



COMMITTEE ON WORLD FOOD SECURITY

Fifty-first Session
"Making a Difference in Food Security and Nutrition"

Rome, Italy, 23-27 October 2023

MONITORING CFS POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS ON PRICE VOLATILITY AND FOOD SECURITY AND ON SOCIAL PROTECTION FOR FOOD SECURITY AND NUTRITION: SECRETARIAT'S ANALYSIS OF THE CONTRIBUTIONS RECEIVED

I. SUMMARY

1. The Committee on World Food Security (CFS) policy recommendations on [Price Volatility and Food Security](#) and on [Social Protection for Food Security & Nutrition](#) were endorsed at CFS 37 in 2011, and at CFS 39 in 2012, respectively. They provide a comprehensive set of interconnected and complementary policy recommendations to address price volatility through related appropriate and coherent policies, actions, tools and institutions to manage risks linked to excessive price volatility in agriculture; and to improve living conditions and resilience of vulnerable populations through social protection systems.
2. The CFS Secretariat issued two calls to its stakeholders to share their “individual” experiences in using these two sets of policy recommendations and reflect on the results of relevant multistakeholder events organized. Inputs received will inform a monitoring event expected to take place at CFS 51. This event will take stock of the uptake of the two sets of CFS policy recommendations.
3. A total of 46 contributions were received from a wide range of stakeholders in response to the call for inputs issued by the CFS through the Global Forum on Food Security and Nutrition (FSN). Out of these, 29 provided relevant and complete information and were used to compile the analysis presented in this report. One of 29 submissions documented the results of multistakeholder events organized to discuss the use and application of the policy recommendations of Social Protection for Food Security and Nutrition which is summarized in chapter IV.

4. Of the 28 contributions received to document “individual” experiences on the use and application of the two sets of policy recommendations, there were twenty national level, two at the regional level, and six at global level. Among the contributors five were from UN organizations, four from governments, five from civil society/non-governmental organizations (CSOs/NGOs), two from academia, and one from private sector. Ten contributions out of 28 were jointly submitted, and one contribution came from “other” constituencies (see chapter III. a).
5. The contributions documented how the sets of policy recommendations were used and how their experiences were related to the recommendations, in a wide spectrum of situations characterized by different contexts, needs and priorities.
6. Submissions documented several good practices that contributed to the successful use of the two sets of policy recommendations. Examples included a multistakeholder approaches with the participation of all actors at all levels, including affected and vulnerable population, in the design, implementation and monitoring of the activities. To this end, well-defined responsibilities and accountability for the achievement of agreed common objectives and the design of a common “roadmap” to apply these sets of policy recommendations and provide support were required.
7. A significant number of contributions highlight the importance of strong engagement and support of UN Organizations, CSOs/NGOs, academia and other technical agencies for empowering stakeholders by providing them with capacity building trainings, technical workshops and practical tools for increasing stakeholders’ capacity to framing policies and programmes, and facilitating their integration into national, regional and global legal frameworks.
8. Finally, stakeholders’ recommendations included: a call for efforts in mobilizing financial resources be strengthened; the support to stakeholders in the implementation of these policy recommendations be increased; and the need to focus on strengthening the resilience of vulnerable populations and their preparedness to react to future shocks.
9. The report is based on voluntary contributions that document experiences in using the two sets of policy recommendations on *Price Volatility and Food Security and Social Protection for Food Security and Nutrition*. It does not provide baselines for future monitoring but establishes a reference by providing information on what is being done, where, and by whom. It is part of CFS’ role to promote accountability and good practice¹.

II. BACKGROUND

Context and rationale

10. At a time of unprecedented threats to food security and nutrition, in a dynamically evolving global environment, the current global food crisis is impacting food security at all levels and affecting the most vulnerable hardest. As such, price volatility appears as a challenge. Adverse effects on household incomes and purchasing power push vulnerable people into hunger and poverty. In this context, social protection mechanisms and programmes gain particular attraction as a means to mitigate vulnerability and to tackle food insecurity and hunger for households and individuals.
11. In 2010, in response to the 2008 food crisis, the CFS requested the High-Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition (HLPE-FSN) to develop a report on price volatility that covers “*all of its causes and consequences, including market distorting practices and links to financial markets, and appropriate and coherent policies, actions, tools and institutions to manage the risks linked to excessive price volatility in agriculture*”².

¹ CFS Reform Document, para.6 (ii), CFS: 2009/2 Rev.2.

² CFS HLPE-FSN #1. 2011. [Price Volatility and Food Security](#)

12. In the same year (2010), the CFS requested the HLPE-FSN to work on social protection on “*ways to lessen vulnerability through social and productive safety net programs and policies with respect to food and nutritional security, taking into consideration differing conditions across countries and regions*³”.
13. Both these HLPE-FSN reports were requested to reflect - on the one hand - how vulnerable nations and populations can ensure access to food when volatility causes market disruptions, and – on the other hand – to report on the impact and benefits of social protection mechanisms for the improvement of living conditions and resilience of vulnerable populations, including for improving local production and livelihoods. Price volatility is understood to pose a threat to food security. To mitigate this issue, a combination of various instruments, including social protection, can be considered towards achieving food security and nutrition.

The CFS stocktaking event on Price Volatility and Food Security, and Social Protection for Food Security and Nutrition

14. As requested during the CFS 50 Plenary Session in October 2022, and subsequently agreed by the Bureau on 26 January 2023, the Committee will hold a stocktaking event at CFS 51, in October 2023, to monitor the use and application of two sets of its policy recommendations:

Set 1: [Price Volatility and Food Security](#) (endorsed in 2011, CFS 37)

Set 2: [Social Protection for Food Security and Nutrition](#) (endorsed in 2012, CFS 39)

15. The two selected policy recommendations are primarily targeted at governments, supporting their efforts to design public policies to enhance food security and nutrition, with particular focus on the most vulnerable populations, and to achieve food security and nutrition for all, advancing the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. They can also be used by other stakeholders, e.g. intergovernmental and regional organizations, including UN agencies, civil society organizations (CSOs) and non-governmental organizations (NGOs), private sector, academia, international financial institutions and philanthropic foundations.
16. **Set 1** of the CFS policy recommendations on [Price Volatility and Food Security](#) stems from the [first report](#) produced by the HLPE-FSN. The resulting policy recommendations, negotiated and then adopted by the Committee in 2011, highlight a series of *action points* that Members and appropriate stakeholders should consider to address the structural causes of food price volatility and ensure that its impact do not undermine producers and consumers’ right to food: actions to increase food production and availability; to enhance resilience to shocks; reduce volatility; mitigate the negative impacts of volatility.
17. **Set 2** of the CFS policy recommendations on [Social Protection for Food Security and Nutrition](#) stems from a [HLPE-FSN report #4](#). The resulting policy recommendations negotiated and then adopted by the Committee in 2012 highlight a series of *action points* addressed to Members and relevant stakeholders should consider to support vulnerable populations, especially in time of crisis: actions to design and implement, or strengthen, comprehensive, nationally-owned, context-sensitive social protection systems for food security and nutrition; ensure that social protection systems embrace a strategy that maximize impact on resilience and food security and nutrition; improve the use of social protection interventions to address vulnerability to acute and chronic food insecurity. These policy recommendations also underline the importance of social protection programmes for food security and nutrition being guided by human rights standards to support the progressive realization of the Right to Adequate Food in the context of National Food Security.

³ CFS HLPE-FSN #4. 2011. [Social Protection for Food Security](#)

18. In preparation for CFS 51 in October 2023, CFS issued a *call for inputs* (from February 2023 to May 2023) for reporting on the adoption and adaptation of these two sets of CFS policy recommendations. The call was open to all CFS stakeholders to inform the preparation of the stocktaking event in October 2023, ensuring a comprehensive, inclusive and transparent review of all actions related to the implementation of these policy recommendations.
19. The call for inputs invited stakeholders to:
- a) document “individual” experiences in applying the two sets of policy recommendations by one group of stakeholders (e.g. a member, civil society, or the private sector);
 - b) share the results of multi-stakeholder events organized at national, regional and global levels to discuss experiences and good practices in applying the two sets of policy recommendations.
20. This report summarizes the inputs received from stakeholders. It outlines experiences shared in using, adapting and applying these two sets of policy recommendations; key catalysts, constraints and challenges; results obtained; good practices to be shared with CFS stakeholders; and anticipated future uses of the CFS policy recommendations.

III. SUMMARY OF STAKEHOLDER CONTRIBUTIONS ON THE USE AND APPLICATION OF THE TWO SETS OF POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

a) Overview of the inputs received

21. A total 46 contributions were received in response to the call for inputs. Out of these, 29 provided relevant and complete information (submitted using the requested template) and were used to compile the analysis presented in this report. One of them documented the results of multistakeholder events organized to discuss the use and application of the two sets of CFS policy recommendations. The list of contributions is provided in **Annex 1**. The multistakeholder event is summarized in chapter IV.
22. Of the 28 contributions received to document individual experiences on the use and application of the two sets of policy recommendations, 20 were at a national level, two at regional level and six at global level⁴.
23. The most represented region in the national experiences was Africa with six contributions, followed by Latin-American and the Caribbean with a total of five contributions, Near East with four contributions, Asia and the Pacific with three contributions, and Europe and Central Asia with two contributions.
24. Five 5 contributions were received from UN organizations, four from governments, five from CSOs/NGOs, two from academia, and one from private sector. A total of ten 10 contributions were jointly submitted by several constituencies, specifically: three contributions were *jointly* submitted by government and UN organization; two contributions by CSOs/NGOs and academia; one contribution was jointly submitted by government and academia; one by government, UN organization and CSOs/NGOs; one by government, UN organization and donor; one by private sector and academia; and one by government, Civil Society/NGOs, private sector and other (Association for the advancement of aboriginal people and their original knowledge (ADACO)). One contribution came from “*other*”: a freelance agro-journalist.

⁴ The full compilation of contributions is made available on the CFS 51 webpage.

b) Policy recommendations most frequently used

25. All the policy recommendations included in the two sets of CFS policy recommendations on *Price Volatility and food security*, and *Social protection for food security and nutrition* are critical to address the structural causes of food price volatility and ensure that its impact do not undermine producers and consumers' right to food; and to design and implement, or strengthen, social protection systems for food security and nutrition, respectively. Contributions gathered within framework of this monitoring exercise underlines the continued relevance of the policy recommendations of both policy products.
26. From the contributions received, the policy recommendations on *Social Protection for Food Security and Nutrition*, were reflected in 17 submissions, whereas experiences on the use and application of policy recommendations on *Price Volatility and Food Security* were showcased in three contributions. Eight contributions shared examples of the use of both sets of policy recommendations.
27. Sixteen of the total submissions highlighted specific recommendations of particular relevance to their experience. Table (1) below details the specific recommendations under each policy-set that have inspired application and use.

Table 1: policy recommendations most frequently used.

Sets of CFS policy recommendations		Specific recommendations found most useful
Set 1	Price Volatility and Food Security	a, c, d, e, g, j
Set 2	Social Protection for Food Security and Nutrition	A1, A3; B1, B2, B3, B4; C3, C5; D2, D3

Note: The same recommendations were mentioned in more than one contribution

c) Results - how were these policy recommendations used

28. The experiences documented in the contributions had different objectives, and showed that these two sets of policy recommendations were used in different ways:

- **Awareness raising:** many awareness raising activities informed by these policy recommendations were implemented, including holding small to large scale events and activities such as workshops, seminars, technical group discussions and consultations to influence several decision-making processes.

Examples of quantitative results: In Armenia, as part of a “Cash Plus” project, agricultural inputs and trainings were provided to 802 people, of which 116 people (of which 60% were women) attended trainings on nutrition, hygiene, financial literacy, food security and safety. These interventions led to households improving their knowledge of healthy diets, agricultural production; increased livestock as well as agricultural sales activities; and maintaining their dietary diversity despite the COVID-19 pandemic challenges.

A number of awareness raising activities organized by CSOs have been informed by the two sets of policy recommendations on Price Volatility and Food Security, and Social Protection for Food Security and Nutrition.

- **Capacity development:** A series of capacity development activities and trainings supported by governments, UN Organizations - in particular FAO, CSOs/NGOs, and other specialized agencies and international institutes were documented. These included, holding of trainings and workshops, providing participants with technical tools and materials, as well as the sharing of experiences and good practices. These efforts aimed at enabling vulnerable populations to take actions to influence

policies that support their livelihoods and economies. Capacity development activities were, in most cases, implemented in tandem with awareness raising activities.

Examples of quantitative results: In Honduras, Nigeria and Rwanda, the international Fund for Agriculture Development (IFAD), under the Climate and Commodity Hedging to Enable Transformation (CACHET) project, provided several trainings to small producer organizations (SPOs): 11 SPOs in Rwanda, four SPOs in Honduras, and one SPO in Nigeria. These capacity development trainings aimed at: reducing income vulnerability related to price risk and climate change; mainstreaming revenue protection against price risk and climate change; and fostering mechanisms to reduce price volatility. These trainings included the provision of: knowledge on risk management; price risk management dash board; how SPOs can protect and insure themselves against sudden price fluctuations; how reducing SPOs losses and offer more stable incomes; improving SPOs' confidence to invest in productivity; reporting to international buyers and consolidating the relationships within the value chains.

In Ethiopia and Pakistan, the World Food Programme (WFP), in close collaboration with national authorities, conducted a number of capacity development trainings to national authorities around the *Fill the Nutrient Gap* (FNG) cost and affordability analytical component (Ethiopia); and associated service delivery trainings were also given to over 1,500 government officials (Pakistan).

- **Development/assessment of projects, national strategies, plans of action, legislative or policy framework or initiatives:** A number of projects, programmes, national strategies, plans of actions, and legislative and policy frameworks were informed by, or in line with, the sets of policy recommendations of this monitoring exercise, aiming at strengthening the social protection of target communities and facilitating access to food when volatility causes market disruptions.

Examples of quantitative results: In Philippines, the use of these policy recommendations was particularly relevant with the disruptions to livelihoods, food security and nutrition caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. In order to mitigate these stresses for the most vulnerable, in December 2021, FAO in partnership with the Provincial Government of Catanduanes, distributed a multi-purpose grant to 1,072 smallholders farmers and fisher folks not covered by any social protection programme, reducing the negative impacts of the pandemic on food security and nutrition.

In Bangladesh, Kenya, Myanmar, Tanzania, the CFS policy recommendations on Social Protection were found of particular relevance and inspired the *Enhancing Nutrition Services to Improve Maternal and Child Health* (ENRICH) programming experience and achievements. With the aim of improving the health and nutritional status of mothers, new-borns, and children (MNCH) and contribute to the reduction of maternal and child mortality in the selected countries, ENRICH directly reached an estimated 2,475,210 men, women, boys and girls, ensuring social protection for those who are in areas with sub-optimal level of essential health and nutrition services, and lower levels of adoption of key households practices. Additionally, ENRICH equipped 640 public health facilities across the four countries with equipment and supplies.

- **Development of research papers and analytical studies:** Both two sets of policy recommendations were particularly relevant to develop comprehensive research papers, and analytical studies on issues around social protection systems at country level recognising the linkages between agriculture and social protection, including to identify gaps and entry points.

Example of quantitative results: in Zambia, a number of analytical *studies* were undertaken in line with the CFS policy recommendations to highlight a series of issues such as the impacts of cash transfers; strengthening coherence between agriculture and social protection; impacts of home grown school feeding and conservation agriculture; livelihoods profiles of rural households to support design of social protection interventions; microsimulation of distributional impacts of social protection and

agricultural policies; and supporting a feasibility study on social insurance for small- scale farmers with International Labour Organization (ILO).

Both set of CFS policy recommendations have informed a number of Civil Society and Indigenous Peoples (CSIPM) reports and recommendations highlighting the importance of taking urgent measures at global, regional and national levels, to address the multiple crisis at play, and recommended urgent actions to cope with the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic before, and the impacts of the conflict in Ukraine on food, fuel and fertilizers prices.

- **Formulation and implementation of specific national and regional programmes and strategies:** formulation and implementation of specific national and regional strategies for fostering support to the most vulnerable were showcased in a number of submissions.

Example of quantitative results: In Uganda, the CFS policy recommendations on Social Protection for Food Security and Nutrition, were found particularly relevant in the implementation of the “Strengthening Shock Responsive Systems in Karamoja” (PRO-ACT) project, started in 2020 and ongoing, to support capacity strengthening efforts of the Governments of Uganda to reduce, anticipate and rapidly respond to the effect of shocks and sustain climate-resilient rural development. It improved local and national systems and capacity to effectively prepare for and mitigate the impacts of shocks on food security and nutrition which resulted in a number of communities and households in Karamoja benefitting from early warning information systems which led to anticipatory actions reducing vulnerabilities to shocks.

In Brazil, national public policies and programmes have been implemented with the objective of assisting government actions to guarantee the internal supply and income for rural producers, and ensuring rural women’s access to several services such as productive promotion programs, rural credit programmes, technical assistance and rural extension services, water infrastructure support programmes, processing and industrialization of food, public procurement programmes for family farming local, and national and international markets. In particular, under the *Acquisition of Food – Public Purchase* programme, of the total funds allocated to the acquisition of food by the public bodies and entities of the government, a percentage of 30% is destined to purchase agricultural products from family farmers and their organizations. The products are purchased at the prevailing market price, guaranteeing a fair return to family farmers. At the beginning of 2023, around 2,302 tons of food produced by 2,874 family farmers and purchased by the government (around US\$ 1.56 million) were delivered/donated to people in situation of vulnerability/food insecurity, public hospitals and schools.

- **Establishment of effective farmers’ registration methods:** The establishment of effective registration methods for farmers were informed by the CFS policy recommendations for Social Protection. Registration methods aim to improve the social protection systems for food systems workers, foster farmers’ access to services, facilities and other social securities and highlight the need to address immediate impacts on income, food security and nutrition.

Example of quantitative results: In Nepal, 17 Local Governments institutionalized a Farmer ID Card (FID) developed by CARE Nepal (under the 2004 Nepal’s National Agriculture Policy) focused on categorizing farmers to increase agricultural productivity and food security. This project reached 52,000 farmers. Twenty-nine percent were categorized as poor and marginalized and as a result received subsidized production inputs; and 546 households received land leases for contract farming.

In Lebanon, the Ministry of Agriculture, with the support of FAO, developed a National Farmers Registry (FR), linked to the CFS policy recommendations, that aim to set up a farmer registration system, using appropriate vulnerability assessment tools, to provide conditional cash assistance to farmers and facilitate participation in social insurance schemes.

- **Investments** (by governments, international institutions, private sector or CSOs/NGOs): the submissions showcased experiences reflecting on investments made by governments, international

institutions, private sector or CSOs/NGOs in favour of agricultural and food workers, in particular smallholders, including youth and women.

Example of quantitative results: In Pakistan, over the next 3 years, 1.7 million safety net beneficiaries will receive an integrated package of food, health, supplementary cash, and nutrition interventions to prevent chronic malnutrition. Given the positive impact of the ongoing programme, the Government confirmed its commitment, and the programme has been fully funded with national investments since 2022.

d) Reported key catalysts to successful adoption and/or adaptation

29. The contributions highlighted a number of external factors that have positively influenced the results obtained, and were conducive to positive outcomes of the use of these two sets of policy recommendations:

- The most often mentioned external factor was the **priority given by key stakeholders**, such as governments, **to address price volatility issues and the immediate impacts on income, food security and nutrition**, while concurrently strengthening the resilience of individuals, households, communities and institutions to future shocks;
- **Favourable political environments** reflected in national and regional strategies to provide support to the most vulnerable by ensuring access to services, facilities, and social security was also underscored as catalysts, as well as the importance of **multistakeholder dialogues, partnerships, collaboration and cooperation among key stakeholders** to develop and implement strategic plans addressing price volatility issues and social protection programmes' gaps;
- **Well-designed policies, programmes and strategies** were documented as key elements that foster poverty reduction towards achieving food security and nutrition;
- The **engagement and commitment of governments'**, particularly post COVID-19 pandemic, in expanding their social protection schemes, including with a long term vision of creating an ecosystem of registries that allow coherent, reliable and timely provision of social protection for the population was reported as a key catalyst; moreover, the **intensive engagement of other relevant stakeholders** such as UN Organizations, CSOs/NGOs, and other technical agencies in providing support through organization of technical training courses and capacity building activities was also key to influence the use of the CFS policy recommendations;
- **The existence of food and market information systems** was documented as key catalyst;
- **Continued advocacy** provided by technical organizations and agencies to establish **business continuity at managerial level in governments** and **coordination mechanisms** to ensure access to services, facilities and social security.

e) Reported key constraints and challenges to uptake and/or use

30. This section provides an overview of the constraints and challenges using these two sets of policy recommendations:

- **Insufficient financial and technical support** to apply the policy recommendations, including for transforming the theoretical concepts of the policy recommendations into practical actions adapted to specific contextually relevant needs, contributing to the sustainability of public policies and programmes;
- **Lack of well-defined accountability and effective multistakeholder coordination mechanisms** between multiple government sectors at all levels and with all actors involved;

- **Weak provision of adequate technical trainings and capacity building activities** in particular for smallholder farmers;
- **Absence of an enabling environment** to implement these policy recommendations;
- **Lack of business continuity** at managerial level in governments and ministries and **lack of government extension services in remote areas**, which created issues in scaling up the interventions at local level;
- **Market power imbalances and information asymmetries;**
- **Low awareness of the existence** of the two sets of CFS policy recommendations;
- **Low political will and commitment** to implement the policy recommendations;
- **Poor infrastructure** which disadvantages the agricultural activities of smallholders, in particular of those living in rural and remote areas;
- Difficulty in outreaching and registering farmers in order to provide financial assistance and facilitate their participation in social insurance schemes;
- **The COVID-19 pandemic, climate change, conflicts, crisis** and shocks, which caused disruptions to livelihoods affecting food security and nutrition.

f) [Highlights on some good practices](#)

31. The contributions also outlined good practices that contributed to positive experiences in using the two sets of policy recommendations on Price Volatility and Food Security, and on Social Protection for Food Security and Nutrition. These include:

- **Multistakeholder approaches bringing together all relevant stakeholders, in an inclusive and participatory manner**, such as government and non-government actors, parliaments, academia, research institutions, affected and local communities, including women and youth, CSOs/NGOs, the private sector, with **well-defined responsibilities and accountability** for the achievement of agreed **common objectives** and to design a common “roadmap” to apply the sets of CFS policy recommendations and provide support to all, particularly the most vulnerable;
- Implementation of **assessment programmes** to identify target people on the ground and **develop context-specific strategies** to address the key issues identified through the assessment programmes;
- **Mobilization of financial resources** to support stakeholders in the implementation of these policy recommendations, and also to strengthen early warning efforts at the national and local levels to allow anticipatory and early decision-making processes for prompt reaction to shocks;
- **Empowerment of all stakeholders**, enabling them to actively engage in the use of the policy recommendations in national and regional policies and programmes through:
 - conducting capacity building activities, including technical and thematic dialogues and webinars, for relevant stakeholders to raise awareness of these CFS policy recommendations and enhance participants/stakeholders’ capacity to influence policy-makers and implement specific policies on the ground;

- developing tools and instruments contextualizing the policy recommendations and adjusting them to the specific realities also taking into account the available resources.
- **Generation of evidence, such as guiding and supporting tools, on good practices and lesson learned** on the implementation of these policy recommendations in order to facilitate a replication of the experience, and inform and foster future programming;
- Monitoring and evaluation processes on the use and application of the two sets of policy recommendations and their update to accommodate evolving global, regional and national needs;
- **Advocacy** provided by technical organizations and agencies to establish **business continuity at managerial level in governments** and **coordination mechanisms** to increase awareness and foster the implementation of these policy recommendations.

g) [Next steps to enhance further use of the two sets of policy recommendations](#)

32. The response to the call for input emphasized the ongoing commitment of stakeholders to utilize the two sets of policy guidance for informing public policies, programmes, and strategies aimed at enhancing food security and nutrition. A forward-looking approach to promoting the policy recommendations on Price Volatility and Food Security, as well as Social Protection for Food Security and Nutrition, particularly at the onset of initiatives across various contexts promoting stronger synergies among key actors seems apparent and is foreseen.

IV. SUMMARY OF A STAKEHOLDER CONTRIBUTION ON AN EVENT ORGANIZED TO DISCUSS AND/OR DISSEMINATE THE TWO SETS OF POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

E 1. Universal Social Protection (USP) 2030 Working Group and Food Systems Summit Coalition on Social Protection and Food Systems Transformation

The Food Systems Summit (FSS) Coalition and the Universal Social Protection (USP) 2030 Working Group (WG) on Social Protection and Food Systems Transformation was established in the aftermath of the United Nations Food Systems Summit (FSS) held in September 2021 in response to the growing recognition of social protection's role to support global food systems' transformation and the need to advance this agenda beyond the Summit. The objectives of the FSS Coalition and USP2030 WG, which aim to improve the adequacy and comprehensiveness, as well as the coverage, quality, and responsiveness of social protection systems, are all fully aligned with the CFS policy recommendations and contribute to "*lessen vulnerability through social and productive safety net programs and policies with respect to food and nutritional security, taking into consideration differing conditions across countries and regions*", HLPE#4).

Since its establishment in addition to convening several meetings with its members, the FSS Coalition and USP2030 WG has organized events, webinars and symposium focused on delineating the linkages between social protection and food systems to create long-lasting, positive changes in the nutritional status of people across the globe.

Participants include representatives from a wide range of stakeholders that have been collectively working to forge and enhance the linkages and synergies between national social protection and food systems.

The CFS policy recommendations provided critical background and guided the activities of the Coalition/WG as they provide key recommendations to address the structural causes of food price volatility and ensure that its impacts do not undermine small and marginal producers' and consumers' right to food.

V. Conclusions and recommendations

33. The contributions provided concrete examples on the continued relevance of the two sets of CFS policy recommendations on *Price Volatility and Food Security, and on Social Protection for Food Security and Nutrition* for addressing a number of food security and nutrition challenges. They

outlined how these policy recommendations were implemented and highlighted how initiatives align with the policy recommendations. More specifically:

34. The empowerment of all stakeholders, through awareness raising activities and capacity building trainings, is key to enable them to actively engage and draw on the CFS policy recommendations in national and regional policies and programme settings.
35. Robust and comprehensive national social protection systems can address vulnerabilities and ensure access to food. To best respond to needs, efforts to strengthen social protection systems should be inclusive, responsive to crises, and consider factors like price volatility and pandemics.
36. Critical to implement the policy recommendations remains resources to support stakeholders towards adapting these global policy products through practical tools to meet context specific needs.
37. Effective cooperation and policy coordination at national, regional and global level are vital for addressing price volatility, ensuring food security, and realizing the right to adequate food including through robust social protection systems. To this end, the involvement of relevant actors and organizations with complimentary mandates and competencies at all levels and across sectors is encouraged. The CFS can contribute to its role as a science-based platform for collaboration, knowledge sharing, and consensus-building among stakeholders.
38. The Committee and its stakeholders should intensify efforts towards promoting and advocating for CFS policy products, including these two sets of policy recommendations, at all levels.

VI. Annex

Contributions documenting the use of the CFS policy recommendations on Price Volatility, and Social Protection, at different levels

<i>CONTRIBUTIONS DOCUMENTING EXPERIENCES IN THE USE AND APPLICATION OF THE TWO SETS OF POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS</i>
Country level contributions
Africa
A 1. Central African Republic. IPC pour la sécurité alimentaire
A 2. Congo. Experience on the use of the Policy Recommendations on Price Volatility, and Social Protection in Congo
A 3. Gabon. Application des recommandations du CFS par le Gabon, à savoir: la volatilité des prix et la sécurité alimentaire et la protection sociale pour la sécurité alimentaire et la nutrition
A 4. Nigeria. Experience on the use of the Policy Recommendations on Price Volatility, and Social Protection in Nigeria
A 5. Uganda. Improving Impact in the Resilience and Social Protection Agenda in Uganda
A 6. Zambia. Leveraging the Zambia's national social protection system to expand coverage, address the COVID-19 pandemic impacts on incomes, food security and nutrition, while strengthening resilience
Asia and the Pacific
P 1. India. Soil Health Card Scheme
P 2. Nepal. Categorization based farmer's identification card
P 3. Philippines. Leveraging the Philippines' national social protection system to expand coverage, address the COVID-19 pandemic impacts on incomes, food security and nutrition, while strengthening resilience
Europe and Central Asia
EcA 1. Armenia. Leveraging Cash Plus approach to improve food security and nutrition of the most vulnerable rural population
EcA 2. Romania. Experience on the use of the Policy Recommendations on Price Volatility, and Social Protection
Near East
N 1. Lebanon. A women's cooperative agricultural production and marketing in Badnayel - Zadat Al-Khairat LLC
N 2. Lebanon. Enhancing resilient livelihoods and food security of host communities and Syrian refugees in Lebanon through the promotion of sustainable agricultural development
N 3. Palestine. Food and nutrition security policy and investment plan in Palestine
N 4. Sudan. Opening discounted sales windows. Developing a food security policy that included reducing production costs in order to reduce and control prices
Latin America and the Caribbean
L 1. Bolivia (Plurinational State of). Proceso de Consulta y Concertación emprendido por el Comité Nacional de la Agricultura familiar (Ministerio de Desarrollo Rural y Tierras, y la Coordinadora de Integración de las Organizaciones Economicas Campesinas, CIOEC-Bolivia)
L 2. Brazil. Public Policies on Food Security and Nutrition
L 3. Chile. Microbancos de alimentos saludables
L 4. Peru. Peru's National Policy for Social Development and Inclusion
L 5. Paraguay. Linking social protection, economic inclusion and climate adaptation: the case of Paraguay's National Social Protection Strategy
Regional level contributions
R 1. Africa. Réduire le bradage des terres rurales des périphéries urbaines
R 2. Asia and the Pacific. Link between farmer to make constable volatility
Global level contributions
G 1. Digital Agriculture Expert
G 2. Enhancing Nutrition Services to Improve Maternal and Child Health (ENRICH)
G 3. Globalization of wheat price and its control
G 4. Experience on the use and application of the CFS policy recommendations on Price Volatility and Social Protection

G 5. Price Risk Management training to SPOs under IFAD project. The Climate and Commodity Hedging to Enable Transformation (CACHET)

G 6. Strengthening food security and nutrition sensitive social protection: WFP support to Ethiopia and Pakistan
--

<i>CONTRIBUTIONS DOCUMENTING MULTISTAKEHOLDER EVENTS ORGANIZED ON THE USE AND APPLICATION OF THE TWO SETS OF POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS</i>
--

E 1. Universal Social Protection (USP)2030 Working Group and Food Systems Summit Coalition on Social Protection and Food Systems Transformation
