

## **5.24: ESTABLISH A GLOBAL CENTRE FOR RISK ASSESSMENT & POLICY RESPONSE ON CONFLICT AND HUNGER**

*A global center with dispersed location to establish a common understanding of the pathways and root causes of food insecurity in conflict settings.*

### **What, in brief, is the solution?**

A global centre, with a dispersed location in regions marked by hunger and conflict brings together experts, food systems actors and peacebuilding practitioners to establish a common understanding of the pathways and root causes of food insecurity in conflict settings. It also provides recommendations for effective food systems interventions on the basis of this understanding. By promoting a comprehensive approach to food security and peace, the centre brings the response and prevention agendas closer together. Where the Food and Peace Facilities concentrate on strategies and programming, the Global Centre concentrates on policy and instruments. To do this it

- Provides analysis of the relationship between food insecurity and violent conflict to:
  - Identify risk management priorities (for short-to-medium term action)
  - Identify root causes of food insecurity (for medium-to-long term priorities for policy and action);
- Increases global awareness of these relationships, including in regional and multinational organizations, as well as international fora;
- Provides analysis and research on opportunities for interventions that combine enhancing food security, livelihoods and resilient food systems with sustaining peace;
- Provides recommendations on preparedness, planning and appropriate instruments for food security interventions in conflict-affected communities, and with the threefold aim of alleviating immediate need, addressing the root causes of food insecurity and contributing to peace;
- Conducts horizon scanning and develops potential scenarios in countries facing weak food systems and/or violent conflict;
- Strengthens regional and national risk assessment capacities and risk management possibilities;
- Works closely with experts and organizations who explore linkages between food insecurity and violent conflict, such as the Global Network Against Food Crises and its member states:
  - The centre should support the work of the Global Network by expanding the evidence base for the relationship between food insecurity and violent conflict; identifying strategic investments to prepare, prevent and respond to food crises in conflict-affected areas; and building political consensus on the pathways and root causes of food insecurity in conflict settings;
  - Synergies and areas of collaboration with the Global Network's work should be explored to amalgamate efforts, where appropriate, and avoid duplication;
- Links research and evidence-based interventions with ongoing policy debates and concrete actions, including global discussions on SDG 2 and 16, UNSDCF, national hunger eradication programs, etc.;
- Supports the broadening and strengthening of a global community of thought and practice on enhancing peace and food security;
- Promotes the implementation of existing frameworks that underscore the relationship between food insecurity and violent conflict, including the Committee on World Food Security's (CFS) Framework for Action for Food Security and Nutrition in Protracted Crises.

**What was/were the source(s) from which this solution emerged?**

The solution emerged from a member of the working group and was developed following discussion with the group. It draws on the experience of working group members, who see the lack of global consensus on the relationship between food systems and violent conflict in their respective policy areas. The solution also draws from suggested solutions submitted in a survey of AT5 members.

### **What problem is it trying to address within food systems?**

Despite ample evidence that violent conflict gravely weakens food systems and is the leading driver of food insecurity, a common understanding of the pathways and root causes of food insecurity in conflict settings does not exist. As a result, there is also a lack of coherent, comprehensive and systematic policy recommendations for effective food systems interventions in conflict settings.

### **How can this solution address that problem?**

Theory of Change: **If** the policy community has a common understanding of the root causes and causal pathways of food insecurity in conflict settings, and of risk management priorities in areas facing violent conflict, **then** international organizations, actors in conflict-affected countries and donor governments can act more effectively to prevent deterioration of food systems in conflict settings, creating stronger food systems and enhancing the prospects of peace.

#### **Inputs:**

- An active network of states, academics and think tanks, together with humanitarian, development and peacebuilding actors from around the world;
- Analysis of the relationship between food insecurity and violent conflict;
- Recommendations on food security interventions that address the root causes and causal pathways of hunger in conflict-affected communities;
- Recommendations on interventions that contribute to sustaining peace by addressing underlying drivers of conflict;
- Horizon scanning and potential scenarios to help define policy priorities;
- Support for regional and national risk assessment capacities and risk management possibilities.

#### **Outputs:**

- Risk management priorities, for short-to-medium term action, are identified;
- Response and prevention priorities are identified;
- Research and evidence-based interventions are linked with ongoing policy debates and concrete actions including global discussions on SDG 2 and 16, UNSDCFs, national hunger eradication programs, etc.

#### **Outcome:**

- Global consensus on the root causes of food insecurity in conflict settings, allowing for medium-to-long term priorities for policy and action;
- Increased global awareness of the relationship between strong, sustainable food systems and positive peace;
- More impactful and sustainable peacebuilding, food security, livelihoods, climate resilience, and early warning interventions;
- Improved understanding of the impact of peacebuilding interventions on food systems, and of food system interventions on the prospects of peace.

#### **Impact:**

- Stronger, more sustainable food systems;
- Positive peace in previously conflict-affected areas.

Assumptions:

- States, academics, applied science, humanitarian, development and peacebuilding actors will work together effectively;
- The global center will have sustainable, long-term funding.

### **Why does this solution align to the definition and criteria for a ‘game changing solution’ developed by the Summit?**

By establishing a common understanding of the pathways and root causes of food insecurity in conflict settings – and by providing policy recommendations on the basis of this understanding – the global centre will fundamentally shift food system interventions in conflict-affected areas. Given its focus on horizon scanning and prevention, it will also ensure a large return on investment, especially through reducing the global humanitarian burden. With adequate funding, the global centre is a sustainable solution focused on medium to long term impact. Lastly, by building global consensus on the relationship between food insecurity and violent conflict, the centre will also help to eliminate the economic and political self-interest of actors from food systems interventions, ultimately making its policy recommendations more easily actionable.

### **What is the existing evidence supporting the argument that this solution will work, or at least that it will achieve the initial outcomes described above?**

The solution builds on the demonstrated returns on investment of food security related early warning and anticipatory action activities that contribute to the prospects of peace. One example is FAO’s anticipatory actions in the La Guajira region of Colombia, which helped to improve social cohesion between host and migrant households targeted by the project.

The solution also draws upon examples of risk assessment informing innovative food security instruments including risk financing, such as the Africa Risk Capacity, and index insurance for small-holder farmers.

### **What is the current and/or likely political support for this idea?**

Many countries are likely to support this idea. These include:

- **The Netherlands, Côte d’Ivoire, Kuwait, and Sweden** – penholders of UNSCR 2417 which highlighted the relationship between war and hunger.
- **Denmark**, who funds WFP’s knowledge partnership with SIPRI focused on improving the evidence base for the relationship between food and security.
- **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines**, who, during its November 2020 Presidency of the UN Security Council, held a virtual open debate on “Peacebuilding and sustaining peace: contemporary drivers of conflict and insecurity.
- **Member states of the Committee on World Food Security (CFS)**, which endorsed, in 2015, the Framework for Action on Food Security and Nutrition in Protracted Crises.
- **Member states of the Global Network Against Food Crises**, whose objective is to “improve coordination and integration of actions along the Humanitarian-Development-Peace nexus for long lasting solutions to food crises”.
- **Member states of the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD)**, whose *2020-2022 Food Security and Nutrition Response Strategy* recognizes the adverse impact of conflict-induced shocks on food security.
- **Member states at the System Board and the General Assembly of Centers CGIAR (Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research)**
- UN organizations and NGOs working on issues related to land/water/food security or violent conflict

The **World Bank** may support this solution given its ongoing efforts on the Famine Action Mechanism, the Crisis Response Window- Early Responses to Slower-onset Events (CRW-ERF) and the Early Warning for Early Action hub focused on integrated food security monitoring. Synergies and areas of collaboration with the World Bank's work should be explored to amalgamate efforts, where appropriate, and avoid duplication.

**CGIAR** (the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research) has already indicated support, including the willingness of its member organizations to play an active role in this solution.

**Are there certain contexts for which this solution is particularly well suited, or, conversely, contexts for which it is not well-suited at all?**

The global centre would benefit from a dispersed location across several regions experiencing hunger and conflict. This will ensure that the center's policy recommendations are grounded in the experiences of local actors and data from conflict-affected communities. This will also ensure that the centre is accessible to regional, national, and local policy makers in conflict-affected areas.

**What do you think are the key actions required to address this solution? Please mention the implementation approach for 3 levels, if appropriate:**

Buy-in is required at two key levels to ensure the establishment and long-term success of Food and Peace Facilities:

- a. By actors working across the humanitarian-development-peace nexus: scientific, humanitarian, development and peacebuilding actors must work together effectively to build consensus.
- a. By donors: long-term, sustainable funding is required to ensure the success of this solution. Where appropriate, the findings and recommendations of the global centre should inform donor and national government policies in countries affected by conflict.