conducted according to common analytical frameworks, quality standards and protocols to maximise objectivity, impartiality and minimise political, institutional and other biases;
 - disaggregated (e.g. by sex, age, urban, rural) as much as possible to understand the varying impacts on the food security and nutrition of different vulnerable groups;
 - evidence- and consensus-based;
 - undertaken in a timely manner for decision-making.
- (iv) Early warning systems and food and agriculture information systems, which detect and monitor threats to livelihoods as well as lives, should be integrated components of broader comprehensive analysis systems.
- (v) Increasing investment and institutional capacity in data collection and analysis should progressively improve the breadth, quality and availability of data.
- (vi) Following a comprehensive analysis of the food security and nutrition situation, a multi-stakeholder, technical analysis of response options should be undertaken, in order to inform political decisions on appropriate and effective policies and actions.

Principle 4

34. Design, support and implement comprehensive, people-centred, resilience-focused policies and actions.

Development actors frequently fail to adequately address underlying causes, or integrate resilience building and social protection measures, in policies and programmes. Humanitarian assistance is often short-term and narrowly focused on meeting immediate food needs rather than early intervention and recovery to protect, promote and rebuild livelihoods. Agriculture and the rural economy are key sectors for supporting resilient livelihoods in protracted crises, but they are often neglected in both national and international policies.

- (i) In line with the twin-track approach described in the GSF, comprehensive food security and nutrition policies and actions in protracted crises should coherently: (1) prevent and eliminate food insecurity and malnutrition by addressing the underlying causes; (2) mitigate the impact of crises by protecting and building resilient livelihoods and food systems; (3) meet immediate needs in a timely and appropriate manner by preparing for and responding to crises.
- (ii) Protracted crisis situations require a combination of long-term and context specific policies and actions.
- (iii) Development policies and actions should address the underlying causes of food insecurity and malnutrition in protracted crises. Particular attention should be given to local food production, trade and consumption, enabling small-scale food producers, family farmers and local traders to strengthen and secure their livelihoods, positive and adaptive coping strategies, and capacity to invest.
- (iv) Development policies and actions should integrate social protection, disaster risk reduction (DRR) and other resilience-focused measures in order to protect, promote and build resilient livelihoods and local food systems.

- (v) *Humanitarian and development actors* should work together to build preparedness capacities to enable long-term national social protection and DRR systems to be scaled up and down in response to early warning of cyclical shocks and seasonal and/or climate change related variations, thereby ensuring early intervention to protect livelihoods and save lives.
- (vi) Humanitarian assistance policies and actions should protect livelihoods as well as lives; be long-term; flexible; timely and culturally appropriate. Actions to protect, promote and rebuild livelihoods should be implemented as part of the first phase of a humanitarian response.
- (vii) *Humanitarian actors* should support States in protection, promotion and provision of sustainable livelihoods and durable solutions (such as repatriation or local integration, when relevant) for refugees residing on their territories. Efforts should also be made to support IDPs to engage in sustainable livelihood activities and to provide support to host populations.
- (viii) *Development and humanitarian actors* should work together to ensure early recovery from crises whereby livelihoods and food systems are more resilient and sustainable than before.
- (ix) Actions to meet immediate food needs and save lives should support and strengthen local food production, trade and other local livelihood systems. The use of a varied set of humanitarian food assistance tools (e.g. food, cash or vouchers), complemented by innovations in how food is procured (e.g. local purchase), or made available through food reserves at community, national and regional levels, can help ensure that appropriate assistance is provided and can serve as a strong basis for longer-term food security and nutrition.
- (x) Food security interventions should be nutrition-sensitive, i.e. be designed to achieve improvements in nutritional status and address different types of malnutrition including stunting, wasting and micronutrient deficiencies. Particular attention must be paid to the nutritional needs of mothers, including pregnant and lactating women, infants and young children, particularly between conception, the breastfeeding and complementary feeding phases until aged two.
- (xi) Given the high rates of malnutrition in protracted crises, nutrition specific interventions are vital, including the promotion of exclusive breastfeeding up to six months of age; continued breastfeeding together with appropriate and nutritious food up to two years of age and beyond; enabling access to nutrients through incorporating them into foods; micronutrient supplementation; and community-based therapeutic feeding to treat of acute malnutrition.

Principle 5

35. Respect tenure of land, fisheries, forests and access to water before, during and when emerging from protracted crises.

Protracted crises are often characterised by competition for land, water, and other natural resources and productive assets. They are the fundamental basis of many livelihoods in protracted crisis situations, both for survival and recovery. Small-scale food producers, family farmers and livelihood groups such as pastoralists and herders are frequently powerless to compete with larger, wealthier and more powerful actors. They lose access to, and control over, natural resources and assets. Women can face additional challenges due to gender-specific constraints which lower their agricultural productivity. Promoting the stable and equitable governance of land and other natural resources can help address the underlying causes of crises in general, reduce the risk and recurrence of conflict, and promote food security and nutrition of men and women.

- (i) The VGGT should be applied as appropriate, in particular, but not limited to, Part 6.
- (ii) *Relevant stakeholders* should negotiate the responsible management of communal resources (including water, land, forests, etc.) to serve as an entry point to facilitate agreement on other contentious issues and causes of violent conflict.
- (iii) *All stakeholders* should avoid actions that degrade natural resources essential to livelihoods and which may hinder access to those resources by small-scale food producers and family farmers.
- (iv) Decisions on the ownership of, control over, access to, and use of productive assets and natural resources should prioritise the interests of all national citizens, particularly those of local communities.

- (v) However, when considering how to manage and share scarce resources *all stakeholders* should consider how refugees may access natural resources. Refugees should be consulted to understand the needs and opportunities within the refugee community.
- (vi) *All stakeholders* should secure conditions of public safety that enable small-scale food producers and family farmers, especially women, to access water and land for cultivation, grazing and harvest, local people to access markets to buy and sell production, and people to access their families and social networks to help one another.
- (vii) Women and children should be given adequate support and protection from resource-related physical violence and other security risks.
- (viii) *All stakeholders* should support the local management and sharing of scarce resources based on the gender-sensitive analysis of the role of local communities and their traditional arrangements, and the division of tasks between men and women.
- (ix) Promote women's active and informed participation in formal and informal decision-making structures, rural institutions and organizations, and governance processes related to natural resource access and management.
- (x) Strengthen participatory and gender-sensitive research, extension and farming service systems, responding to the specific needs of smallholder and family farmers, with a particular focus on women farmers and youth.
- (xi) Together with local communities, facilitate the adaptation of traditional arrangements and capacities to shocks and stressors. Technology that works in and with communities, respecting indigenous knowledge, local cultivars, planting material and breeding stock, amongst others, should be promoted.

Principle 6

36. Promote and integrate solutions for food security and nutrition into peace-building, transitional justice and governance related efforts.

Food insecurity and malnutrition can be both a cause and a consequence of conflict, occupation and war, contributing to a vicious cycle. Food security and nutrition are critical for political stability, and can have tangible peace dividends, but are often given insufficient attention in peace-building and related initiatives.

- (i) *All stakeholders* should promote the role of food security and nutrition policies and actions in contributing to sustainable peace-building objectives (including confidence building and conflict driver mitigation), thus supporting the resolution of protracted crises.
- (ii) *All stakeholders* should also ensure that peace-building and related initiatives consider, integrate and promote food security and nutrition objectives as part of a coherent, context-specific and rights-based approach.
- (iii) *All stakeholders* should ensure participation of women in peace-building and related initiatives, reflecting their fundamental role in food security and nutrition, by including a wide representation of women's organizations and national gender expertise.
- (iv) Support to food security and nutrition should not be phased out too quickly, as this can leave populations at risk and potentially reverse gains in building peace.
- (v) *UN* and other *peacekeeping operations* should ensure that their actions do not undermine food security and nutrition.

Principle 7**37. Actively support and ensure institutional capacities, better coordination and governance at local and national levels.**

Structural factors, including weak or failed state institutions, are often at the root of protracted crises, and also play an important role in perpetuating crises. The role of local organizations and formal and informal institutions is often ignored by national and international actors despite the fact that they can successfully adapt to crises and provide the basis for addressing the drivers of a crisis, building resilient livelihoods and food systems, and meeting immediate needs.

- (i) *States* should uphold their responsibility for ensuring the right to food for all persons under their jurisdiction by ensuring national and local policies and institutions provide an enabling environment for the creation of sustainable livelihoods and food systems.
- (ii) Existing formal, informal and customary structures that are successful, non-discriminatory and accountable should not be undermined. Functioning systems within existing local institutions, communities and other stakeholder networks that support and enable local livelihoods should be identified, supported and rebuilt, where required.
- (iii) *National governments* with support from *cooperation partners*, where necessary, should review and enhance the technical and logistical capacity of national and local institutions to play central roles in addressing food insecurity and nutrition in protracted crises, e.g. the provision of basic services and social protection needs.
- (iv) *National governments* should establish and strengthen inter-ministerial coordination mechanisms to support a comprehensive, multi-sectoral approach and to lead multi-stakeholder platforms as described in Principle 2.
- (v) In protracted crisis situations, there is a particular need to ensure close coordination and coherence between *development and humanitarian actors*, with clear and complementary divisions of responsibility in support of a single national strategy or plan.
- (vi) In situations in which States are failing to uphold their responsibility to, and/or purposefully violating, the right to food of persons under their jurisdiction, other national and local actors, especially community-based and other civil society organisations and informal institutions, should be supported to promote and advocate for the right to food, including the right to effective remedy.
- (vii) Efforts that target corruption should be supported by *all stakeholders*, including participatory, community-driven processes, raising public awareness and strengthening the capacity and functioning of national anti-corruption commissions, where they exist.
- (viii) *National governments* and *other stakeholders* should promote the participation in, and monitoring of, governance mechanisms and institutions by civil society organisations, especially those representing food insecurity and malnutrition affected populations.

Principle 8**38. Ensure multi-year, predictable and flexible funding mechanisms, to support coherent and comprehensive national policies and actions.**

Humanitarian funding and resources are generally aimed at short-term efforts to address the immediate effects of a crisis, whilst actions to build resilient livelihoods and food systems and address underlying causes have been neglected by national governments and cooperation partners. Areas of intervention that are particularly important in protracted crises (including support to small-scale food production, social protection and risk reduction) are often underfunded.

- (i) *National governments* of protracted crisis affected countries and territories should take primary responsibility for mobilizing adequate resources to finance coherent and comprehensive policies and actions to address food insecurity and malnutrition, in accordance with national plans.
- (ii) *Cooperation partners* and *national governments* should ensure that there is adequate, multi-annual and flexible funding to enable a comprehensive approach to food insecurity and malnutrition, including for refugee and displaced population situations.

- (iii) *Cooperation partners* and *national governments* should support programmes that readily adapt and respond to new shocks and stressors, including rapidly scaling up social protection and DRR programmes. Humanitarian funds should be used to support the scale up of existing programmes and strengthen national and local capacities wherever possible.
- (iv) Design and implement agile operational policies to avoid interruptions or delays in support resulting from bureaucratic or procedural issues.
- (v) *Cooperation partners* and *national governments* should more effectively manage risks in protracted crisis situations to support greater levels of upstream investment for prevention, mitigation and early response. This is more cost-effective than repeated humanitarian responses to food security and nutrition crises, as underlying causes can be addressed, more resilient livelihoods built and situations of entrenched humanitarian assistance avoided.
- (vi) *Funding agencies* should consider automatically releasing additional resources when agreed early warning thresholds are reached in order to ensure timely intervention to protect and promote livelihoods and save lives.
- (vii) *Cooperation partners* should coordinate their investments and financial support through national, multi-stakeholder platforms, aligned with national policies and plans. They should aim to support, and not undermine or duplicate, sustainable national and local systems and capacities and avoid creating dependency on international assistance.
- (viii) *Cooperation partners* should closely analyse and consider how the multiplicity of funding mechanisms can be better aligned and used. Efforts being undertaken by both *humanitarian* and *development cooperation partners* to more effectively and efficiently utilize available resources to support country-owned plans to address food insecurity and malnutrition in protracted crises should be encouraged and scaled up.
- (ix) *Cooperation partners* should make further reforms, based on good practices and lessons learned, to the architecture of external assistance in protracted crises to ensure financial assistance and technical cooperation is provided in coherence with CFS-A4A guidance. Common risk-management and resilience objectives should be agreed, and achieved through joint analysis, planning, programming and funding.

Principle 9

39. Ensure systematic learning from experience and integrate into improved policies and actions.

Systems to learn and share lessons from the implementation of policies and actions to address food insecurity and malnutrition tend to be particularly weak within and between protracted crisis situations. Consequently, policies and actions are often ill informed by existing evidence and practical experience.

- (i) Monitoring and evaluation systems and capacities, involving the people and communities most affected by protracted crises, should be developed at local, national, regional and global levels, and be gender-sensitive, in order to review progress in realizing the right to food and nutrition and to learn lessons from the implementation of policies and actions.
- (ii) There should be an on-going, iterative process between policy implementation and learning.
- (iii) Progress and lessons learnt should be shared between stakeholders at all levels.
- (iv) The policies and actions of *all stakeholders* should be evidence-based, regularly reviewed, strengthened and informed by the lessons learnt by different actors in different contexts, especially the communities and people most affected. The use of local knowledge is essential.
- (v) In order to justify response options, it is preferable for them to have been tested and shown to work. *All stakeholders* should work together to test new approaches and demonstrate success.
- (vi) Local and national research capacities should be supported, with international research institutions aligning their support with national and local research priorities.
- (vii) Country led, multi-stakeholder platforms should routinely undertake a two-step process of self-assessment of: (1) the quality of policies and actions; and (2) the impact of policies and actions on food security and nutrition of men and women.

- (viii) The principles outlined in this document provide a reference against which progress and quality can be measured. They allow all stakeholders the opportunity to judge whether their proposed actions, and the actions of others, are appropriate, relevant, and to be accountable for the same.
- (ix) The impact of policies and actions on food security and nutrition should be assessed against a baseline at regular intervals.
- (x) Monitoring and evaluation should be in line with the five principles set out in the GSF^{xvi}.
- (xi) *All stakeholders* should aim to reach consensus in the monitoring and evaluation of policies and actions. Divergent views of different stakeholders should be communicated in the presentation of progress and lessons learnt.

Principle 10

40. Improve accountability to all stakeholders to ensure that prevention and response happens in a timely manner, and respects the rights of individuals affected by crises.

Failures of accountability have been identified as one reason why severe food insecurity and malnutrition persist in protracted crises where weak governance structures and imperfect or absent democratic institutions often exist.

- (i) *Governments* and other stakeholders responsible for the design and implementation of policies and actions addressing food insecurity and malnutrition in protracted crises should be accountable primarily to affected populations.
- (ii) Specifically, *governments* should ensure that, throughout the programme cycle, all segments of an affected community (considering gender, age and other aspects of diversity) receive the information they need to make informed decisions, can participate or be fairly represented in the decisions that affect their lives and livelihoods, and can provide feedback on the assistance or services provided to them through adequate and accessible complaint mechanisms.
- (iii) Special efforts should be made to ensure that affected people are protected from any form of exploitation or abuse, including sexual, by anyone associated with the implementation of a response. This applies equally to refugees and IDPs as to other population groups.
- (iv) The roles and responsibilities of different stakeholders should be clearly defined in national multi-stakeholder strategies and plans and communicated publically in a way easily accessible to affected populations.
- (v) All stakeholders should be transparent about the impact of their policies and actions, individually and collectively.
- (vi) Accountability mechanisms should be created or strengthened as appropriate for the enforcement of the right to food in protracted crisis situations.

PLAN OF ACTION

OBJECTIVES

41. This section describes the key actions that should be taken by stakeholders to:
- Use the CFS-A4A to strengthen, implement and review policies and actions at local, national, regional and global levels;
 - Share progress and lessons learned from the implementation of such policies and actions at local, national, regional and global levels;
 - Periodically review the impact and usefulness of the CFS-A4A on the basis of lessons learnt.

ACTIONS

Disseminating and promoting the CFS-A4A and mobilising high-level political commitment

42. *All stakeholders* are encouraged to disseminate the CFA-A4A and to promote its use in the development, implementation and monitoring of more effective policies and actions at global, regional, national and local levels.

43. The transformation of policies and actions requires high-level political commitment within governments, international organisations, and cooperation partners, as well as commitment from other stakeholders. The *CFS Bureau and Advisory Group* should lead the process of mobilising such commitment.
44. The *CFS* requests the *UN Secretary General (UNSG)* through his High Level Task Force on the Global Food Security Crisis and the UNSG's Special Representative for Food Security and Nutrition to act as advocates and catalysts in order to: address food security and nutrition in protracted crisis situations; promote the use of the CFS-A4A to review and strengthen the policies and actions; promote integration into broader global and regional initiatives; work together to mobilise high level commitment and action amongst all stakeholders.
45. *Civil Society Organisations* have an important role in promoting the application of the CFS-A4A and are encouraged to develop, with the support of other stakeholders, a simplified implementation manual and other material that are easily accessible by the communities and organisations of protracted crisis affected populations.
46. The *CFS Secretariat* is requested, subject to available resources, to support dissemination of the CFS-A4A through implementation of the CFS Communication Strategy. This may include the development of a user-friendly, concise, version of the CFS-A4A and related communication materials to be produced for, and disseminated, to key audiences and potential users.

Applying the CFS-A4A to guide more effective policies and actions

47. *National governments* and *regional entities* are encouraged to facilitate and institutionalize multi-stakeholder processes to review, develop and implement national and regional policies and actions for addressing food insecurity and malnutrition in protracted crises.
48. This includes reviewing, developing and implementing policies and actions within at risk and affected protracted crisis situations, and in other countries, whose policies and actions may impact on food security and nutrition in protracted crises, including international cooperation and assistance.
49. The application of the CFS-A4A should build on, complement and, where possible, integrate with existing global and regional initiatives, processes and strategies with similar objectives in protracted crisis situations.
50. *Cooperation partners, international organisations, private sector entities* and *civil society organisations* are encouraged to facilitate participatory reviews of their own policies and actions.

Providing coordinated support in the application of the CFS-A4A

51. *Development partners, UN specialized agencies, and regional organizations* are encouraged to support voluntary efforts to implement and use the CFS-A4A. Such coordinated support could include technical cooperation, financial assistance, institutional capacity development, knowledge sharing and exchange of experiences, and assistance in developing desirable policies and actions. Such support should be sourced as locally as possible to protracted crisis situations, including through *South-South cooperation*.
52. Technical support from the global level should be demand driven and provided in a coordinated and coherent manner. In this regard the *CFS* requests the *UNSG* to consider initiating the development and implementation of a plan through existing mechanisms for coordination and joint action (such as the Chief Executives' Board and HLTF).
53. To support the application of the CFS-A4A, additional material should be developed, such as user-friendly guide to existing human rights norms as applicable to food insecurity and malnutrition in protracted crisis situations, and an accessible policy reform kit to assist CFS stakeholders in developing informed and legally compliant policies and actions.

Monitoring the application and impact of the CFS-A4A on policies and actions

54. In alignment with the CFS approach to monitoring, the *CFS* should encourage stakeholders to share lessons learned and experiences on the application of the CFS-A4A and its impact on the policies and actions of States and other stakeholders.
55. High-level statements of intent to use the CFS-A4A to review strengthen and implement their own policies and actions may be shared with other CFS stakeholders.
56. *CFS stakeholders* are invited to voluntarily share their policies, action plans, operational guidelines etc. with others, and provide feedback on how the CFS-A4A helped guide reviews, policy development and actions.

Monitoring progress in addressing food insecurity and malnutrition and learning lessons from the implementation of policies and actions

57. *States and other stakeholders* should monitor progress in addressing food insecurity and malnutrition in protracted crises and learn lessons from the implementation of policies and actions, as highlighted in Principle 9.
58. *All stakeholders* are encouraged to share progress in addressing food insecurity and malnutrition in protracted crises and lessons learnt from the implementation of policies and actions.
59. In alignment with the CFS approach to monitoring, *CFS* should, (i) encourage consensus-based guidance to stakeholders on how to monitor progress and lessons learnt, including indicators to monitor food security and nutrition; (ii) promote spaces and mechanisms at the global level to enable the sharing of progress and lessons learnt; (iii) enable the collation and sharing of progress in addressing food insecurity and malnutrition and lessons learnt from the implementation of policies and actions.

Reviewing and updating the CFS-A4A

60. The CFS-A4A should be periodically reviewed and be updated as necessary, based on lessons learnt, and reflected accordingly in future versions of the GSF.

IMPLEMENTATION CAPACITIES AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

61. A number of global level, implementation support activities are recommended above including: producing communication materials and supporting dissemination of the CFS-A4A; liaising with related global initiatives; supporting high level advocacy; facilitating coordinated technical and financial support from global level; facilitating the global sharing of learning; and reviewing the CFS-A4A on the basis of lessons learnt.
62. *All stakeholders* have a role to play in these implementation support activities. Subject to available resources, the *CFS Secretariat* should consider: (i) exploring complementary existing capacities within the Rome Based Agencies, other International Organisations and other CFS stakeholders to support different activities, and (ii) assessing what resources may be required for additional capacities, as needed.
63. The *CFS Secretariat*, subject to available resources, and in alignment with the CFS approach to monitoring, should periodically update the CFS on actions undertaken by CFS stakeholders to disseminate, apply, provide support to the use of, monitor, review and update the CFS-A4A.

ENDNOTES

ⁱ This proposed change in title from: “Agenda for Action for Addressing Food Insecurity in Protracted Crises” to “Framework for Action for Addressing Food Insecurity and Malnutrition in Protracted Crises” is for consideration by the CFS-A4A Open-ended Working Group (OEWG). This proposal reflects recommendations and feedback from CFS stakeholders received during the consultative process. However, it should be noted that any change in title to this work stream can only be formally endorsed by CFS Plenary. The CFS Secretariat will advise on the correct procedure to request endorsement of a title change should a change be agreed upon and proposed by the CFS-A4A OEWG.

ⁱⁱ The CFS-A4A is a major work stream of the CFS. In 2012 CFS 39 approved a consultative process including all relevant stakeholders to elaborate an Agenda for Action for Addressing Food Insecurity in Protracted Crises, building as appropriate on the elements provided in CFS 2012/39/7. The CFS-A4A was elaborated by an Open Ended Working Group comprising CFS stakeholders that met between July 2013 and August 2014, supported by a Technical Support Team and the CFS Secretariat. The CFS-A4A draws on technical work contributing to the State of Food Insecurity in the world (SOFI) 2010, and is informed by the outcomes of a CFS-mandated High-level Expert Forum on Food Insecurity in Protracted Crises (HLEF), held in Rome in September 2012. The CFS-A4A is based on an inclusive process of consultations and electronic discussions that took place between April 2013 and April 2014. Four electronic discussions on key topics were hosted to help inform the CFS-A4A Zero Draft. A global consultation on the Zero Draft was held in Addis Ababa in April 2014, and an electronic consultation was held in May 2014. Consultations included representatives from governments, UN agencies, civil society and non-governmental organizations, international agricultural research institutions, private sector associations and private philanthropic foundations, international and regional financial institutions. The Principles were endorsed by the CFS at its 41st Session on 15th October 2014.

ⁱⁱⁱ Recognising that the methodology deployed in SOFI 2010 (available at: <http://www.fao.org/docrep/013/i1683e/i1683e.pdf>) used three of a number of possible measurable criteria, and that the list therein is not definitive. See the CFS-A4A Online Resource Package, Appendix D ‘Glossary’ for additional information.

^{iv} See, for example, UNHCR Global Trends in persons of concern to UNHCR at mid-year, June 2013. Available at: <http://www.unhcr.org/52af08d26.html>.

^v According to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the cost to anticipate and proactively address a locust plague that threatened the livelihoods and food security of millions of families in the Sahel in 2013 was USD 8 million – less than 2 per cent of the cost of reacting to a similar crisis in 2003-2004. In addition, according to research commissioned by the United Kingdom’s Department for International Development, early action to address drought in Kenya and Ethiopia has proven to be around three times more cost-effective than traditional emergency response. Additional research by the World Bank suggests that upgrading early warning systems in developing countries not only helps save lives but also typically yield financial benefits that are up to 36 times higher than initial investment expenditure.

^{vi} The online resource package was not negotiated by the CFS and has been produced by the CFS Secretariat, supported by the CFS-A4A Technical Support Team (TST), in order to provide reference material to accompany the CFS-A4A.

^{vii} These principles are explored and expanded upon in a number of places, including the CFS endorsed “Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security (VGGT)” (available at <http://www.fao.org/docrep/016/i2801e/i2801e.pdf>).

^{viii} United Nations General Assembly A/RES/46/182 endorses humanity, impartiality and neutrality (adopted in 1991); A/RES/58/114 endorses independence (adopted in 2004). The General Assembly has repeatedly reaffirmed the importance of promoting and respecting these principles within the framework of humanitarian assistance.

^{ix} In line with categories identified in the Reform of the Committee on World Food Security (2009) document, reference to small-scale food producers or to family farmers are meant to include smallholder farmers, agriculture and food workers, artisanal fisher-folk, herders/pastoralists, indigenous peoples, the landless, urban poor, women and youth.

^x See the “Voluntary Guidelines to Support the Progressive Realization of the Right to Adequate Food in the Context of National Food Security (VGGT)” (available at: <ftp://ftp.fao.org/docrep/fao/009/y7937e/y7937e00.pdf>).

^{xi} Ibid., para 16.

^{xii} Consisting primarily of the four 1949 Geneva Conventions, the two 1977 Additional Protocols, and their commentaries.

^{xiii} See https://docs.unocha.org/sites/dms/Documents/OOM-humanitarianprinciples_eng_June12.pdf

^{xiv} Key national stakeholders include, amongst others: national governments (involving different ministries), parliaments, local authorities, traditional leaders, organisations of small-scale food producers and other civil society and community-based organisations, women’s and youth groups, associations of companies and businesses.

^{xv} Cooperation partners include, amongst others: States, intergovernmental organizations, financing institutions, donors, foundations, and funds.

^{xvi} Second Version of the GSF, October 2013, p. 46, states the five principles that should apply to monitoring and accountability systems are: a) they should be human-rights based, with particular reference to the progressive realization of the right to adequate food in the context of national food security; b) they should make it possible for decision-makers to be accountable; c) they should be participatory and include assessments that involve all stakeholders and beneficiaries, including the most vulnerable; d) they should be simple, yet comprehensive, accurate, timely and understandable to all, with indicators disaggregated by sex, age, region, etc., that capture impact, process and expected outcomes; e) they should not duplicate existing systems, but rather build upon and strengthen national statistical and analytical capacities (available at:

http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/cfs/Docs1213/gsf/GSF_Version_2_EN.pdf).