

gFSC SAG & Global Network Against Food Crisis, TSU – Meeting Minutes – 16th of June 2020	
Global network against food crises	<p>Since the gFSC Partners Meeting in November 2019 and May 2020, several gFSC partners have asked to know more about the GNAFC and how/if international NGOs can be involved and play a key role. The gFSC team therefore invited the GNAFC’s Technical Support Unit (TSU) to meet the SAG; some of the main questions the NGOs have can be answered during this meeting, and the notes published on the gFSC website for future reference.</p> <p>Attendance Luca Russo (senior steering group of the GNAFC) Lavinia Antonaci (technical officer, technical coordinator of the TSU) Hugh Macleman (TSU – working on governance) Riccardo Suppo (gFSC team member in the TSU) Elisa (WFP SAG, sitting in Alite – partnership) Emily Farr (Oxfam – emergency FSL unit – SAG Dec 2020) Fabien Tellac (FSC CC – Haiti, rep of CCs) Katie Rickard (REACH – SAG) Thomas (Global Livelihoods and FS specialist of NRC) Bruno Minjauw – Global FSC coordinator Davide Rossi – gFSC team member</p> <p>Introduction by TSU (Luca Russo)</p> <p>The GNAFC is an initiative of a political nature, with many stakeholders with different expectations but working together on the same issues. TSU has been operational since February 2020 – despite C19 challenges, the pandemic is also seen as a useful opportunity for analysis. GNAFC was initiated by the EU and driven forward together with WFP/FAO; now the US is also ready to support. Weak point: certain areas have never been fully discussed (e.g. governance), membership not defined, relationship with gFSC and partners; it was difficult to define it before the stakeholders were fully on board. Clearer definition of roles/governance to come in the coming weeks; senior steering group cannot be only donors and UN, needs to have representation of civil society organizations too. Small team supporting governance will be in touch with SAG to understand the expectations of SAG members to improve the structure. GNAFC work is extremely relevant to what the gFSC is doing, there are already opportunities but must be developed further. This is the beginning of the consultation process.</p> <p>Presentation (TSU – Riccardo Suppo) Overview on working modalities, priorities and achievements</p> <p>Composition: A steering group is in charge of supervising the work of the TSU (FAO and WFP members from various sectors); a senior steering group reports to the Principals. Three dimensions of work:</p>

- A. Understanding food crises
- B. Strategic investments for responding to/mitigating food crises
- C. Going beyond food (WASH, health, social cohesion, etc.)

Roles:

Steering committee: Advocacy & partnership, define strategic direction, supervise the work of the TSU and validate it;

TSU: promote the three-by-three approach (three dimensions above) at different levels (global, regional, country); TSU is the operational arm of the GNAFC.

Main achievements for 2020, by dimension:

A

1. Best-known product is the 4th edition of the Global Report on Food Crises
2. Regional reports (e.g. IGAD)
3. Security council updates
4. Supported countries on analysis (IPC/CH)

B

1. Promoting operational convergence around common objectives – area-based coordination on SDG 2 (Chad experience)
2. Haiti and Mali
3. Resource allocation analysis on humanitarian/development work
4. Improved collective programme design

C

1. Formal and informal briefings to the UNSC on starvation as consequence of conflict, building on resolution 2417
2. High-level events (CFS events, etc.)

Priorities:

- Governance and structure definition
- TSU to pull together efforts from partners to understand better the effect of COVID-19 (IPC, WFP, FAO assessments, C19 gFSC WG – result 1)
- Support to strategic programming, disseminating lessons learned on C19 and FS
- Anticipatory action, role between FS & Nutrition

End of presentation from TSU

Q&A - Discussion

Request to better understand the relationship between the TSU and IPC

We call it a “network”: it is a structure to unite ongoing efforts, for example by the IPC GSU, but also FSIN; the role of the TSU is to make sure that all quality reports are brought together in a coordinated and harmonized manner.

For example, FSIN members came with different analyses: in the past it was not easy to harmonize the work of IPC GSU and FEWSNET, and TSU played an active role in facilitating harmonization and consensus building. The GNAFC tries to maximize use of the IPC's work without influencing it. Furthermore, the role of the TSU is to highlight data gaps, and thereby strengthen capacities at field level.

Country participation: how can enabling agencies participate/connect global/field work better?

Suggestion to use the Cluster – gFSC in the field to play a bigger role on this, etc.

A lot of work has been done at global level, the next step is to operationalize the work in the field, mobilizing support and specific initiatives in country. TSU can map the key actors, initiatives, coordination means, and then provide recommendations to the senior steering group to strengthen those initiatives or fill gaps. For example, TSU worked on a few country profiles and it would be a good idea to identify key partners to provide inputs on these – indeed FSC can play a key role to facilitate this process – to strengthen M&E systems, data collection, etc.

In country we need to also have other clusters involved, not just FSC: if we talk about SDG2, FSC can be an entry point as it is part of the TSU, but WASH, Health should be fully involved. On governance: much easier to build it at country level as it is based on operations (e.g a group of agencies working around the same agenda, and ensuring that all critical organizations can bring inputs, push towards the same goal).

CHAD example: GNAFC is dealing with various donors and stakeholders, creating a map on the area-based approach – but there is a need to show how all humanitarian efforts are taken into consideration as a part of a larger initiative; working on a protracted crisis (humanitarian + development) and involving all actors is a long process and GNAFC wants to bring this ahead.

Comments from SAG: NGOs are often the most knowledgeable organizations in the field – there should be a clear way to include them, needs to be a transparent process (nominations, etc.) and again, FSC can play a key role here.

- 1. Result 1 C19 TWG of gFSC: lots of work going on there, how can the GNAFC better support/fund it? There is a clear identified need (IMOs, etc); how are gFSC initiatives included/could they be more included?**

Political answer: pillar 1 of the mandate: all relevant analytical efforts are being brought together in a more coordinated manner; not directly supported by GNAFC funds; FSC efforts can be at the core of the next event organized by GNAFC.

On funding: DEVCO wants the work of the FSC supported, so funding can be called for by highlighting the excellent work of the gFSC.

Three questions:

- 1. How long has DEVCO committed to support GNAFC?**

DEVCO is working to ensure that GNAFC and food crises remain priorities/key elements on the Agenda of the new commission. Advocating for funding needs to remain a priority. The commitment now is until 2022, but the issue is to ensure continuity in the longer term.

- 2. How do you anticipate NGOs will participate in knowledge and risk analysis?**

There is full consensus from all GNAFC stakeholders to draw together different areas of knowledge, improve programming, etc. – needs to be viewed under the governance of the TSU to be developed in the coming period.

3. Food systems in fragile contexts were mentioned among other issues: what exactly is the work of the GNAFC there? Since GNAFC is not a programme implementation body, how does it provide support?

Food systems are a part of food crises, and there is a lot of focus on food systems in fragile contexts, and now also food systems and COVID-19. One grey area is exactly how the GNAFC's work - through TSU - can become a tool for agencies and donors for programming: there is an appetite for this, but no real tangible outcome as yet.

4. Explain better the relationship with FSIN/GNAFC.

It is true that overlaps exist and need to be better understood – the discussion on governance is going some way towards this. WFP and FAO are preparing a document to better clarify the relationship between the GNAFC and FSIN.

GNAFC is essentially a political initiative – stakeholders come together to streamline efforts on coordination, which means it also has the capacity to bring some issues to attention at higher level (e.g. mVAM should inform the IPC);

5. Difference between the work of individual members of GNAFC and more collaborative efforts (e.g. agencies' priorities vs GNAFC priorities); strategic decision making?

6. To what extent do you see the network playing a facilitating vs communication role with the wider community (NGOs), not only on governance but also on different events, information sharing, GNAFC products?

The GNAFC website will be populated in the coming weeks – more regular communication is in the pipeline.

There is high recognition from donors on the impact of crises on FS, and the impact on their own political interests (conflicts, economies). There is great political momentum around the network, with significant efforts to address fragility in protracted crises.

There is a need for a more systematic approach, which is what the network is trying to address: linking different levels/stakeholders, which is not an easy thing to do. There is added value from what the GNAFC is trying to put together, including looking into duplications and gaps.

Comment: Some frustration from NGOs is due to the misunderstanding that the GNAFC is already fully operational and there is no space for civil society organizations to play a role; however, the GNAFC it is still under definition/creation but there is a need to define how NGOs can be part of it, and what the process would be (transparency, etc.)

Comment: If NGOs have insight to GNAFC products this will bring ownership, and the products will be used much more broadly; NGOs can play a key role in strengthening the GNAFC, generate debate, help to streamline the work.

WAY FORWARDS & ACTION POINTS

1. **TSU Work-plan:** TSU welcomes the interest from gFSC members (some areas already identified)
ACTION: work-plan can be shared with Global Partners
2. **Country-level linkages:** TSU prepared some country profiles – each could be shared within Cluster members at field level to get their inputs/ownership;
ACTION: gFSC to share country profiles with country clusters
3. **Knowledge/info sharing is another area to be explored further**
4. **Governance:** structure and potential added value – discussions to be continued to understand best modalities (**TSU working on it**)
5. **Ensure regular communication with SAG:**
 - standing agenda point of GNAFC at every SAG meeting; or
 - ad hoc meetings on bi-monthly basis?

To be defined: how to ensure a regular dialogue between meetings.

6. Convene messages to all gFSC members on the work between gFSC and GNAFC
ACTION: next gFSC Partners Meeting (25th - 26th November) a presentation should focus on how the gFSC is working with GNAFC, etc.