

FACTSHEET

External Evaluation of the Changing Course in Global Agriculture Programme (CCGA) Segment I, conducted July – October 2015

Objectives of the Evaluation

The objective of the evaluation of the Changing Course in Global Agriculture Programme (CCGA) commanded by SDC was to enlarge the understanding of SDC and the implementing organizations on the effectiveness, relevance and efficiency of advocacy work and policy dialogues. These activities seek for enhancing political support and policy coherence for food security and sustainable agriculture at the level of global coordination mechanisms, platforms and institutions, including through activities at national policy level. Since the CCGA project is operating at international as well as national level, the evaluation of the programme was divided in two segments. The first encompasses global level activities, the second segment includes activities on national level (in chronological order; Segment 2 not yet available). The report at hand evaluates the international activities (Segment 1) and assesses the following aspects:

1. Effectiveness and relevance of CCGA: a) Degree by which the agreed outcomes at the global and national policy levels were achieved, and b) Relevance of the achieved results
2. Attribution of results to CCGA: Contribution of the CCGA programme to the degree by which outcomes were achieved (attribution), including by relating and comparing it to the contribution of other actors (in particular the GPFS)
3. Efficiency CCGA: Evaluation of the performance and efficiency of the CCGA programme in relation to the results attributable to CCGA including partnerships
4. Sustainability of CCGA: Evaluation of the sustainability of the CCGA programme
5. Recommendations: Recommendations on how to strengthen the effectiveness, impact, relevance, efficiency and sustainability of the CCGA programme, taking into account major constraints, gaps and challenges, as well as success factors and opportunities

Background of the Changing Course in Global Agriculture Programme (CCGA)

The programme aims at strengthening the political support for sustainable agriculture and food systems at the policy level. Improved food security, rural welfare and the sustainable use of natural resources shall be achieved through the implementation of sustainable agriculture and food system policies based on the findings of the International Assessment on Agricultural Knowledge, Science and Technology (IAASTD).

At the international policy level, the programme focused on the Rio+20 conference in its first phase. Based on the results of the Rio+20 conference (para 111 and 115), CCGA followed-up by working on achieving that the UN Committee on World Food Security (CFS) facilitate support and advice to countries on multi-stakeholder assessments as a basis for plans on sustainable agriculture and food systems. In view of the Rio+20 decision to develop Sustainable Development Goals, the project set a further outcome that Sustainable Development Goals and targets be endorsed, that prioritize

enhanced food security and a paradigm shift towards sustainable agriculture and food systems, including appropriate means of implementation, as well as a monitoring and accountability framework.

Methodology adopted for the Evaluation

The evaluation focused on the engagement of Biovision and the Millennium Institute in three processes: Rio+20, the development of the work programme of the Committee on World Food Security and the definition of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

The dimensions followed reflect the components of the DAC evaluation approach to assess whether programmes outcomes meet the criteria of *relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact* and *sustainability*.¹ The recommendations were established on the basis of the assessment of programme outcomes against these criteria. They included identification of success factors, opportunities, major constraints, gaps and challenges and recommendations on how to strengthen the effectiveness, impact, relevance, efficiency and sustainability of the programme.

In each case, establishing the extent to which the programme achieved its outcomes was based on analysis of key policy documents, internal planning documents and meeting reports, supported by interviews with key individuals involved in the relevant processes. Attributing results to the CCGA programme involved following the evolution of the drafts of the policy documents and the negotiations that led to revisions or the inclusion of specific text in these documents.

Main results of Evaluation

In terms of effectiveness, relevance and impact, the CCGA programme has facilitated and contributed to the debate on sustainable food systems in different global fora, mapping out the limits of feasible and unfeasible solutions ultimately derived from the IAASTD and so helping to achieve consensus. It has championed multi-stakeholder national assessments as a basis for strategy and policy formulation. Along the way, it has generally enhanced awareness and knowledge of sustainability in agriculture and different approaches to achieving more sustainable food systems and thus improved the quality of debate. CCGA has also had a valuable facilitation role in bringing experts together and organization of events.

In terms of gaps and challenges, there is a need to tailor the style of engagement more to the audience concerned. CCGA's understanding of complex political processes can still be enhanced in order to steer its strategic communication accordingly. Finally, CCGA should more clearly acknowledge alternative pathways which are perhaps more versed in current international policy trends. This includes the role of the private sector and international trade.

While CCGA has been very present in the different international processes it is not easy to trace an attributable significant influence upon final outcome documents. CCGA's main contribution may well have had a beneficial effect in a more general sense including facilitation and partnerships and that indirectly has probably had an influence on outcome documents. BV/MI can certainly share credit along with many other actors for good outcomes while attribution remains difficult.

¹ [DAC Principles for Evaluation of Development Assistance](#)

Evaluation Team

The evaluation was directed by two independent consultants, Dr David Hallam as team leader and Dr Ali Arslan Gurkan as technical expert. Based on Dr David Hallam's application and proven track record as policy advisor and negotiator, he was chosen to direct Segment 1 and 2 of the evaluation of the CCGA programme. Dr Ali Gurkan has supported him specifically on Segment 1. Both are experts on food security and agriculture issues and have worked in multilateral cooperation settings for a long time.

EXTERNAL EVALUATION OF THE CHANGING COURSE IN GLOBAL AGRICULTURE PROGRAMME

REPORT ON EVALUATION OF SEGMENT 1

July - October 2015

Contents

Contents.....	1
Acknowledgements.....	2
Acronyms	3
1. Introduction	4
2. Terms of reference of the evaluation	5
3. Overview of the Changing Course in Global Agriculture programme	6
4. Evaluation methodology	7
5. The CCGA Programme and Rio+20	10
6. The CCGA Programme and the Committee on World Food Security	14
7. The CCGA Programme and the UNGA Open-ended Working Group on Sustainable Development Goals	22
8. The CCGA Programme and Post 2015.....	36
9. Conclusions and Recommendations	41
ANNEX: Extract from Terms of Reference for Segment 1.....	46

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to express their gratitude to all of those who assisted them in the preparation of this report. Since many gave their views in confidence it is invidious to name individuals but we would like to thank the staff, present and past, of Biovision, the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation's Global Programme on Food Security, international organizations and NGOs in Rome, New York and Geneva, the Secretariat and Bureau of the Committee on World Food Security and especially those involved in the Multi-Year Programme of Work, and many country representatives in the different processes this report examines. We are grateful to all these people who gave their time and shared their valuable insights with us.

Acronyms

BV	Biovision Foundation
CCGA	Changing Course in Global Agriculture
CFS	Committee on World Food Security
GPFS	Global Programme on Food Security
IAASTD	International Assessment of Agricultural Knowledge, Science and Technology for Development
MI	Millennium Institute
MYPOW	Multi-Year Programme of Work
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal

1. Introduction

1. The *Changing Course in Global Agriculture (CCGA)* programme is a joint project of the Millennium Institute (MI) and Biovision Foundation (BV) aimed at improving food security, rural welfare and the sustainable use of natural resources through the promotion and support of sustainable agriculture and food system policies at global and national levels. More specifically, the programme seeks to influence policy in favour of the implementation of sustainable agriculture and food system policies based on the findings of the *International Assessment on Agricultural Knowledge, Science and Technology (IAASTD)*. The programme has been supported in part by the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation's Global Programme on Food Security (GPFS).
2. This evaluation consists of two segments that are linked but for simplicity are being treated largely independently. The first segment evaluates the impact of CCGA at global policy level so far and the second segment will evaluate the impact at national policy level. This Report is concerned only with Segment 1 dealing with global policy impacts. The first phase of the project has included some engagement at national policy level in three pilot countries - Kenya, Senegal and Ethiopia - including putting in place the instrument used to support decision-makers, the T-21 simulation model. However, evaluation of this work will be undertaken under Segment 2 as part of the evaluation of national policy impacts and will be completed in 2017. In some ways, this separation of global and national levels is a false dichotomy since the two are closely interrelated and indeed one conclusion of the evaluation is that success in the national level activities will be important in building support for CCGA objectives at global level.
3. The evaluation focuses on the engagement of BV/MI in three processes: Rio+20, the development of the work programme of the Committee on World Food Security and the definition of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).
4. The evaluation formally commenced on 1 July 2015. A total of less than thirty days is devoted to Segment 1. Given the wide-ranging nature of the evaluation, and the time-consuming methodology followed, this means that some issues in the evaluation could not be explored in as much detail as might be desirable.
5. Overall, the evaluation comes to a positive view of the work and contribution of CCGA to these three processes and the achievement of the agreed outcomes. As with any programme, some elements are more successful than others. Exploring the reasons why some desired outcomes were not fully achieved is especially important since these experiences can provide valuable lessons for future engagement.

2. Terms of reference of the evaluation

6. The overall objectives of the evaluation are set out in the terms of reference. These involve assessment of the following dimensions
 - a. Effectiveness and relevance: the degree to which the project achieved its agreed outcomes at the global and national policy levels and the relevance of the achieved results which together determine the impact of the program
 - b. Attribution of results: the extent to which observed outcomes reflect the specific contributions of the project relative to the contributions of other actors.
 - c. Efficiency in achieving the attributable results, including formation of partnerships.
 - d. Sustainability of project outcomes beyond the duration of the programme.

These dimensions reflect the components of the DAC evaluation approach to assess whether project outcomes meet the criteria of *relevance*, *effectiveness*, *efficiency*, *impact* and *sustainability* of the project. As far as possible given the nature of the CCGA activities and the policy processes they seek to influence, the evaluation follows the DAC approach.

7. The evaluation is expected to draw conclusions and make recommendations on the basis of the assessment of programme outcomes against these criteria. These include identification of success factors, opportunities, major constraints, gaps and challenges and recommendations on how to strengthen the effectiveness, impact, relevance, efficiency and sustainability of the programme and on future collaboration between CCGA and GPFS.
8. The terms of reference also outline a suggested approach and deliverables in relation to each of the three global processes studied. In each case, establishing the extent to which the programme achieved its outcomes is based on analysis of key policy documents supported by interviews with key individuals involved with process. The relevant documents are the Rio+20 Outcome Document, the Multi-year Programme of Work (MYPow) 2014-2015 of the Committee on World Food Security (CFS), the Outcome Document of the UN General Assembly Open Working Group on SDGs. Attributing results to the CCGA programme involves following the evolution of the drafts of these documents and the negotiations that led to revisions or the inclusion of specific text. Much of this is documented. Study of meeting minutes and notes backed up by interviews with participants allows the identification of supporters and opponents of specific changes in the course of discussion and provides a basis for assessing the contribution to those changes of CCGA interventions and

other activities. The detailed terms of reference for Segment 1 are reproduced in an Annex.

3. Overview of the Changing Course in Global Agriculture programme

9. The CCGA program aims at strengthening the political support for sustainable agriculture and food systems at the policy level. It rests on the premise that improved food security, rural welfare and the sustainable use of natural resources will be achieved through the implementation of sustainable agriculture and food system policies based on the findings of the *International Assessment on Agricultural Knowledge, Science and Technology (IAASTD)*. The project operates at both the international and the national levels, seeking to influence policy formulation towards a greater emphasis on encouraging sustainable agriculture and food systems.

10. At the international policy level, considered in this first segment of the evaluation, the program first focused on the Rio+20 conference. Initially, CCGA tried to attain the outcomes at Rio+20, that an international organization such as FAO or UNEP would be mandated to propose actions to implement sustainable agriculture based on the findings of the IAASTD (Outcome 1, Phase I) and that an intergovernmental, participatory, multi-stakeholder panel was established to regularly review agricultural knowledge, science and technology (Outcome 2, Phase I). When the Rio+20 conference failed to mandate an international organization as anticipated under Outcome 1, the CCGA substituted Outcomes 1 and 2 by the adapted outcome that the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) would establish an intergovernmental, multi-stakeholder process to facilitate support and advice to countries on multi-stakeholder assessments as a basis for plans on sustainable agriculture and food systems (Adapted Outcome 1/2, Phase I and Outcome 2, Phase II). In relation to the Sustainable Development Goals, the CCGA programme originally sought a further outcome that the implementation of sustainable agriculture would be strengthened in binding agreements (Outcome 4, Phase 1). This was also revised by dropping the reference to binding agreements and seeking only to strengthen the implementation of sustainable agriculture at the international policy level. This leads on to the Phase II outcome that Sustainable Development Goals and targets called for by Rio+20 would be endorsed that prioritize enhanced food security and a paradigm shift towards sustainable agriculture and food systems, including appropriate means of implementation, as well as a monitoring and accountability framework (Outcome 1, Phase II).

4. Evaluation methodology

11. As far as possible given the nature of the CCGA activities and the policy processes they seek to influence, the evaluation follows the DAC evaluation approach to assess whether project outcomes meet the criteria of *relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact* and *sustainability* of the project.
12. As noted above, the terms of reference outline a suggested approach and deliverables in relation to each of the three global processes studied and this approach has been broadly followed. Assessment of the impact of the programme is based on analysis of the content and the drafting and negotiation processes of key policy documents. This is based on study of the documentary evidence such as meeting minutes, notes and reports and on interviews with key individuals involved with processes. The focus documents were suggested in the evaluation terms of reference: the Rio+20 Outcome Document; the Multi-year Programme of Work (MYPow) 2014-2015 of the Committee on World Food Security (CFS); and the Outcome Document of the UN General Assembly Open Working Group on SDGs.
13. A major problem throughout this evaluation is that of attribution since sustainability and agriculture is a crowded field and there are many other actors, including the international organizations and similarly specialised NGOs, all working on the issues involved and some of which CCGA has collaborated with. Assessment of effectiveness may make comparisons with these other groups and their activities and documents. There was/is already significant political support for sustainable agriculture and food systems at the global policy level so attempting to identify the individual contribution of CCGA requires a significant level of detail in determining what adjustments were made to that concern as a result of uniquely CCGA arguments and activities.
14. It should not be overlooked that the CCGA has undoubtedly contributed to making the general case for more sustainable food systems, stimulating debate around it and building political support in the three processes targeted. That is an acknowledged and appreciated contribution. However, there are some features of the CCGA approach, including its basis in the comprehensive framework of the IAASTD and particularly its emphasis on multi-stakeholder approaches, which differentiate it from other actors and might allow an attribution of outcomes to the CCGA contribution. The CCGA has a consistent strategic approach towards strengthening policy support for sustainable food systems with national multi-stakeholder assessments as an integral part of policy formulation. CCGA engagement with global processes, especially the CFS, is essentially in pursuit of that objective.

15. There are other ongoing, influential global discussions which were not targeted by the CCGA but which nevertheless promoted similar calls for sustainability and through similar approaches: for example, the G20's concern with sustainable agricultural productivity from the Mexican Presidency onwards. These can provide a kind of control group to compare with those processes where CCGA has been active.
16. While the interviews revealed a knowledge and even broad support for sustainable food systems, there seems to be little awareness of the IAASTD on which CCGA is based. It is not the purpose of this evaluation to assess the merits or otherwise of the evidence and technical knowledge underlying the CCGA position but rather to assess its influence on policy outcomes. Obviously the two are connected since if the technical base does not command wide support then it is difficult for the CCGA to sway political opinion. It does therefore have a bearing on the success or otherwise that the CCGA programme might have in seeking to influence global and national policy processes and needs to be considered seriously in CCGA communication. The technical merit issue is not explored here although it should be noted that the opinions offered by individuals interviewed were divided. Some of those interviewed were already supportive of the broad thrust of the CCGA agenda. Others, including a number of more influential individuals, felt that the CCGA prescriptions were too exclusively focused on organic agriculture, were inadequate to achieve food security and were anti-business and anti-trade. It does not matter whether these perceptions are true or not, the important thing is that such views are held by some very influential individuals and this needs to be taken into account in CCGA's advocacy strategy.
17. The evaluation undertook a detailed study of the wide range of relevant documentation including correspondence, minutes, internal reports and presentations as well as technical reports written by the project partners. These included: the Rio+20 outcome document, the CFS work programme 2014-15, and the UNGA OWG report on SDGs together with documents prepared to date relating to the post-2015 process; draft negotiation documents for Rio+20; minutes of the CFS MYPOW OWG relevant to the development of the CFS MYPOW for 2014-15; documents including country statements etc. relating to the process of setting SDG goals and targets on food security, nutrition and agriculture; currently available documents related to the process for the development of the final post-2015 agenda. The review of documentation provides a narrative on the CCGA engagement that can then be compared with actual agreements in negotiation and final outcome documents. The review also compared documents prepared by other actors, especially the Rome based agencies, with MI/BV documentation.

18. The review of documentation has four basic objectives:
 - a. description of the activities of the MI/BV during the four intergovernmental processes, including the informal exchanges, roundtables and networking activities they have organized;
 - b. characterisation of the principles guiding these activities and the extent to which they are different from those expounded by other institutions active during these processes;
 - c. determination of the extent to which the principles and concepts expounded by them have been incorporated into the final outcome documents of the four intergovernmental processes and attribution of those that have been incorporated to their activities;
 - d. comparison of the outcomes 1 and 2 and outputs under them as expressed in the PRODOC with the achievements claimed in the final report of Phase 1 of the project, taking into account the analyses conducted under each of the above sections.

19. Of course, comparison of observed outcomes with those sought by CCGA cannot give a complete picture of the CCGA contribution. In fact, the narrow focus of the specified programme outcomes in the evaluation's terms of reference is unhelpful in this respect since it can lead to an equally narrow definition of programme success. As the experience of CCGA shows, such specific outcomes can also be overtaken by events as political processes unfold. The CCGA activities have a valued indirect contribution in enhancing awareness and the information base for policy discussions which the evaluation has tried to capture. The analysis of documentation therefore needs to be supplemented by interviews with participants in the processes and other stakeholders. Sometimes, text in agreed documents is open to different interpretations and text is sometimes deliberately drafted to allow that. It can also be the case that documented outcomes do not reflect real commitments, as the CFS case illustrates. Again, interviews are an important means to gain a better understanding of CCGA's contribution.

20. Interviews are therefore an important and primary mechanism for the evaluation and a significant number of interviews with key stakeholders have been conducted. An initial list of around 60 potential interviewees was provided to the evaluation by BV/MI and many of those were interviewed. These included staff of the New York and Rome-based Agencies and various Swiss ministries, and permanent representatives in Rome, Geneva and New York all with experience and involvement with one or more of Rio+20, CFS, SDGs and post-2015. This list was supplemented by others identified by the evaluation and who have been actively involved in the various processes. The evaluation has taken advantage of other stakeholder gatherings such as G20 Development

Working Group meetings to canvas opinions of colleagues who have also been involved in the processes of concern. A further wider group of individuals - about 75 people - composed of participants in workshops and roundtables organized by BV/MI were also contacted with a simple, short set of questions about their knowledge and appreciation of the CCGA activities. This “survey” was a simple device to reach the widest audience given the limited time and resources available.

21. Interviews were conducted in person or by telephone/skype. Interviews were informal and lightly structured around a basic set of questions adapted according to the interviewee’s position and involvement. These questions covered:
- a. awareness and opinions of the activities and inputs of CCGA during the Rio+20, CFS MYPOW, OWG/SDG and Post-2015 processes;
 - b. awareness of the main principles underlying these activities and inputs;
 - c. extent of agreement with the CCGA principles;
 - d. prior familiarity with sustainability and agriculture issues and extent to which these were considered to be already acknowledged in the processes;
 - e. extent to which CCGA influenced the processes;
 - f. the relevance of CCGA activities to the processes;
 - g. the perceived added value of CCGA in terms of approach and content;
 - h. the perceived impact of CCGA on the outcomes of the processes, including language;
 - i. the perceived overall and relative effectiveness of CCGA’s contribution.

While interviews have been an essential part of the evaluation, it must be remembered that interviewees are by definition expressing their personal opinions.

5. The CCGA Programme and Rio+20

22. During the RiO+20 process, BV/MI’s main aim was to inform their partners and the Member States about the basic aims and principles of the CCGA project with the hope of reflecting them in the outcome document of the Conference. This is clearly noted in the Position Paper entitled “Food security and Sustainable Agriculture in Rio+20”:

1. Mandate an International Organization to propose actions to implement sustainable agriculture and food security based on the findings of relevant reports such as the International Assessment of Agricultural Knowledge, Science and Technology for Development (IAASTD).

2. Strengthen the scientific basis for political action on sustainable agriculture and food security by inviting an existing body to conduct a regular, intergovernmental, participatory, and multi-stakeholder assessment of agricultural knowledge, science, and technology, while taking into account pre-existing processes.

23. BV/MI also contributed to the preparation of a document by a large number of civil society organizations entitled “Rio+20 What are the options - when “Business as usual” is not an option?”. A number of demands specified there is likely to be a reflection of their effort, especially the following ones:

- *Ensure that agriculture in all its dimensions is a core issue at the UNCSD in Rio and subsequently in global policy and practice*
- *Give strong and increasing support to small scale, agroecological and other forms of sustainable, ecological food production*
- *Welcome the reformed UN Committee on World Food Security (CFS) as the governing body for food, agriculture and rural development policy and related financial issues, and as the interlocutor on these issues within the proposed new UN environmental network*
- *Give the UN Committee on World Food Security (CFS) a mandate to identify current deficiencies and shortcomings impeding the implementation of existing plans and proposals, and to develop a work plan for implementing the decisions of UNCSD 2012, Chapter 14 of Agenda 21 and UNCSD 16/17, the findings of the International Assessment of Agricultural Knowledge, Science and Technology for Development (IAASTD)*

24. Subsequently, these principles were extended and presented in a background paper to a High Level Roundtable on Food and Nutrition Security and Sustainable Agriculture during 15-16 March 2012 in New York¹. The recommendations from the Roundtable were as follows:

- *To address current and future challenges, a transformation of our entire agriculture and food systems is needed to ensure food and nutrition security, protect natural resources and support equitable development for all, with a particular focus on ... small farmers and food producers, of whom the majority are women*
- *broad coalition of actors at all levels including, amongst others, governments, local authorities, private sector, farmers, pastoralists, and other food producers, research, and civil society, should be established*
- *Mechanisms which improve the economic environment for food producers adopting more sustainable and resilient methods ... should be introduced*

¹ A side event was also organized by BV/MI cohosted with Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), More & Better Network and IFOAM, in January 2012 entitled ““Sustainable Agriculture: Zero Draft Proposals – What will deliver the change we need?””.

- *the link between science and policy implementation should be strengthened, in particular taking into account local knowledge*
- *The Committee on World Food Security (CFS) should provide strategic leadership for an orderly and progressive transformation of agriculture and food systems at all levels (and) ... should explore options for continuous assessment of agricultural knowledge, science, and technology*
- *To ensure that the transformation results in truly sustainable agriculture and food systems it is essential to have ... clear outcome targets, and performance indicators against which the outcomes should be monitored. An independent monitoring system is a prerequisite for strengthening accountability*

25. In order to assess whether these considerations have been incorporated into the final outcome document entitled “The future we want”² a word/phrase search was conducted. The selection of words/phrases used were taken from the various documents noted above and represented the main arguments put forward therein. These included the following:

- food systems
- nutrition security
- small farmers though ‘small-scale farmers’ is mentioned once in paragraph 52)
- coalitions
- food producers
- transformation
- science and policy implementation
- monitoring system
- broad coalition

26. The search results for these terms did not yield positive results. However, the sections on “Food security and nutrition and sustainable agriculture” and “Technology” cover almost all aspects of the principles stressed by BV/MI, albeit not in terms of the exact terminology used/expounded by them. It is not, however, possible to assess the extent to which BV/MI played a role in having those principles incorporated into the text, since much was already common currency anyway. Their views on the CFS, although finding some mention in the document, appear not to have gained full support, as the wording accepted in paragraph 115 is as follows:

*“We reaffirm the important work and inclusive nature of the Committee on World Food Security, including through its role **in facilitating country-initiated assessments on sustainable food production and food security**, (emphasis added) and we encourage countries to give due consideration to*

² http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/66/288&Lang=E.

implementing the Committee on World Food Security Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security. We take note of the ongoing discussions on responsible agricultural investment in the framework of the Committee on World Food Security, as well as the principles for responsible agricultural investment.”

Especially, the role foreseen by BV/MI for CFS in providing “*strategic leadership for an orderly and progressive transformation of agriculture and food systems at all levels (and) ... should explore options for continuous assessment of agricultural knowledge, science, and technology*” appears to have been rejected by the Member States.

27. While it may be difficult to discern a detailed impact from analysis of the various documents, interviews with other participants revealed a positive assessment of the role of BV/MI in Rio+20. BV/MI were highly visible, strongly focused and respected and, as one interviewee put it, seemed effectively a monopoly provider of relevant information. A generally expressed view is that while they had little control over the outcomes, BV/MI had played a valuable role in facilitating dialogue and maintaining sustainable agriculture high on the agenda. This made an important contribution to promoting a common understanding of the limits of what was politically feasible and hence some convergence. Their many events had attracted a high-level and interested attendance and were well-received. The importance of this facilitation and information role should not be under-estimated especially in the context of the New York audience which, in contrast to that in Rome, is not familiar with complex food security issues. In this sense CCGA could be said to have had an impact on the outcome document. In terms of their general role in Rio+20, no other NGO came close to the BV/MI in facilitating dialogue and providing information.

28. While BV/MI played an important role in facilitating discussion, the engagement in Rio+20 was very much driven by the messages of the IAASTD. This encountered resistance from some international organizations and countries according to some interviewees who saw it as marking the boundaries of political acceptability rather than the potential mainstream. Nevertheless, BV/MI seemed to show some flexibility because they seem to have selectively de-emphasised IAASTD when it became clear that it would not command wide support, focusing instead on multi-stakeholder assessments and the role of the CFS. However, a number of interviewees commented that on occasions, BV/MI “pushed too hard” on their agenda and this was counter-productive in terms of swaying opinion.

29. The CCGA programme was very effective in forming productive partnerships. They worked especially closely with the Rome-based agencies for their mutual benefit. There was a significant alignment of interests between CCGA and FAO and IFAD and BV/MI regularly consulted and coordinated their activities with these organizations. This provided good exposure for the RBAs and FAO certainly found CCGA a valuable channel of communication in promoting the CFS, for example.
30. There has obviously been a close alignment between the CCGA programme and the Swiss Government, or at least the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation's, agenda in Rio+20. However, while BV/MI might have helped promote *that* Swiss agenda, it was not always *the* Swiss agenda and was sometimes at variance with the views of the Ministry of Agriculture causing some confusion. Nevertheless, there seems to be a general perception that BV/MI leveraged Swiss positions beyond what would otherwise have been possible.

6. The CCGA Programme and the Committee on World Food Security

31. Engagement with the CFS was not part of the original plan for CCGA and there is no mention of such engagement in the Prodoc. Nevertheless, CCGA was flexible and devoted a great deal of effort and human resources into the CFS, including in the Rio+20 discussions in New York. Again, the programme achieved high visibility and was very successful in presenting its vision. The CCGA contributed to confirming the important post-Rio role of the CFS in relation to the SDGs and in securing text in the CFS MYPOW, the final outcome has been disappointing in that follow-up action by the CFS has been limited in spite of a concrete commitment. Engagement with the CFS is not as straightforward as with the New York-based processes. The OEWG on the MYPOW is only one, albeit important, forum influencing the priorities and work programme of the CFS. Much discussion takes place between members not only in formal CFS sessions but also in the margins outside and in many other meetings where the same subjects are discussed and the same delegates are present. The OEWG on the MYPOW is also a relatively recent creation whose procedures are still developing. Furthermore, the biennial cycle of the MYPOW means that strategic commitments need to be made on which work streams to seek to influence.

32. The CCGA Programme's interest in the CFS and its work programme stems from paragraph 115 of the Rio+20 outcome document which BV/MI had lobbied for and which said

"115. We reaffirm the important work and inclusive nature of the Committee on World Food Security, including through its role in facilitating country-initiated assessments on sustainable food production and food security, and we encourage countries to give due consideration to implementing the Committee on World Food Security Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security. We take note of the ongoing discussions on responsible agricultural investment in the framework of the Committee on World Food Security, as well as the principles for responsible agricultural investment."

This highlighted the CFS' role and specifically mentioned facilitating country assessments which had been the key element of the CCGA engagement based on the IAASTD. While the Rome-based agencies among others had also been lobbying for a central role for the CFS, the "country initiated assessments" are from CCGA. However, the CFS had not actually had "a role in facilitating" such assessments, at least with the objectives assumed by CCGA, and was not well-equipped to fulfill that role in relation to what are national initiatives.

33. The CFS response to this call at its 39th Session was muted. The decision box for the *Policy Roundtable: Food Security and Climate Change* made no mention of assessments. These were relegated to the decision box for the *Global and Regional Coordination and Linkages* item with the suggestion that FAO rather than the CFS should propose guidelines for such assessments. Biovision did not feel that this CFS response did justice to paragraph 115 and sought to reinstate the designation of CFS, more precisely the CFS Bureau, rather than FAO as the body to elaborate guidelines for country assessments on the grounds of its inclusive nature. They wanted this included in the final report of the 39th Session and in the decision box on Global and Regional Coordination and Linkages and proposed alternative wording which more closely reflected paragraph 115. While these commitments are not entirely out of line with the terms of reference of the CFS this was unlikely to be acceptable and it seems there was little support from members, in spite of the identification and briefing of potentially sympathetic members by BV/MI, to put them into practice as well as a lack of capacity. The idea that the CFS Bureau would take the lead suggested a misunderstanding of how the CFS operates and what the Bureau can and cannot do. The delegation of the responsibility to FAO was inevitable and the BV/MI strategy might better have been adapted to reflect that.

34. The Report of 39th CFS includes “The Committee recognized the outcome document of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20), in particular regarding food security and nutrition and sustainable agriculture.” This seems rather weak and fails to make reference to multi-stakeholder assessments. Some mention was made elsewhere in discussion of food security and climate change (paragraph 11, especially 11.c) where members and other stakeholders were invited *“to facilitate, as appropriate, participation of all stakeholders in food security policies and programmes to address climate change recognizing the contribution of all farmers and food producers, especially small-scale producers, to food security, by: encouraging multi-stakeholder fora at local, national and regional levels to promote broad participation of local communities and the most vulnerable groups, as well as the private sector, in decision-making processes; supporting CSOs, notably those representing the most hunger-affected populations, small-scale producers’ organizations, and women farmers’ organizations, to participate in decision making and the implementation of food security policies and programmes to address climate change.”* So the idea was not lost altogether. However, there was no mention of BV/MI concerns in the discussion of future work and the MYPOW or in the section of the report dealing with Global and Regional Coordination and Linkages with CFS. There was more concern over the limited capacity of CFS to undertake ambitious work programme and how to restrict it rather than to adopt new workstreams.

35. Sustainability issues were inevitably on the agenda of CFS. The CFS had to mention Rio+20 outcome document and follow up since it was specifically cited so that cannot be claimed even implicitly as a result of Biovision’s inputs alone. There was already a CFS event on “Rio+20 and the CFS”. However, it is clear that there was only limited support from CFS members for BV/MI goals (basically Switzerland and, through speaking points provided by BV/MI, Ethiopia) and a single mention of assessments or the IAASTD report does not constitute effective broad support. Nevertheless, two aspects were considered among possible agenda items for 40th Session: development of guidelines on how to implement multi-stakeholder food security assessments at country level; and a series of deliberations identifying the role of the CFS as a facilitator in country-initiated assessments on sustainable food production and food security and nutrition. The idea for assessments thus made it into the indicative list of emerging issues for publication on the CFS webpage although this implies no commitment or prioritization and there were several more. However, it would be looked at by the OEWG on Programme of Work and Priorities formulating the MYPOW and assessed against the criteria for prioritization of work in the MYPOW, as possible issues for CFS after 2014. CCGA succeeded therefore in keeping assessments on the CFS agenda.

36. It is important to understand the role and modus operandi of the OEWG. The OEWG plays a key role in determining the prioritization of workstream proposals and eventually the work programme of the CFS. This identifies and sets limits on three categories of work: a maximum of two HLPE reports per year; a maximum of two major workstreams to be carried out by CFS every year with any delay in the finalization of a major workstream automatically postponing the launch of a new one; and a maximum of five other workstreams carried out by CFS every year. These are meant to be strongly articulated and to resonate with the work programmes of the three Rome-based to better profit from technical and financial resources. The 39th Session of the CFS also set five criteria for prioritization: relevance to the CFS mandate and value added; contribution to the CFS overall objective via one or more of its three outcomes; no duplication; within available limited resources; and most importantly, consensus among CFS members to address the issue within the CFS framework and to include it in the CFS MYPoW. In the case of the multi-stakeholder assessments it is not clear that real consensus was actually reached.
37. The CCGA Programme therefore focused its attention on the 2014-15 MYPoW and specifically through active participation in the MPOW Open-ended Working Group. As noted above, some kind of CFS follow-up to Rio+20 was already agreed and in fact FAO had been using BV/MI in New York to promote that idea. So the main issue for BV/MI was whether the idea of multi-stakeholder assessments would be taken on board. This reflects CCGA Adapted Outcome 1/2: *“An intergovernmental, participatory, multi-stakeholder process to facilitate country-initiated assessments on sustainable food production and food security and nutrition is established at the Committee on World Food Security (CFS)”*. This outcome was not misplaced since the CFS was regarded as the “foremost inclusive international and intergovernmental platform for a broad range of stakeholders to work together in a coordinated manner towards the elimination of hunger and ensuring food security and nutrition for all human beings”. So, multi-stakeholder assessments are in theory a characteristic of the CFS. Furthermore, the three outcomes to be achieved by the CFS in support of that goal - enhanced global coordination on food security and nutrition questions, improved policy convergence on key food security and nutrition issues and, especially, strengthened national and regional food security and nutrition actions – are all consistent with such mechanisms. Achieving the third outcome in particular requires the CFS to coordinate with stakeholders at regional, national and local levels to exchange information, share best practices and lessons learnt and facilitate support to national and regional food security and nutrition plans. However, the reality of how the CFS operates turned out to be rather different.

38. A workstream proposal was put forward at the 12th March 2013 meeting, supported by Switzerland and Ethiopia. This was one of seven proposals:

1. Connecting small-holder farmers to markets
2. Facilitating support and advice for country-initiated, multi-stakeholder assessments on sustainable food systems, food security and nutrition
3. Agroecology, a peasant food and agricultural system that guarantees Food Sovereignty
4. Promotion of Food Sovereignty as a practice for ensuring the Right to Food
5. [Coherence in the] Global Governance of Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture to Food Security and Nutrition
6. 2016 Year of Pulses
7. HLPE Vision Paper

39. The OEWG held four meetings in 2013 to arrive at the draft CFS 2014-2015 MYPoW which was then discussed at the CFS 40th Session 7-11 October. BV/MI actively participated in all of them. In line with the guidance outlined above, the OEWG recommended that no new major workstream should be begun until the two current major workstreams (RAI and protracted crises) were finalised. However, with that proviso, a new major workstream on a framework for implementing the post-2015 agenda on issues related to sustainable agriculture, food security and nutrition was proposed looking forward to the post 2015 agenda. The second workstream proposal mentioned in the previous paragraph was proposed as a major workstream to be implemented in 2015. Specifically, this was

Framework for implementing the post-2015 agenda on issues related to sustainable agriculture, food security and nutrition - Preparatory phase: CFS role in facilitating country-initiated multistakeholder assessments on sustainable food systems, food security and nutrition.

It was further requested that “Draft terms of reference (ToRs) for the preparatory phase should be prepared by the CFS Secretariat, and discussed by the Bureau and Advisory Group by August 2014 at the latest”. This was all clearly a successful outcome for the CCGA.

40. The decision box on the draft MYPoW discussed at CFS 40 included “Adopts the CFS MYPoW for 2014-2015, including the proposed HLPE report themes, major and other workstreams”. This was duly agreed. It reflected an understanding, following the endorsement of the CFS by the Rio+20 Outcome Document and the Ministerial Declaration of the 2012 ECOSOC high level

segment, that the CFS should play a leading role during the implementation of the post-2015 development goals, and that a possible CFS major workstream could be launched in 2016 to develop a framework for implementing the post-2015 agenda on issues related to sustainable agriculture, food security and nutrition. A final decision on this would be taken by the CFS Plenary in 2015, once the post-2015 agenda is adopted by the UN General Assembly. In preparation, the intention was that the CFS should start work in 2015 on its role in facilitating country-initiated multi-stakeholder assessments on sustainable food systems, food security and nutrition, as CCGA had hoped.

41. This Preparatory Phase was intended to strengthen capacity in multi-stakeholder, country-initiated assessments on sustainable food systems, as a prerequisite for determining effective food security and nutrition strategies and actions, needed to achieve the post-2015 development goals and discuss options on how CFS could support countries and regions in planning and implementing such assessments. It would contribute to the CFS third outcome dealing with assistance to countries and regions. In practice, the actual work involved was quite modest - a series of inclusive consultations and discussions among all CFS stakeholders during in 2015 with the results presented at the CFS Plenary in 2015. CFS stakeholders could then discuss the future CFS work related to the implementation of the post-2015 agenda. Furthermore, the concept of multi-stakeholder assessments was not intrinsically alien to CFS members since many of them use such mechanisms in different circumstances. Given nature of the work and the concept subsequent events were, on the surface, rather surprising.
42. It was undoubtedly a significant achievement of CCGA to get language on country initiated multi-stakeholder assessments into the CFS MYPOW 2014-15. However, this was not implemented and the whole activity was put on hold. By the CFS 41 there was no mention of this commitment in the progress report on the 2014-15 MYPOW. It did not reappear in the CFS 42 MYPOW paper. The idea of CFS supporting national assessments was not explicitly rejected but neither was it encouraged. It was also stressed that "It should be noted that activities contained in the MYPOW will only take place provided resources are made available by CFS stakeholders". So, while the CCGA had been successful in getting multi-stakeholder assessments into the CFS work programme, there was no implementation. The two ongoing work programmes on RAI and on protracted crises were completed and as noted above, the actual work involved was modest, so there was no practical reason according to the CFS practices to delay. While there is a general understanding and agreement that the CFS should have a role in the implementation of the SDGs, the basic problem seems to have been a lack of real consensus and commitment on the assessments. Interviews with CFS officers, members and other stakeholders

provided explanations for this. CCGA missions also explored these reasons.

43. In spite of the various events and presentations, some CFS members simply did not understand the underlying rationale and objectives of the CCGA case for national multi-stakeholder assessments or how CCGA expected the CFS to support it in a practical way. Others did not understand the full implications of what they were agreeing to but rather were supportive of the idea of multi-stakeholder processes in a more general sense. Some CFS members saw a contradiction between the CFS criteria for selection of activities and the nature of the work programme and that it was not a good fit to CFS capabilities. The idea was seen as out of sync with the post 2015 calendar so CFS members did not want to commit to anything before September 2015. The CFS was undecided about what its role should be and members were not sure of the rationale for the CCGA proposal or how it might contribute. The G77 appears to have been particularly cautious but among the developing country members in general there was resistance to the idea of multi-stakeholder assessments under the auspices of the CFS since these were seen as peer reviews. There may also have been some fear by some countries that CFS support might be used to legitimize claims of national NGOs for a role in national policy formulation. This general uncertainty was exacerbated by the changes in key players in the CFS, notably the Chair. While the CCGA mission reports refer to strong support from the Africa Group this does not seem to have been the case although the Chair personally may have been broadly in favour. Only Ethiopia among Africa Group members seems to have been a consistent champion. BV/MI do not appear to have had the full support at this time of the CSM. In general, it appears from the mission reports that BV/MI overestimated the true level of support among CFS members. While some CFS members were broadly supportive, many more were not or were lukewarm or just uncertain. It seems there was also some problems in identifying and influencing key players and in understanding politics and possibilities in CFS. The CFS has little capacity to provide country level support and capacity building although it might helpfully endorse the efforts of national stakeholders to undertake assessments. Finally, there was also some concern over where funding would come from for the proposed activities. The suggestion that “The ongoing activities including fundraising for the carrying-out of assessments and the administrative tasks would be carried out by the Secretariat of CFS” (From Rio to Rome - Thought Starter on the way forward with the Rio+20 Outcomes within the Committee on World Food Security, 22 August 2012) was never realistic.

44. It is clear that CCGA has had a very visible and effective presence in relevant fora in Rome, notably the CFS and the discussions of its MYPOW. However, this view is not shared by those involved in managing the CFS who did not attribute a significant contribution to CCGA in shaping the MYPOW. Of course, in Rome the

specialised agencies are much more familiar with sustainability issues and these were already seriously addressed in work programmes of the RBAs for some time eg in the new FAO strategic framework. CCGA side-events at CFS were among many and appear to have had limited impact. It has also been suggested that the CCGA has not been very influential in the CSM. The impression given by CFS officers was that the overall engagement with CFS has not been very productive. However, the evidence speaks for itself in that CCGA language was incorporated into the MYPOW. It seems that there may be a need to revisit the relationship with the CFS Secretariat

45. Since there was no actual action/follow up it seems that the impact of CCGA on CFS MYPOW was *not sustainable*. It may be that work on national assessments can be revived although the progress report on the CFS MYPOW presented at the 41st Session of the CFS suggest a full work programme in 2016-17 with two HLPE reports and a request to the OEWG to revise the guidance for selection and prioritization of CFS activities on the basis of lessons learned, including from the experience with the assessments proposal, in 2014-15. However, CFS did also discuss the framework on monitoring CFS decisions which might provide a window of opportunity. It recommended that the OEWG on Monitoring continue its work building on the outcome of the baseline assessments, towards helping countries and regions, as appropriate, address the questions of whether objectives are being achieved and how food insecurity and malnutrition can be reduced more quickly and effectively.
46. A new proposal has been developed with the backing of the CSM - *CFS Engagement with SDGs on Food Security and Nutrition* - for inclusion in the 2016-17 MYPOW. This essentially revives the earlier proposals with a two part effort: *Thematic follow-up and monitoring/review of the Post-2015 development agenda related to Food Security, Nutrition and Sustainable Agriculture*; and *Inclusive national assessment and planning efforts to advance Food Security and Nutrition SDGs*. The first of these already commands broad support. The Rome-based agencies have actively sought to cement that role and have appreciated CCGA support whatever its motives. With the improved clarity that completion of the post-2015 process should bring there will be another chance to promote the second “advancing the unfinished workstream that had already been endorsed as part of the MYPOW 2014-15 on CFS role in facilitating country-initiated multi-stakeholder assessments on sustainable food systems, food security and nutrition”. However, just because CFS might have a role in “follow up and monitoring/review”, this does not mean it is the best forum for pushing the multi-stakeholder *national* assessments. While CCGA links the two, this was obviously not a perception shared by the CFS members.

47. If the idea of national assessments can be revived what lessons can be learned from the CFS experience to date? Clearly, a different strategy is required. For practical purposes, this needs to separate the two strands although for CCGA the two are inextricably linked. The global CFS role is widely accepted but not the national multi-stakeholder assessments. Clearly, CCGA needs to make a more convincing case for the multi-stakeholder assessments providing clear and convincing explanations of their rationale and objectives. Doing this in abstract at global level is difficult. Piloting national assessments has got to come first since the CFS is unlikely to facilitate something where there is no evidence of its effectiveness. Evidence needs to be collected from the national level work to demonstrate their practical value and build a convincing argument. The experience with the CFS provides some more general lessons for the CCGA engagement and these are discussed in the Conclusions and Recommendations section of this evaluation.

7. The CCGA Programme and the UNGA Open-ended Working Group on Sustainable Development Goals

48. BV/MI were especially active during the sessions of the Open Working Group (OWG) that dealt with topics within the scope of their interest, networking with representatives of the Member States and civil society organizations. They were also collaborating in the preparation of reaction documents to the working documents prepared by the Co-Chairs and of technical briefs and discussion papers highlighting the principles on which their activities were based³. They continued their collaboration when making presentations at Plenums and organizing informal exchanges and roundtables to disseminate those principles, with a view to influencing discussions at the formal meetings of the Sessions. A list of these activities is provided below first, in order to illustrate the nature and extensiveness of their contribution and networking linkages and the progress they achieved as the OWG process progressed.

³ It is likely that through networking with the Member States, BV/MI were also able to influence the positions of some of them as the sessions proceeded. The Members collaborating with BV/MI are mentioned below to the extent that they have contributed to the presentations made and meetings and informal exchanges co-organized by BV/MI. However, it is difficult to assess the impact that they might have had on the official positions of those Member States as the statements made by the Member States are not fully documented on the official website of the UN: Member State statements are not provided from the 2nd Session onwards until the 12th Session. Therefore, the changes in their positions during these sessions due to the efforts of BV/MI cannot be determined. To what extent these possible changes have been incorporated into the final documents is assessed below.

3rd Session of the OWG on the topics of food security and nutrition, sustainable agriculture, desertification, land degradation and drought, 22-24 May, 2013-

- Made a presentation at the Plenum on ‘Nourish our people - Nurture our planet’, based on the work they did for the Rio+20 process.
- Co-organized an informal exchange supported by Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) entitled “Possible Post-2015 Goal on Food Security and Nutrition, Sustainable Agriculture, Desertification, Land Degradation and Drought”, which was attended by 29 participants: among them there were representatives from 12 different countries and 7 international institutions and civil society organizations.

5th Session of the OWG on topics of sustained and inclusive economic growth; macroeconomic policy questions (including international trade, international financial system and external debt sustainability); infrastructure development and industrialization and energy, 25-27 November, 2013-

- Co-organized a side event on “Addressing trade in agricultural products and food price volatility in the SDGs/Post-2015 framework”, with Permanent Missions of Guyana and Italy, Third World Network, Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy, Rethinking Bretton Woods Project - Center of Concern, Better Markets Inc. and UNCTAD.

6th Session of the OWG on the topics of means of implementation and global partnership for achieving sustainable development; needs of countries in special situations, including LDC, LLDCs, SIDS, Africa and middle-income countries; and human rights and the right to development, on 9-13 December, 2013-

- Prepared and presented a brief describing the CCGA project
- Co-organized with Permanent Representation of Senegal a side event entitled “Means of Implementation: Country-initiated, multi-stakeholder assessments to foster sustainable development and poverty eradication”. Presentations were made by UNEP, UNDESA, and French Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

9th Session of the OWG devoted to the discussions of the progress report prepared by the OWG summarizing the discussions of the previous eight sessions of the OWG, 3-4 March, 2014-

- Contributed to the document containing an assessment of what is contained in the report related to the focus area on food security and nutrition presented on behalf of the Major Groups: Local

Authorities, NGOs, Indigenous Peoples, Women, Farmers, as well as the Food and Agriculture Cluster.

10th Session of the OWG in preparation for determining the goals to be proposed, their wording and the targets associated with each, 31st March- 4th April, 2014-

- Prepared a discussion paper entitled “SDG/Post-2015 Goals and Targets on Food and Nutrition Security through Sustainable Agriculture and Food Systems” prior to the Session reflecting the views of Alliance Sud, Berne Declaration, Bread for all, Helvetas Swiss Intercooperation, HEKS and Swissaid.
- Based on this paper, co-hosted with the Government of Benin a High-Level Roundtable, supported by the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, the German Federal Environment Agency (UBA), the Institute for Sustainable Development and International Relations (IDDRI), the Third World Network, the World Society for the Protection of Animals (WSPA) and Mercator Foundation Switzerland on “Food and Nutrition Security through Sustainable Agriculture and Food Systems in the Post-2015 Agenda”. 72 participants attended the Roundtable: 26 of whom were representatives of various governments; 19 from international organizations; 12 from non-governmental organizations; and the rest from research organizations and private industry.

11th Session of the OWG devoted to the discussions related to the working paper containing the proposed wording for the goals of 16 focus areas and the broad targets and indicators for each compiled from statements, presentations and interventions made during the previous sessions by the participants, 15-19 May, 2014-

- Prepared a document as a reaction to the working paper that contributed to the compilation document of Major Groups NGOs, Women, Indigenous Peoples, Children and Youth, Local Authorities, the Food and Agriculture Cluster, as well as the following stakeholders: Wada Na Todo Abhiyan, World Society for the Protection of Animals, Shumei International, Temple of Understanding, Association of World Citizens, Institute for Planetary Synthesis, All Win Network and the Commons Cluster.
- Based on this document presented a statement to the Plenum on behalf of these groups.

12th Session of the OWG was devoted to the discussions related to the “zero draft” prepared by the Co-Chairs, 16-29 June, 2014-

- Prepared a reaction document to the “zero draft”

- Made a statement to the plenum on behalf of the Major Groups NGOs, Women, Indigenous Peoples, Children and Youth, as well as the Food and Agriculture Cluster of the NGO Major Group.

13th Session of the OWG was devoted to the discussions to the document prepared by the Co-Chairs entitled “Introduction and Proposed Goals and Targets on Sustainable Development for the Post2015 Development Agenda”, 14-18 July, 2014-

- Prepared a reaction document

49. The presentation, given by Mr. Hans Herren, and the discussions at the informal exchange during **the 3rd Session of the OWG** centered on a proposal for the wording of the goal on food security and nutrition, sustainable agriculture, desertification, land degradation and drought, on the exposition of the principles underlying and the scope of the proposal and suggestions for possible targets that could be used to monitor progress toward achieving that goal.

50. The key principles identified could be summarized as follows:

- High priority to be given to sustainable agriculture, food security and nutrition because of their importance for sustainable development and poverty reduction
- A holistic, integrated, and inclusive approach that promotes sustainable agriculture and food systems
- Priority to be given to smallholder farmers and women, who play a major role all along the food chain
- A transformation to sustainable, diverse, resilient and multifunctional agriculture and food systems
- Multi-stakeholder assessments on sustainable agriculture and food systems to inform all

51. The concluding remarks by the Co-Chairs at the end of the Session highlighted the contributions of non-government participants to the process through the conversations they held with the Major Groups and other stakeholders: “many of the concerns and proposals raised there have been reiterated by Member States”. Indeed, some elements of their summary contain those that have been expressed, at least by BV/MI and their partners, and some that have later been incorporated into the principles expounded by BV/MI themselves. Some examples of the former are as follows⁴:

- Sustainable intensification to promote sustainable agriculture and food systems should draw on a variety of techniques that are widely known but not all widely practiced

⁴ See (<https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/1825owgsbulletsummary.pdf>).

- Smallholders, including importantly women farmers, pastoralists and indigenous peoples, deserve particular focus when crafting agricultural policies

Some examples of the latter, which have been later incorporated into presentations made by BV/MI during subsequent sessions, are as follows:

- (I)t seems likely that ensuring food security and adequate nutrition for all *on a sustainable basis, i.e., irreversibly*, will prove elusive if we don't **shift to sustainable agricultural systems** (emphasis added)⁵
- The urgent need to address the root causes of heightened price volatility
- The need for an open, rules-based, and equitable trading system that promotes rural development and food security

52. It is not clear, however, whether those that appear in the summary and mentioned in the presentations of BV/MI are there solely because of their efforts. Especially the briefs prepared by the Technical Support Teams and presented by the Rome based agencies, e.g. FAO, WFP and IFAD, covering “Food Security and Nutrition” and “Sustainable Agriculture”, also mention the principles that are central to the thrust of the activities BV/MI. For example: “(G)oining forward, agriculture needs not only to provide nutritious food, income, and decent jobs, but also address a host of environmental challenges. To respond to these multiple challenges, *there is need to shift to more sustainable forms of agriculture and to introduce comprehensive policies that support this shift* (emphasis added) ... (T)hese challenges require that food and agricultural systems are made more sustainable, not only from an economic perspective but also from environmental, social and institutional perspectives and at various scales, from the local to the global level⁶.”

53. Moreover, it is also noted that the multidimensional and complex nature of food security and nutrition: “suggest the need to capture both food security and nutrition outcomes and their enablers (e.g. linkages to sustainable agriculture, infrastructure, education, water, health, decent jobs, social protection, the empowerment of women, and gender equality). It also signals the need to promote a holistic notion of food systems, including all food-related activities (producing, storing, processing, packaging, trading and consuming food) and acknowledging the challenges confronting different food systems in the current global environment”⁷.

⁵ A sentiment similar to this was expressed by Maria Helena Semedo, Deputy General Director of FAO, in her Keynote Speech: “We need **to shift to more sustainable** production approaches, to ensure higher yields with lower adverse environmental impacts” (p. 3

<https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/3582fao.pdf>)

⁶ See (p. 1-3. <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/1802stissuesagriculture.pdf>).

⁷ See (p.5 <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/1804stissuesfood.pdf>).

54. Statements made by some delegates during this session suggest that others may have been influential in shaping their views. For example, delegate from Bangladesh noted: “Yesterday morning, we heard a number of excellent presentations from the representatives of FAO, WFP, IFAD, and UNCCD on various aspects of food security, nutrition and sustainable agriculture. These were very informative and thought provoking. We appreciate the strong recommendation put forward in their presentations to adopt food security and nutrition as a stand-alone SDG goal.” These sentiments about the contributions of FAO, WFP, IFAD and UNCCD were also expressed by the delegate from Dominican Republic.
55. In terms of pressing for a single goal on food security and nutrition, joint statement from Croatia and Bulgaria noted: “Let us emphasize that food security has been identified by 80% of the responding countries to the UNDESA questionnaire on SDGs, as a thematic priority. In line with key recommendations from global thematic consultations and initiatives on food security and nutrition, we should acknowledge a strong call for a stand-alone and prominent time bond SDG on food security and nutrition. The goal might be structured around specific targets related to main multidimensional and interconnected aspects of food and nutrition concerns and followed by indicators that capture short and long terms impacts of policy measures and progress”.
56. Although **the 5th Session of the OWG** also included topics related to international trade, international financial system and external debt sustainability among the varied topics included in the discussions, the problems related to international trade was not discussed in depth. The preliminary schedule of side events indicate these topics were not high on the agenda either: out of the 13 side events over the 3 days of the Session not even a single one dealt with these issues. Moreover, no Technical Support Team briefs on the topics were prepared on the subjects. But BV/MI appear to have garnered support both from some Member States and civil society organizations to organize the only side event on international trade of agricultural products and food price volatility⁸. Despite this, the international trade appears only as a single sentence⁹ and no mention of price volatility is made in the summary report of the Co-Chairs.

⁸ A summary of the presentations at the side event can be found at http://www.biovision.ch/fileadmin/pdf/sdgs/8_Summary_SideEventOWG5_AgTrade_MI-BV-Guyana-Italy-IATP-TWN.pdf.

⁹ “Trade is a growth driver and, in this regard, an open, fair, rule-based, predictable, and nondiscriminatory trading system needs to be maintained and enhanced” (p. 4 https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/2773Summary%20of%20owg-5_0612.pdf).

57. It was during **the 6th Session of the OWG** that BV/MI presented the CCGA project to the participants, though a brief and a side event organized around it in order to highlight the necessity of country-level multi-stakeholder mechanisms and assessments that can assist developing countries to develop and implement policies and strategies to eradicate poverty and achieve sustainable development goals. This topic encompasses one of the major outcomes specified in the CCGA project: "...national or regional authorities endorse national policies and agricultural strategies that allow for effective, comprehensive and long-term planning of sustainable agricultural development". In this respect, the presentations in the side event emphasized the tools that can help stake-holders decide on most effective policies to achieve those goals. An important element highlighted was MI's Threshold 21 model; which was used in a country setting by Senegal; UNEP's use of it was as a part of its GEAS to determine the impacts of green investment on environmental, economic and social fronts; and its use by UNDESA was to simulate the effects of more sustainable consumption and production patterns in the World Economic Social Survey 2013, in particular in the area of food and nutrition security.
58. The summary presented by the Co-Chairs at the end of the session did make references to multi-stakeholder partnerships and the role that governments can play in facilitating them¹⁰, but this was also the main topic of the TST issues brief on "Global Partnership for achieving sustainable development"¹¹ and a recommendation of Secretary General's High level panel recommendation to build multi-stakeholder partnerships. Third World Network, Major Group: NGOs and many delegates also mentioned the concept, country-level issues were not specifically mentioned in any.
59. The assessment of the focus area on food security and nutrition contained in the progress report discussed during **the 9th Session of the OWG** presented by the partners of BV/MI notes: "We are pleased that many elements that characterize *sustainable agriculture and food systems* are outlined in the document ... We are concerned that *farmers as the critical "agents of change,"* have not been given the necessary prominence in the document. *Empowering smallholder farmers* and other rural communities, in particular women and disadvantaged groups, is essential ... We note that concrete measures to support countries in achieving the food and agriculture related goals and targets are missing. In this regard, we wish to emphasize the role of the

¹⁰ See (p.7

<https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/3412Summary%20Cochairs%20OWG6.pdf>.)

¹¹

https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/2079Issues%20Brief%20Means%20of%20Implementation%20Final_TST_141013.pdf.

Committee on World Food Security, not only as the foremost inclusive intergovernmental body on food security and nutrition, but also with the ability to support regular global, regional, and national multistakeholder assessments on sustainable agriculture and food systems (all of the emphasized terms are ours) ”¹². These elements and the wordings reflect the thrust of the strategies that BV/MI employed during these sessions.

60. **The 10th Session of the OWG** was devoted to preparing the groundwork for determining the goals to be proposed, their wording and the targets associated with each. To initiate the discussions a compilation was prepared by the members of the UN inter-agency technical support team (TST) covering similar goals and targets in existing intergovernmental commitments around 19 focus areas¹³. A similar compilation was also prepared by major groups and other stakeholders and presented during a dialogue with the CO-Chairs of OWG on 4th April¹⁴.
61. The discussion paper anticipating the purpose of the Session was prepared in January 2014, setting the conceptual framework for the proposals they were putting forward for the title and targets of the focus area 2 on food security and nutrition. The paper also served as the background for discussions during the High-Level Roundtable organized by BV/MI that was held prior to the session and was presented by Birgit Kopainsky, from the System Dynamics Group of the University of Bergen¹⁵. The wording for the goal in the paper was proposed as: “**Achieve food and nutrition security through sustainable agriculture and food systems**”. Using food systems as the conceptual framework, the targets were differentiated according to food systems activities, enabling conditions and food systems outcomes and several indicators were suggested for each target. The discussions in the Roundtable resulted in an outcome document that did not include the proposed wording for the goal, but agreed to a simplified message that would indicate to a need for:
- Transformational change in agriculture and food systems
 - A world free from poverty, hunger and malnutrition

¹²

https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/3362Compilation%20Major%20Groups%20Statements%20and%20Focus%20Areas%20Responses_March%202025_final.pdf.

¹³ https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/3507Existing_targets_1_April_version.xlsx.

¹⁴

https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/3674Compilation%20Document%20on%20Goals%20and%20Targets_April%202011-%20final.pdf.

¹⁵ http://biovision.ch/fileadmin/pdf/sdgs/9_Discussion-Paper_SDG_Food-Agriculture_UPDATE_06-01-2014.pdf.

- A standalone goal on “Sustainable Agriculture, Food Security and Nutrition”

62. That message was encapsulated in the acronym **SHIFT** representing:

- **S**mall-scale food producers empowered
- **H**unger and all forms of malnutrition ended, and full access to food ensured
- **I**nclusiveness in decision-making on sustainable agriculture, food security and nutrition
- **F**ood systems established which are sustainable, diverse and resilient, less wasteful, restore soil fertility and halt land degradation
- **T**rade policies reshaped and food price volatility mitigated

The acronym also harks back to the TST brief on sustainable agriculture that was prepared for the 3rd Session of the OWG that was quoted above.

63. The compilation by the major groups and other stakeholders included the following statement on behalf Women, Indigenous peoples, and NGOs, and the Food and Agriculture Cluster, illustrating the effect of the Roundtable:

“We strongly support a stand-alone goal on “Sustainable Agriculture, Food Security and Nutrition”, which can be summarized in the word SHIFT:

- **S**: for Small-scale food producers, especially women, including pastoralists, fishermen and forest people are empowered
- **H**: for Hunger and all forms of malnutrition ended, and full access to nutritious, adequate and affordable food ensured
- **I**: for Inclusiveness in decision-making on sustainable agriculture, including acknowledging food sovereignty as a key demand of the poor
- **F**: for Food systems established which are sustainable, diverse, and resilient, less wasteful, restore soil fertility, marine diversity, halt land degradation
- **T**: for Trade policies reshaped and food price volatility mitigated”

The changes in the wording reflecting, of course, the interests of the other groups who had contributed to that statement.

64. **The 11th Session of the OWG** was devoted to the discussions related to the working paper containing the proposed wording for the goals of 16 focus areas and the broad targets and indicators for each compiled from statements, presentations and interventions made during the previous sessions by the participants. The wording for the goal of the focus area on “sustainable agriculture, food security and nutrition” was: “**End hunger and improve nutrition for all through sustainable agriculture and improved food systems**”. Not the one proposed by BF/MI in the 10th Session, but their central conceptual framework of “food systems” was included. Moreover, there was substantial overlap between the targets proposed by BV/MI and the draft

targets contained in the working document. This is reflected in the document prepared by BV/MI as a reaction to the working document¹⁶. First, the proposed wording for the goal of the focus area was accepted by noting that: “The present formulation deserves unequivocal support”. Second, the scope of some of the proposed targets was found to be limited in coverage and two areas, one on price volatility and the other on multi-stakeholder decision processes that BV/MI considered to be important were not included as separate targets in the working document. BV/MI’s reaction document contains their suggested amendments¹⁷.

65. It should be noted that some of these suggestions did at least become a part of the compilation document of the major groups and other stakeholders¹⁸. Two examples of exact wording proposed by BV/MI and included in the compilation document are:

- **Target c):** “productive, ... resilient and diverse agriculture and food production systems that maintain and regenerate natural resources and ecosystems” (p. 3)
- **Add a new target:** “By 2030, contain excessive food price volatility (maximum standard deviation of x% from food price index over time)” (p. 5)

66. Their suggestion on multi-stakeholder processes was included under focus area 15 (Means of implementation/Global partnership for sustainable development) on target v) in following terms:

“... the global partnership among Member States and multi-stakeholder initiatives and partnerships that include government, civil society organizations, and the private sector) (p. 31)

67. How much of what BV/MI had suggested as reaction to the working paper presented in this session can be gauged to some extent by the “zero draft” presented for discussion in **the 12th Session of the OWG**¹⁹. The proposed wording for goal on focus area 2 was changed as: “**End hunger, achieve food security and adequate nutrition for all, and promote sustainable agriculture**”. Although the term “food systems” was dropped, the concept of ‘food security’ was introduced explicitly. Nevertheless, “food systems” was introduced as a part of target 2.5: “develop food systems that are more productive, sustainable, resilient and efficient, and minimize adverse human and environmental impacts without compromising food and nutrition

¹⁶ http://www.biovision.ch/fileadmin/pdf/sdgs/4_Reaction_FA2_WorkingDocOWG-11_BV-MI.pdf.

¹⁷ The trade issue was resolved as under “means of implementation” trade received three targets.

¹⁸ <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/3758mgsummary11.pdf>.

¹⁹ <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/4528zerodraft12OWG.pdf>.

security”, very similar to the wording suggested for target c) in the Major Groups’ compilation during Session 11. The new target suggested by BV/MI on price volatility was introduced in target 2.11 as: “... fully implement measures that curb excessive food price volatility and ensure proper functioning of markets”. Moreover, the addition suggested by BV/MI to “double smallholder food producer’s income and productivity”, though not included in the 11th Session compilation made it into the wording of target 2.3 as: “... substantially increase small-scale food producers’ incomes and productivity”. BV/MI’s concern regarding multi-stakeholder initiatives and partnerships are taken into account in targets 17.6 and 17.43. Indeed, their reaction document to the “zero draft” does not contain suggestions that can be considered major, not even on the wording of the goal itself²⁰.

68. Despite this, however, the statement made by the BV/MI to the Plenum on behalf of the “Major Groups NGOs, Women, Indigenous Peoples, Children and Youth, as well as the Food and Agriculture Cluster of the NGO Major Group” contained a suggestion to change the wording of Goal 2 to include ‘shift to’ in place of ‘promote’²¹. Other differences in the statement made to the Plenum and the BV/MI’s reaction document are probably due to the interventions of the partners who contributed to the preparation of the statement.
69. In the document presented to **the 13th and final Session of the OWG** the title of Goal 2 was changed to “**End hunger, improve nutrition, and promote sustainable agriculture**”, dropping the wording “achieve food security and adequate nutrition for all”, but not incorporating the ‘shift to’ suggested made by PR of Benin and the statement made in the previous session. BV/MI in their reaction to the new document explicitly proposed the insertion of the ‘shift to’ in place of ‘promote’ into the title this time²². In the compilation document the rewording of the goal reflected not only their suggestion but also that by others:: “End hunger, achieve food security and **wholesome adequate** nutrition, and **shift to promote** sustainable agriculture”²³. The Outcome Document²⁴ prepared right after the end of the Session on 19th July to be presented to the General Assembly, however, did not incorporate either of the

²⁰ http://www.biovision.ch/fileadmin/pdf/sdgs/Reaction_FA2_ZeroDraftOWG-12_BV-MII_13062014.pdf.

²¹ This difference may be due to a tactic employed by BV/MI not to be seen as pushing for the concept of SHIFT especially if the reaction document was for general distribution.

²² <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/4438mgscompilationowg13.pdf>.

²³ The wording “achieve food security and adequate nutrition” was apparently introduced by the Co-facilitators in the second version of the document presented, although the version on the website currently displayed is the unrevised first one.

²⁴ <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/7891Transforming%20Our%20World.pdf>.

suggestions made, though “food security” was re-introduced. This goal and the associated targets appear as follow:

“Goal 2. End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition, and promote sustainable agriculture

2.1 by 2030 end hunger and ensure access by all people, in particular the poor and people in vulnerable situations including infants, to safe, nutritious and sufficient food all year round

2.2 by 2030 end all forms of malnutrition, including achieving by 2025 the internationally agreed targets on stunting and wasting in children under five years of age, and address the nutritional needs of adolescent girls, pregnant and lactating women, and older persons

2.3 by 2030 double the agricultural productivity and the incomes of small-scale food producers, particularly women, indigenous peoples, family farmers, pastoralists and fishers, including through secure and equal access to land, other productive resources and inputs, knowledge, financial services, markets, and opportunities for value addition and non-farm employment

2.4 by 2030 ensure sustainable food production systems and implement resilient agricultural practices that increase productivity and production, that help maintain ecosystems, that strengthen capacity for adaptation to climate change, extreme weather, drought, flooding and other disasters, and that progressively improve land and soil quality

2.5 by 2020 maintain genetic diversity of seeds, cultivated plants, farmed and domesticated animals and their related wild species, including through soundly managed and diversified seed and plant banks at national, regional and international levels, and ensure access to and fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the utilization of genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge as internationally agreed

2.a. increase investment, including through enhanced international cooperation, in rural infrastructure, agricultural research and extension services, technology development, and plant and livestock gene banks to enhance agricultural productive capacity in developing countries, in particular in least developed countries

2.b. correct and prevent trade restrictions and distortions in world agricultural markets including by the parallel elimination of all forms of agricultural export subsidies and all export measures with equivalent effect, in accordance with the mandate of the Doha Development Round

2.c. adopt measures to ensure the proper functioning of food commodity markets and their derivatives, and facilitate timely access to market information, including on food reserves, in order to help limit extreme food price volatility” (p.7)

70. The reaction prepared by BV/MI for the document prepared by the Co-facilitators also made suggestions to insert the wording “maintain and

regenerate natural resources and ecosystems, including through” in Target 2.4 after “...drought and disasters, and ...” and add an additional target related to “global food waste and production and post-harvest food losses”. As can be seen, neither has ‘food systems’ been included in the wording of the goal. Although the term was included as a part of Target 2.4 in the zero draft in its 12th Session iteration, in its current iteration the wording was changed to ‘food production systems’, despite their efforts²⁵. Another attempt to change the wording of a target related to the means of implementation and the global partnerships was to insert “multi-stakeholder assessments” into Target 17.10. This also was not successful.

71. There were successes, however: in Target 2.3 the wording was changed from “substantially increase small-scale food producers’ incomes and productivity” as in the 12th Session iteration to “... double the agricultural productivity and the incomes of small-scale food producers”, as initially proposed by BV/MI.. The wording in Target 2.4 was changed from “*boost* productivity and production” to “*increase* productivity and production” mainly as a result of their efforts. And trade and price volatility issues were included under Targets 2.b and 2.c explicitly.
72. The overall assessment by BV/MI about the outcome of their activities at the 13th Session noted that: “The main objective of the mission was achieved as the outcome document of the Open Working Group on SDGs includes all the critical elements advocated for, including the elements of the SHIFT message from New York”. Considering the above, it is not clear that this claim can be fully justified especially since ‘food systems’ and ‘multi-stakeholder assessments’ had not been included in the final document, which are part of the **I** and **F** words in the SHIFT message. Neither is it possible to state unequivocally that all those that had been included, have had been included *solely* as a result of their own activities²⁶.

²⁵ Their push for ‘food systems’ rather than ‘food production systems’ also finds its full justification in the report of CFS’s High Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition, where it is stated that “A *food system* gathers all the elements (environment, people, inputs, processes, infrastructures, institutions, etc.) and activities that relate to the production, processing, distribution, preparation and consumption of food, and the outputs of these activities, including socio-economic and environmental outcomes” and that “A *sustainable food system* (SFS) is a food system that delivers food security and nutrition for all in such a way that the economic, social and environmental bases to generate food security and nutrition for future generations are not compromised.”(p. 2 http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/hlpe/hlpe_documents/HLPE_S_and_R/HLPE_2014_Food_Losses_and_Waste_Summary_EN.pdf). It is not clear how much FAO has pushed for this change during the various sessions.

²⁶ For example, the Rome based agencies, i.e. FAO, IFAD and WFP, in their joint think piece *on Food security, nutrition, and sustainable agriculture at the centre stage on the road to the Addis Ababa conference*, note: “**1. The starting point: the centrality of food security, nutrition and sustainable**

73. It was also possible to gain some insights from participants on the CCGA presence in relation to post 2015/SDG where it appears that CCGA may have had a more significant albeit indirect (for example through meetings of “non-state actors” with co-chairs) contribution in improving the information base and the quality of discussion. This is valuable, not least because the level of awareness on food security and sustainability in New York is lower than in Rome. CCGA has also had a valuable facilitation role in getting experts together and organization of events. The stronger focus on these discussions appears to have been the right strategic choice. CCGA has established a good reputation in New York as a knowledgeable and trusted authority. However, it is not clear that the specific aims of the CCGA have been achieved in relation to the SDGs.
74. Interviews with participants in the process revealed a number of benefits to other interest groups of the CCGA involvement. There was common ground and collaboration between FAO and BV/MI in promote the CFS as an integral part of the SDG process. Since aspects of the CCGA agenda were close to the Swiss agenda, Switzerland was able to gain some leverage for their own agenda through CCGA activities. Other countries may have benefitted in presenting their positions from selective reference to aspects of the CCGA agenda: the EU and multi-functionality, for example. Interviewees in general felt that the outcome document did reflect much of what BV/MI was promoting but acknowledged that much was common currency anyway. As with Rio+20, BV/MI was seen as having played a useful role not in changing any views but in facilitating discussion and getting a common understanding of the limits of what was politically feasible and hence some convergence.

agriculture to the post-2015 development agenda - Achieving food security and adequate nutrition for all is an essential component of sustainable development with poverty eradication at its core. Inclusive, efficient and sustainable food systems, underpinned by productive and sustainable agriculture, are critical both for food security and nutrition and for the eradicating poverty. They are also central for meeting other post-2015 aspirations related to inclusive growth, gender equality, health, education, reducing inequalities, resilience, and decent employment”.

Similar sentiments were also expressed in 2009 during the World Food Security Conference held in Rome in the 3rd of the Five Principles agreed by the participants: “Strive for a comprehensive twin-track approach to food security that consists of 1) direct action to immediately tackle hunger for the most vulnerable, and 2) medium- and long-term sustainable agricultural, food security, nutrition and rural development programmes to eliminate the root causes of hunger and poverty, including through the progressive realization of the right to adequate food. The Declaration affirms the right of all to access safe, sufficient and nutritious food. Steps will be taken to enable farmers, particularly women and smallholder farmers from countries most vulnerable to climate change, to adapt to and mitigate climate change impacts through appropriate technologies and practices that improve the resilience of farming systems”.

8. The CCGA Programme and Post 2015

75. There were eight meetings between January and May 2015 in preparation for the Post-2015 Conference scheduled for September 2015: during 19-21 January on *Stocktaking*; 17-20 February on *Declaration*; 23-27 March on *Sustainable development goals and targets*; 21-24 April on *Means of implementation and global partnership for sustainable development*; 18-20 May on *Follow-up and review*; three meetings during June and July on *Intergovernmental negotiations on the outcome document*. During the 'Stocktaking' session BV/MI disseminated the discussion paper entitled *Towards achieving Food and Nutrition Security, and changing course in global agriculture*. The paper reflected the views of 13 other institutions and was based on the outcome of the Roundtable organized by BV/MI and their partners during the 3rd Session of the Open Working Group (OWG) on 27-28 March, 2014. The main aim of the paper was to "trigger reactions / find facts / understand positions of Member States, UN agencies, etc., that will help ... (BV/MI) to further narrow down ... (their) position and tactics".
76. The paper reiterated the main principles that the BV/MI planned to expound during the negotiating process as mentioned above. During this period BV/MI concentrated on building networks among various participants, including member states. Also it was during this period that they signed a Memorandum of Understanding with IASS to follow the intergovernmental negotiations of the post-2015 development agenda. (to include "right to food" and "sustainable food systems" in the Declaration through the Food and AG cluster). During the 'Declaration' session, BV/MI, as a part of the Food and Agriculture Cluster of the NGO Major Group prepared a short brief, collaborating with Shumei International and World Animal Protection (formerly WSPA), with contribution and/or support from Compassion in World Farming, Humane Society International (HIS), IFOAM – Organics International, Institute for Advanced Sustainability Studies (IASS), International Fund for Animal Welfare (IFAW), Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (RSPCA). The brief was designed to propose the following inputs/wordings for the Declaration:
- *"We resolve to achieve a world free from hunger and realize the right to food for all people through a transformative shift to humane and sustainable agriculture, and sustainable food systems that are resilient, diverse, less wasteful, and contribute to maintaining and improving rural and urban ecosystems, in particular through a strong focus on enabling productivity growth by small-scale producers, achieving a land-degradation-neutral world, and ensuring equitable multilateral trade systems and markets that promote rural development and food security."*

- “We reaffirm the important work and inclusive nature of the Committee on World Food Security, including through its role in facilitating country-initiated assessments on sustainable food production and food security, and we encourage countries to give due consideration to implementing the Committee on World Food Security Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security as well as the Principles for Responsible Investments in Agriculture and Food Systems.”

77. A search was conducted in the final document to be presented to the General Assembly ²⁷, *Transforming our world: The 2030 agenda for sustainable development* to find out whether any of the important phrases in the 1st paragraph above found its way into the Declaration. The following phrases were used in the searches:

- right to food
- sustainable food systems
- equitable multilateral trade system
- small-scale producers
- shift to²⁸

78. The search did not yield positive results, but ‘equitable multilateral *trading* system’ and ‘small-scale producers’ were discovered. Search using phrases from the 2nd of the suggested paragraphs found similar wording in paragraph 24 of the Declaration related to the Committee on World Food Security, the same wording found in paragraph 115 of the final document of the Rio+20 process, “The future we want”:

“24 ... we reaffirm the important role and inclusive nature of the Committee on World Food Security and welcome the Rome Declaration on Nutrition and Framework for Action...”

79. But, especially ‘country-initiated assessments on sustainable food production and food security’, a key priority for BV/MI to identify an international organization to conduct ‘multi-stakeholder assessments on sustainable agriculture and food systems’, was not included in the Declaration.

80. This priority was made an important part of the activities of BV/MI during the session on ‘Sustainable development goals and targets’ with the preparation and dissemination of a short brief entitled “Role of the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) in the follow-up and review of the post-2015

²⁷ <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/7891Transforming%20Our%20World.pdf>.

²⁸ The word ‘shift’ was found in the second paragraph of the *Preamble* as a part of the sentence “... shift the world onto a sustainable and resilient path”.

development agenda”²⁹. The suggested wording in the brief to be included in the post-2015 agenda was:

“We reaffirm the important work and inclusive nature of the Committee on World Food Security, and encourage the Committee to provide a platform for thematic follow up and review of progress on the implementation of the goals and targets of the post-2015 development agenda related to food security, nutrition and sustainable agriculture, while not duplicating the work of other international platforms and bodies.”

Which as already stated above did not make it into the “Transforming our world” document.

81. In a similar vein, another short brief was prepared for dissemination during the session entitled “Multi-Stakeholder Assessments for Long-Term Policy Planning”³⁰, this time to insert a phrase change in the wording of Target 17.9 as follows:

*“17.9 Enhance international support for implementing effective and targeted capacity building in developing countries to support **multi-stakeholder assessments to inform** national plans to implement all sustainable development goals, including through North-South, South-South, and triangular cooperation.”*

Again, the suggested change was not incorporated into the final document.

82. BV/MI returned to the same topic by holding a side event at the second drafting session on the outcome document of the *Third International Conference on Financing for Development* entitled “Multi-Stakeholder Assessments for Post-2015 Development”, hosted by the Permanent Missions of Benin, the Republic of Korea, and Switzerland, along with the Sustainable World Initiative.
83. BV/MI prepared suggested inputs to the Zero Draft of the Addis Ababa Outcome Document. A word search was conducted in the final document adopted by the Conference, entitled *Addis Ababa Action Agenda of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development*. The search used certain phrases included in the proposals put forward by BV/MI and are listed below:

29

http://www.biovision.ch/fileadmin/pdf/e/services/downloads/changing_course_download/ShortBrief_CFS-Post-2015.pdf.

30

http://www.biovision.ch/fileadmin/pdf/e/services/downloads/changing_course_download/ShortBrief_Multi-StakeholderAssessmentsPost-2015.pdf.

- multi-stakeholder assessments³¹
- sustainable food systems
- market inefficiencies
- market failures
- information asymmetries
- unfair trade practices practices (the terms ‘trade restrictions’ and ‘distortions’ are used in the document to refer to the world agricultural markets)
- small-scale food producers (wording in document “formal financial services to **all**” rather than a list specifically mentioning ‘small scale food producers’, although ‘smallholders’ are specifically mentioned with respect to enhancing their food security and nutrition, raising their incomes etc.)
- dumping of food surpluses
- value chains accessible to small and low-income agricultural producers (the wording in document is “integration of micro, small and medium-sized **enterprises** into value chains” rather than a list specifically mentioning certain producers in the agricultural sector)
- food reserves
- food price volatility
- right to food

84. None of the specific searches was successful, although as noted above, next to some the terms that can be alternatives to those were used instead. However, the suggestion “to give due consideration to implementing the Committee on World Food Security Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security (VGT) as well as the Principles for Responsible Investments in Agriculture and Food Systems (RAI principles)” has been included in the final document as “we recognize the Committee on World Food Security’s voluntary(sic) Principles for Responsible Investment in Agriculture and Food Systems and the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests” (paragraph 13, page 5, UN A/COF.227/L.1). However, this was included at the instigation of BV/MI is not clear.

85. To be fair, however, Civil Society Forum’s declaration clearly expresses the fact that the many of the demands of its members have generally not been met

³¹ To be fair, paragraph 127 of the document includes the statement: “We further recognize the importance of preparing **country needs assessments** (emphasis added) for the different priority areas to allow for greater transparency and efficiency by linking needs and support, in particular in developing countries”. Although “multi-stakeholder assessments” can also be used to determine “needs”, the processes necessary for an assessment to be called “multi-stakeholder” are quite unique and the term “country needs assessments” may not fully reflect those processes.

by the outcome agreed by the countries at the Conference on many levels³². So it is not unexpected that most of the proposals put forward by BV/MI have not been incorporated into the outcome document either.

86. Although, the issue of commodity price volatility is not mentioned in the initial document, paragraph 108 recognizes its importance “for food and agriculture and its consequences for global food security and improved nutrition outcomes”.
87. Mr Herren attended the 3rd Session of the Roundtable on “Global partnership and the three dimensions of sustainable development”, as a civil society representative.

³² See (<https://csoforffd.files.wordpress.com/2015/07/addis-ababa-cso-ffd-forum-declaration-12-july-2015.pdf>)

9. Conclusions and Recommendations

Effectiveness, relevance and impact

88. In terms of a comparison of the specific outcomes at global level sought by the CCGA programme and the actual outcomes, the record is mixed. However, such comparisons do not capture all the impacts of the programme and can be misleading. Arguably the one instance of the CFS where there is a clear link between an observable outcome and the CCGA Programme was the most frustrating of the engagements in the different processes. In that sense, Adapted Outcome 1/2 has only been partially met as of now. The programme has had a more generalised positive impact in relation to Revised Outcome 4.. It has facilitated and contributed to the debate on sustainable food systems in different global fora, mapping out the limits of feasible and unfeasible solutions ultimately derived from the IAASTD and so helping to achieve consensus. It has championed multi-stakeholder national assessments as a basis for strategy and policy formulation. Along the way, it has generally enhanced awareness and knowledge of sustainability in agriculture and different approaches to achieving more sustainable food systems and thus improved the quality of debate. All three of these contributions are highly relevant to the global processes in which CCGA has engaged.
89. The issue of sustainability in food systems is highly relevant and increasingly a subject for international debate. CCGA tapped into what was already a major concern. CCGA was not alone in arguing for more sustainable food systems but brought its own particular perspective and, uniquely, a proposed mechanism to identify and explore national policy options. Its value added has been in facilitating dialogue and promoting convergence on the importance of sustainability issues in agriculture and their links to food security and in helping to keep these issues high on the international agenda. CCGA has also had a valuable facilitation role in bringing experts together and organization of events. In these senses, CCGA can claim to have achieved revised Outcome 4. More than that, there are some indications at least in rhetoric of acceptance of a “paradigm shift “ towards sustainable food systems beyond the SDGs, for example in the recent G20 Action Plan on Food Security and Sustainable Food Systems.
90. CCGA’s awareness raising and information providing roles have been especially valuable in relation to the New York processes, since the level of awareness on food security and sustainability in New York is lower than in Rome. The CCGA presence in relation to Rio+20 and SDGs/post 2015 appears to have had a more significant albeit indirect (for example through meetings of “non-state actors”

with co-chairs) contribution in improving the information base and the quality of discussion. The stronger focus on these discussions appears to have been the right strategic choice. CCGA has established a good reputation in New York as a knowledgeable and trusted authority. However, it cannot easily be demonstrated that the specific aims of the CCGA have been achieved in relation to the SDGs.

91. BV/MI through the CCGA programme have been very active in the various global processes not only through highly visible activities such as side-events and roundtables but also through bilateral meetings and networking. It is clear that BV/MI are of good standing and enjoy the respect of relevant stakeholders. Their activities, especially in New York, have been much appreciated by participants in facilitating dialogue and providing information although lobbying and advocacy have received mixed responses, especially in Rome.
92. At least some of that respect for the CCGA work is derived from the reputation of Hans Herren personally. His involvement helped BV/MI gain access to senior figures and fora. This is both a strength and a weakness of the overall BV/MI approach in that the absence of Hans Herren might limit the opportunities and effectiveness of CCGA. At the same time, he is well-known for promoting a particular stance and in a particular way and this can polarise opinion when what is needed is to explore opportunities for consensus.
93. Those who were already in agreement with BV/MI positions valued their lobbying on their behalf feeling it counters the asymmetric power relationship with the transnational agribusiness corporations. However, others, including a number of highly influential individuals, representatives and organizations, with alternative views were not in general persuaded by CCGA solutions. Although the need to have more sustainable food systems is widely accepted, how to achieve them is in any case a hotly contested question with alternative answers and entrenched viewpoints. CCGA has done a good job in outlining one approach in an evidence-based and objective way. However, to advance that approach it is important to acknowledge alternative solutions which are perhaps more dominant in current international policy trends rests. That includes the role of the private sector and international trade.
94. It is apparent that BV/MI could enjoy a more productive dialogue on technical possibilities with more technical audiences, for example in Rome, rather than more political and diplomatic audiences where raising awareness and providing information was the key. There is a need to tailor the style of engagement more to the audience concerned. It is also important, as the CFS experience shows, to base engagement on a full understanding of the political processes involved and what is feasible and infeasible. Over the period covered

by this evaluation it seems that BV/MI recognized the need for greater flexibility in presenting their views.

95. A number of interviewees, including sympathetic ones, complained that BV/MI were “too pushy” in their lobbying and this was inappropriate to the political processes involved and ultimately counter-productive. It is noteworthy that Biovision CFS Mission Reports talk about their “demands” being met or not met when strictly speaking BV/MI are not in any position to make “demands”. BV/MI were also guilty of over-estimating the true level of support for their views, whatever the formal results they achieved. This seems to have been a particular problem in Rome in relation to the CFS where the level of cynicism and sense of urgency was misjudged. A more subtle approach is needed in what are complex inter-governmental processes with different national and regional interests and complicated bureaucracies. These tend to rely on compromise and consensus so lobbying cannot be pushy or confrontational but needs to be more informational and persuasive. There is a need to understand the political culture and work patiently and constructively with the bureaucracies and members to convey messages and build trust. BV/MI need to play to their technical strengths, presenting their case more clearly and demonstrating its worth.
96. The CCGA Programme basically targeted two headline processes in promoting its messages on sustainable food systems. While it played a part in securing desirable outcomes in these processes there were other opportunities that might also have been explored and where there might have been greater rewards. One of these would be the G20 which has been working on sustainable food systems since the Mexican Presidency in 2012. Another strategy would have been to target important strategic elements in international discussion rather than the headlines. These would have included the CFS negotiations on the Voluntary Guidelines on Land Tenure and the Principles for Responsible Agricultural Investment. In the CFS, it might have been more productive to target the monitoring work to gain a foothold on assessments rather than the MYPOW. There may be some advantage in a broader strategic review of CCGA engagement and following trends in international discussions rather than trying to set an agenda.
97. At the global level, CCGA has been to some extent preaching to the converted on the general importance of food security and sustainability issues and a central role for the CFS in relation to these. Nevertheless, CCGA has played a role in cementing these in global policy. For the reasons explained earlier, there has been less real success in making the case for multi-stakeholder national assessments. It has been recognized that national policy makers need tools to help them explore trade offs between food security and sustainability goals and

policies It may therefore be that national level support to policy makers potentially holds most opportunity for a significant contribution although that is for Segment 2 to explore. However, demonstrating the value of CCGA approaches at national level will be important in securing acceptance at the global level and the national level activities need to be conducted with that aim in mind.

Attribution of results

98. Outcome documents did reflect a lot of what BV/MI were talking about but much was common currency anyway and language tends to be very general and open to different interpretations. Many other groups could also claim similar influence.
99. While CCGA has been very present in the different international processes it is therefore not easy to trace an attributable significant influence upon final outcome documents. Only in the case of the CFS MYPOW is it clear but that proved a hollow achievement at least so far. CCGA's main contribution may well have had a beneficial effect in a more general sense including facilitation and partnerships and that indirectly has probably had an influence on outcome documents. BV/MI can certainly share credit along with many other actors for good outcomes but attribution is difficult.
100. The difficulties of attribution mean it is not easy to substantiate the claims made in the CCGA end of phase project report about its influence. The other thing that is noticeable is the very low level of awareness of IAASTD. For those who have heard about it the view is that it had little impact and has largely disappeared from view.
101. It seems that other international processes where CCGA did not engage have moved as far on sustainable food systems as those targeted, although in many case it is largely the same participants involved so the processes are inter-dependent. Nevertheless, these provide a kind of control group to assess CCGA's contribution. The major example is the work of the G20 Agricultural Deputies and Development Working Group. These have both pursued a sustainability agenda including, with the OECD Productivity Framework, a kind of national assessment framework to support policy-making. The same goes for the new FAO Strategic Framework Strategic Objective 2, where CCGA might still provide valuable input into its refinement. As noted above, engagement also with these other processes might have been beneficial.
102. The CCGA Programme has undoubtedly been directly beneficial to some countries and organizations. There was close alignment between CCGA and

Swiss positions in Rio+20, for example, which was perceived as providing significant leverage on the Swiss agenda. The wide-ranging nature of the IAASTD meant that other countries could also find valuable independent support from CCGA for some of their policy positions – multifunctionality and the EU being one case in point. FAO and the other Rome-based agencies found CCGA very useful in cementing a strong role for the CFS in relation to the SDGs.

Efficiency and partnerships

103. Although no detailed breakdown of budgets was available, the CCGA programme has been well-resourced compared to other NGO activities and even compared to some international organization teams. It seems that BV/MI have been judicious and effective in using their resources and have leveraged these through very productive partnerships with other NGOs, international organizations and countries as noted above. The idea of multi-stakeholder national assessments strengthens the possibilities for partnerships at national level. While beginning uncertainly, BV/MI's partnership with the CSM is stronger and the reworked proposal to the CFS for work on SDGs and national assessments is promising. BV/MI are very different from other members of the CSM which are basically campaigning groups so this relationship has taken a lot of effort and commitment on the part of BV/MI to build. Working within the CSM is important to gain traction in the CFS so these efforts need to be continued.

Sustainability of project outcomes

104. The processes in which the CCGA Programme has been involved - Rio+20, SDGs/post 2015 - will have a lasting impact on global policy towards sustainable food systems. To the extent that CCGA has contributed positively to these processes and has kept alive the key elements of its programme, the programme also has sustainability.

105. The lack of follow-up to the CFS MYPOW commitment raises questions about the sustainability of that achievement but hopefully that particular CFS workstream is not lost forever. The CFS will have a role in relation to the SDGs and a new proposal may reinstate the multi-stakeholder national assessments. The idea is not dead but there will need to be some reconsideration of strategy vis-à-vis the CFS as outlined above to bring it to fruition.

ANNEX: Extract from Terms of Reference for Segment 1.

Overall Objectives

The consultant will have to strive to attain the following interlinked objectives:

- Effectiveness and relevance of CCGA: a) Evaluate the degree by which the agreed outcomes at the global and national policy levels were achieved, and b) evaluate the relevance of the achieved results, in order to assess the effectiveness and draw conclusions on the impact of the program
- Attribution of results to CCGA: Assess the contribution of the CCGA program to the degree by which outcomes were achieved (attribution), including by relating and comparing it to the contribution of other actors (in particular the GPFS)
- Efficiency CCGA: Evaluate the performance and efficiency of the CCGA program in relation to the results attributable to CCGA including partnerships
- Sustainability of CCGA: Evaluate the sustainability of the CCGA program
- Recommendations: Make recommendations on how to strengthen the effectiveness, impact, relevance, efficiency and sustainability of the CCGA program, taking into account major constraints, gaps and challenges, as well as success factors and opportunities, and make recommendations for future collaboration between CCGA and GPFS

Specific tasks for Segment I (April – October 2015)

The specific deliverables for the consultant for each objective are:

1. Results observed:

- - Analyse agreed policy documents at global policy level to assess whether they reflect the agreed outcome goals, in particular Rio+20 outcome document, Multi-year Programme of Work 2014-2015 of the Committee on World Food Security (CFS), the Outcome Document of the UN General Assembly Open Working Group on SDGs, and the final Outcome of the post- 2015 process as endorsed at the Post-2015 Summit in September 2015.
- - Collect further evidence and data as needed through interviews

with CCGA and GPFS staff

2. Attribution of results to CCGA:

Rio+20

- - Analyse the draft negotiation documents of Rio+20 to track the changes over the course of the negotiations and identify the supporters/opponents of specific changes (e.g. which countries, groups of countries)
- - Elaborate, and if possible, identify the specific contribution of CCGA interventions (including awareness raising activities) and GPFS interventions to the changes tracked
 - Conduct interviews to collect further evidence and data, including with CCGA and GPFS staff, former staff at the Permanent Representation of Switzerland to the UN in New York, key negotiators and partners, and the Special Representative of the UNSG on Food Security and Nutrition. CFS
 - Analyse the process for the development of the CFS Multi-year Programme of Work 2014- 2015 to identify the steps that led to the endorsement of a workstream on facilitating multi- stakeholder assessments, in particular by looking at the minutes of the Open-Ended Working Group on MYPOW, formal submissions, and the results of the ranking exercise for different propositions
 - Elaborate, and if possible, identify the specific contribution of CCGA interventions (including awareness raising activities) and GPFS interventions in the process
 - Conduct interviews to collect further evidence and data, including with CCGA and GPFS staff, staff at the Permanent Representation of Switzerland to the Rome-based Agencies, the former Chair of the OEWG on MYPOW in 2013, the former Chair of the CFS, and the Special Representative of the UNSG on Food Security and Nutrition. SDG OWG Process
 - Analyse the process for the development of a set of SDGs within the UNGA Open Working Group on Sustainable Development Goals to identify the steps that led to the endorsement of the specific goals and targets on food security, nutrition and agriculture, in particular by looking at the country-statements in the OWG, CCGA mission reports, comparing the SHIFT message with the final outcome, and comparing CCGA inputs to

the process (e.g. Hans Herren's presentation in May 2013, CCGA reaction papers, etc.) with the final outcome.

- Elaborate, and if possible, identify the specific contribution of CCGA interventions and GPFS interventions to the changes tracked

- Conduct interviews to collect further evidence and data, including with CCGA and GPFS staff, staff at the Permanent Representation of Switzerland to the UN in New York, staff at FOAG in Switzerland, negotiators of member states (including the chair of the group of LDCs), Representatives of the Rome-based Agencies, staff of UNDESA, and the Special Representative of the UNSG on Food Security and Nutrition. Post-2015 Process

- Analyse the process for the development of the final post-2015 agenda, conducted from January 2015 to September 2015, to identify the steps that led to the achievement or non-achievement of CCGA outcomes (e.g. in case goals and targets were changed, as well as means of implementation and monitoring and accountability systems on food security)

- Elaborate, and if possible, identify the specific contribution of CCGA interventions and GPFS interventions to the changes tracked

- Conduct additional data collection and analysis as needed (details to be agreed at later stage)

3. Efficiency CCGA

- Analyse the efficiency of the CCGA program in relation to the relevance and effectiveness of the interventions

- Evaluate the partnerships undertaken

4. Sustainability of CCGA

- Assess the sustainability of the results achieved, including the conditions under which the CCGA efforts have a long-term effect after the completion of the CCGA program

5. Conclusions and Recommendations:

- Derive conclusions and recommendations for the CCGA program, including by identified: o Constraints, gaps and challenges(external and internal) o success factors (external and internal) o future opportunities

- Make recommendations for the collaboration between CCGA and GPFS for the period up to December 2017