"Implications of the UNFSS on the CFS and its HLPE"
(suggestion: Possible CFS Roles in Supporting the implementation of the outcome of UN FSS)

OPTIONS PAPER

30 March 2022

1. ON THE OVERVIEW OF POST-UNFSS PROGRESS

1. The CFS should continue serving as a global platform to bring all FSN stakeholders together, to discuss in voluntary and informal manner possible ways to follow up the outcomes of UN FSS ~~providing its intergovernmental and inclusive space to **regularly discuss the follow-up to the summit**, to **review UNFSS progress reports to be prepared/issued by the UNSG,** and to **discuss those reports** with all CFS stakeholders~~ under possible different options:

    ~~a. Within the annual CFS plenary agenda;~~
    ~~b. At an extraordinary plenary, convened annually;~~
    ~~c. Through a dedicated special event within the regular plenary week;~~
    d. Through CFS plenary week side events;
    e. At a specific intersessional event.
    f. Other activities as agreed by all stakeholders, in line with CFS mandates.

Through this discussion, the UN system could also present activities of its coordination Hub in support of Members and of food systems transformation.

~~2. T**he CFS may serve as the platform for hosting or co-hosting the regular "stocktaking exercises"** planned every two years (next in 2023), with a specific and explicit link to the High Level Political Forum (HLPF).~~

3. The CFS may decide to **play no role in the overview of progress,** except that which is already envisaged of the CFS chair as part of the briefing structure (besides the RBA governing bodies and its Chairs)

2. USE OF THE CFS CONVENING POWER TO SUPPORT MEMBERS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THEIR NATIONAL PATHWAYS/STRATEGIES.

The convening power of the CFS is unique-due to its inclusive multi-stakeholder and intergovernmental composition. This convening power may serve to enhance countries' efforts with their National Pathways, in different ways.

1. **Adequately connected to the HLPF, and together with the Hub, the CFS may serve as the intergovernmental and inclusive platform**, to discuss in voluntary and informal manner possible ways to follow up the outcomes of UN FSS ~~**where interested Members and Participants, on a voluntary basis, present National Pathways/Strategies, share progress on National Pathways implementation, and exchange experiences, lessons learned, and good practices**~~**.**

~~This exercise could be linked to the Voluntary National Reviews of the 2030 Agenda.~~ This would allow Members and other stakeholders to exchange experiences in National Pathways implementations, map challenges, and encourage collaboration across governments, including South-South and Triangular cooperations, and intra-regional cooperation.

These sessions could also specifically include the (potential) use/relevance of CFS policy products in implementation of National Pathways.

This may be done:

~~a. Within the annual plenary;~~
~~b. At an extraordinary plenary, convened annually;~~
~~c. Through a dedicated Special event within the regular plenary week;~~
d. Through plenary week side events;
e. At a specific intersessional event, in July, linked to the HLPF

2. The CFS may foster a **more proactive link with financing and means of implementation (MOL)** in these exercises-e.g. Through the participation of IFIs and Regional Development Banks and the investor community.

3. **Members could use the science-backed, inclusive global CFS model as an inspiration for their National Dialogues' structure.**

4. If requested, The **CFS, through the participation of its chair of secretariat, could participate in National Dialogues** and regular meetings with Convenors, organized by the Hub. They may share its HLPE reports, agreements and products to national stakeholders on this occasion.

5. CFS **Members are invited ~~should remain committed~~** to the promotion of CFS policy products and their use in implementing National Pathways.

To this aim, CFS Members' representatives may connect the CFS with national agencies/institutions that have led Food Systems National Dialogues, and should inform about and advocate the use of pertinent CFS policy products for the implementation of their National Pathways.

3. ENGAGE WITH THE UNFSS COALITIONS

CFS may also use its convening power to **generate and increase momentum in support of the coalitions** that have emerged as a result of the UNFSS.

1. To this effect, the CFS could serve as a platform to **present-and connect-the coalitions and other multi-stakeholder initiatives** launched at the Summit, and **how they are making specific use of CFS products**. This will help strengthen and raise awareness of the work of the coalitions(especially those promoting CFS policy products, or those focusing on topics included in the CFS MYPOW), share best practices, and foster connections between existing coalitions.
   This may be done:
   ~~a. Within the annual plenary;~~
   ~~b. Through a dedicated Special event within the regular plenary week;~~
   c. Through plenary week side events;

~~2.~~ The **coalitions may use CFS policy products** as key reference frameworks and **should assist in** disseminating those CFS policy products relevant to their objectives, ~~This may be done through:~~

~~a. A **proactive outreach by the chair, Secretariat and HLPE to the Coalitions;**~~
~~b. A **commitment by CFS members and UN entities involved,** may foster coalitions to serve as "vectors" of the uptake of CFS products.~~

3. The **CFS may invite coalitions to regularly inform CFS Member and other stakeholders** of their progress, including their contributions to the dissemination and uptake of CFS products, and to discuss opportunities for collaboration.

To this effect, CFS Secretariat, the Coordination Hub and the coalitions may collaborate to carry out a mapping of the existing coalitions against the CFS policy products in order to identify which CFS policy products might be more relevant to them.

4. STRENGTHENING THE CFS-HLPE (propose: to delete this cluster)

The HLPE was established in 2009 to give the CFS a solid and independent scientific basis, making it possible to inform political decision-making in a broad and systemic way, including issues of sustainability of food systems and economic and social access to food.

The HLPE should be closely involved in the UN FSS follow-up process to ensure strong science-policy interface, to enable informed policy decisions on food systems.

There is no need to “reinvent the wheel”, instead priority may be given to:

1. **Strengthening the existing HLPE** to improve science-policy interference on food systems.

This may be done through:

a. **An increased and diversified resource-base** of the HLPE, including strengthening the financial and human resources contribution of the UN bodies, particularly RBAs;
b. **Strengthened dissemination and impact of its reports**/publications through strengthened communication and outreach, for example looking at how the IPCC manages to get massive attention and coverage when they issue a new report and recommendations. The HLPE policy recommendations have value in themselves and could be communicated directly, before CFS has negotiated policy convergence tools from them.
c. **Increased size of its steering Committee** (currently 15 members) and broaden the network of scientists involved in HLPE reports, also to include policy practitioners to facilitate implementation of the products and recommendations on the ground.
d. **Broadened review of relevant research** to inform its approach to various workstreams on which it is asked to report. Likewise, HLPE could invest more effort to consider different sources of knowledge-including grey literature and traditional knowledge of small-scale farmers, local communities and indigenous peoples.
e. **Developed initiative function** in order to be able to respond to urgent needs/issues, as well as its modeling/foresight work.
f. **Broaden its thematic scope** to reflect the connections between food systems and food security and nutrition, as reflected in the HLPE report #15,

UN entities could be more systematically engaged with the HLPE, in order to ensure their expertise is available to the HLPE Steering Committee, without HLPE losing any of its independence.

2. **Connecting the HLPE with other Science-Policy Interfaces** across the UN system

Develop synergies and strengthen links and coordination between existing science-policy interfaces that have useful expertise from a food systems transformation perspective. These include the HLPE, IPCC, IPBES, OHHLEP (One Health) and the UNCCD SPI.

This could be done:

a. As a first step, by **organizing joint events** bringing together the SPIs.

b. Later, by **developing joint flagship reports every two or three years.**
c. Making the HLPE **serve as a platform for other global panels of experts** on FSN and food systems, beyond the UN ones.

To this effect, the HLPE secretariat could also map relevant global initiatives and platforms or global panels of experts that are already in place aiming to enhance dissemination of knowledge and scientific evidence in the area of food security and nutrition (e.g. GLOPAN, GNR, IPES-Food, etc.) and increase interaction between them and the HLPE. This could broaden the capacity as well as the spectrum of activities, evidence based recommendations, as well as research and analytical capacity of the HLPE.

The above may also include UN hosted evidence based initiatives, such as the Hand-in-Hand initiative geospatial platform. Mapping existing agrifood platforms and coalitions with complementary objectives to those of the CFS, HLPE could suggest modalities for establishing more continuous relations and dialogues with such platforms. However, HLPE should not overlap but coordinate with the work of other global and regional panels.

5. STRENGTHEN DIALOGUE AND COORDINATION WITH RELEVANT GLOBAL, REGIONAL AND SUBREGIONAL FORA; AND AMONG REGIONAL AND SUB-REGIONAL STAKEHOLDERS (propose to combine with cluster 2)

1. The CFS and the HLPE ~~need **more presence in the liaison offices of the RBAs and UN hubs,** particularly with UN NY and UN Geneva. For example, the CFS~~ and the HLPE could consider organizing public events in UN hubs- in collaboration with the UN Food Systems Coordination Hub and other relevant Agencies- at side events and at the HLPF and other major intergovernmental meetings (e.g. Climate, Desertification and Biodiversity COPs) (FAO).

2. The CFS may explore ways to disseminate its products ~~**strengthen its presence at regional and sub-regional levels,** and sub-regionals actors on the work of CFS~~.
In this regard, CFS may hold special events, also linked to other major events (such as G20,G7,G77,COPs,etc.) in order to gather high level political and media interest; and it should also consider organization of events at regional levels, to reach out to regional and national stakeholders.

3. CFS may also **foster participation in and reinforce collaboration with regional fora**, including UN Regional Sustainable Development Forums, FAO Regional Conferences and other relevant regional events.

4. The CFS **may support the development of regional preparatory events-in advance of CFS plenaries**- where discussions and consultations are grounded in the

reality of the countries in order to strengthen the sharing of experiences towards creating of strategic alliances for implementation.

5. Where possible and relevant, there could be strong**er interaction between CFS and FAO technical committees** that provide policy guidance on issues relating to food security and nutrition, such as the Committee on Agriculture (COAG), Committee on Fisheries (COFI), Committee on Forestry (COFO), nd Committee on Commodity Problems (CCP).

6. The CFS may **support stakeholders to convene at regional and national levels.**

6. REINFORCE COLLABORATION WITH THE COORDINATION HUB AND THE UN SYSTEM AT LARGE (propose to combine with cluster 2)

1. CFS should **deepen the collaboration with the RBAs,** as this would contribute to a more secure resource basis and more scope for action for CFS.

   The CFS Secretariat, working closely with the RBAs, **should link CFS policy products to relevant areas of work of the RBAs and other UN agencies**- for instance, linking CFS policy products with FAO's Operations and FAO programme Priority Areas.

   The CFS Secretariat, working closely with the coordination Hub, may also do a mapping of existing National Pathways and coalitions against CFS policy products in order to identify which policy products might be more relevant in each case.

~~2. **The coordination Hub include the CFS secretariat's participation**. The CFS mechanisms could also act as the intended Hub's stakeholder Advisory Group.~~

3. The coordination Hub should **sensitize Members to use CFS policy products** and build national capacities to deloy them, in relation to National Pathway implementation.

4. In order to promote implementation of CFS policy products in support of Members' implementation of their National Pathways, **the Coordination Hub should offer concrete guidance to Members how to use CFS policy products** to address their national priorities and to enrich their National Pathways, to strengthen their use in support of nationally led processes.

5. **The Hub Steering Committee should regularly inform the CFS Chair and Members of the contribution of the Hub to the implementation of CFS** policy products.

6. RBAs should **strengthen linkages between their operations and CFS policy guidance-** for instance FAO should map CFS policy products to relevant programme priorities areas (FAO).

7. RBAs should use their expertise to **underpin CFS products with more practical examples** in order to assist Members in applying those products and translating them into practical actions.

8. RBAs could **further the presentation of CFS work and products to their respective country offices,** and carry out a mapping of CFS products against country priorities and country programming frameworks. RBAs country offices could also strengthen their support to countries in engaging with HLPE and CFS.