

5. FOOD AND PEACE HUBS

ACTION AREA	FOOD SYSTEMS RESILIENCE
SOLUTION CLUSTER	HUMANITARIAN-DEVELOPMENT-PEACE (HDP) NEXUS
THEMATIC AREA	HUMANITARIAN-DEVELOPMENT-PEACE NEXUS
SUBMITTED BY	PEACE & RESILIENCE WG

WHAT, IN BRIEF, IS THE SOLUTION?

A Food and Peace Facility is a multidisciplinary hub made up of humanitarian, development and peacebuilding analysts, actors and funders in a country that faces – throughout the country or in a part of it – the identifiable risk, current reality or aftermath of violent conflict and its humanitarian impact. The Facility houses the capacity to develop, plan and carry forward activities that address and ameliorate the double burden of food insecurity and conflict. It houses teams that bring together discreet and disparate initiatives and ways of working to exploit the synergies between them. It integrates and amalgamates existing and new activities. It ensures a nuanced, coherent, comprehensive and systematic approach to strengthening sustainable food systems so that, to the greatest extent possible, efforts to strengthen food systems are conflict-sensitive and peace positive.

A Food and Peace Facility shapes the strategy and actions that build food security and peace in the country, and shapes incoming funding streams to ensure they are appropriate to meeting those goals in the specific context. Donors support the Facility to give it authority and weight and the Facility's capacity ensures it has impact and influence. Each facility is a point of consolidation and cross-learning.

It is of the essence of this proposal that each Facility contributes to preparedness and prevention, as well as response and recovery. Each Facility will therefore contribute to the fundamentals of resilience.

Each Food and Peace Facility:

- Provides context-specific multidisciplinary analyses on the complex relationships between food systems, livelihoods, climate change and violent conflict with policy recommendations;
- Increases awareness of these relationships at the local, national and regional levels;
- Promotes coherent and coordinated food system planning that incorporates these relationships;
- Thus, promotes a range of individual actions that are designed for and appropriate to the specific contexts in which they are to be implemented;
- Monitors actions and lessons learnt, thus improving programming;
- Conducts detailed conflict analyses with policy recommendations for government agencies, national and international non-governmental organizations, and UN organizations (taking into consideration the needs of girls, boys, men and women);
- Brings together and, where necessary, ensures the collection of contextual data, including biophysical, agro-environmental, weather patterns, climate predictions, food and nutrition security, geo-political data and conflict trends to inform scenarios of food system fragility and impacts, and to feed early warning systems;
- Scales-up food security, livelihoods, climate resilience, and early warning activities proven to contribute to the prospects of peace, and scales-up peacebuilding interventions proven to strengthen food security, livelihoods, and climate resilience;
- Facilitates coherent practice and cross-learning among UN organizations, national and international NGOs, government institutions and local organizations;

- Informs, where appropriate, inter-agency processes in the country or region, including Humanitarian Response Plans, Regional Refugee Response Plans, UN Sustainable Development Cooperation Frameworks (UNDCF) and World Bank Cooperation Frameworks and Preparedness Plans, etc.;
- Assists with food security preparedness planning of governments, where appropriate (particularly those done in conjunction with the World Bank);
- Works with the private sector to establish sustainable food security, livelihoods and climate resilience interventions that contribute to improving the prospects for peace and sustainable peacebuilding interventions that strengthen food systems, livelihoods, and climate resilience;
- Fundraises for evidence-based interventions that strengthen food security and improve the prospects for peace.
- Promotes the on-the-ground implementation of existing frameworks that underscore the relationship between food insecurity and violent conflict, particularly 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 all working group members. It also includes components of suggested game-changing solutions submitted in a survey of AT5 members.

The solution draws upon recommendations noted in, inter alia, the 2017 *State of Food Security and Nutrition*⁷ report, the 2017 FAO study, *Sowing the Seeds of Peace for Food Security: Disentangling the nexus between conflict, food security and peace*⁸, the 2018 UN and World Bank report, *Pathways for Peace: Inclusive Approaches to Preventing Violent Conflict*⁹, CGIAR Climate Security webinars on a *Partnership Agenda for Climate Security*^{10,11}, and SIPRI's 2019 *The World Food Programme's Contribution to Improving the Prospects for Peace*¹² report, published as part of the SIPRI-WFP knowledge partnership (see section 2.7 for more details).

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, scientific perspectives, as well as interventions designed to strengthen food systems, support livelihoods, and mitigate the impacts of climate change often overlook conflict dynamics, as well as the root causes of violent conflict and food insecurity. Such interventions therefore risk having a limited impact and exacerbating existing fragilities.

WHY IS ADDRESSING THAT PROBLEM IMPORTANT FOR ACHIEVING THE GOAL OF YOUR WORKING GROUP?

The goal of the working group is to ensure that regions, countries and communities are able to resist, respond to, and recover from violent conflict, and sustain peace in the longer term. By building a comprehensive, multidisciplinary approach on a foundation of context-specific analyses of the relationship

⁷ Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), World Food Programme (WFP) and World Health Organization (WHO), *The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World 2017: Building Resilience for Peace and for Food Security* (FAO: Rome, 2017)

⁸ C. Holleman, J. Jackson, M.V. Sánchez & R. Vos, ed., *Sowing the Seeds of Peace for Food Security: Disentangling the nexus between conflict, food security & peace* (FAO: Rome, 2017)

⁹ United Nations, World Bank Group, *Pathways for Peace: Inclusive Approaches to Preventing Violent Conflict* (World Bank Group: Washington, DC, 2018)

¹⁰ CGIAR. CGIAR Climate Security Webinar, 2020. *The Role of Climate and Food Systems Science in Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding with panellists Vermeulen S, Smith D.* https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Mbe2KU_zxFY (accessed Feb 9, 2021).

¹¹ CGIAR. CGIAR Climate Security Webinar, 2020. *A Partnership Agenda for Climate Security with panellists Malley R, Sadoff C, Ibrenk HO, Bousquet F.* https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=w5bvBzZOrsw&t=1994s&ab_channel=CGIAR (accessed Feb 9, 2021).

¹² Delgado, C., Jang, S., Milante, G., Smith, D. *The World Food Programme's Contribution to Improving the Prospects for Peace*, Preliminary report (SIPRI: Stockholm, June 2019)

between conflict and food insecurity, Food and Peace Facilities strengthen food systems and contribute towards sustaining positive peace.

HOW CAN THIS SOLUTION ADDRESS THAT PROBLEM?

Theory of Change: **If** peacebuilding, food security, livelihoods, climate resilience, and early warning interventions are evidence-based, integrated and managed by a dedicated institution in each conflict-affected country, **then** peacebuilding efforts will strengthen sustainable food systems and food systems will enhance the prospects of positive peace.

Inputs:

- An active network of humanitarian, development and peacebuilding actors in country;
- Donor government support;
- Tools to ensure that efforts to strengthen food systems are both conflict-sensitive and peace positive, and that peacebuilding activities ensure strong and sustainable food systems, including:
 - Detailed conflict analyses;
 - Nuanced and context-specific analyses on the root causes of food insecurity and violent conflict;
 - Thorough integration with land/water/food systems and climate change scientific research;
 - Guidance on effective impact measurement, assessment and evaluation.

Outputs:

- Effective and well sequenced programmes that enhance both food systems and peace, and reduce risks of food insecurity and conflict;
- Coalitions and cross-learning among actors;
- Greater knowledge of what works.

Outcome:

- More impactful and sustainable peacebuilding, food security, livelihoods, climate resilience, and early warning interventions;
- Increased awareness of the relationship between strong, sustainable food systems and positive peace;
- Improved understanding of the impact of peacebuilding interventions on food systems, and of food system interventions on the prospects of peace;
- Scaling up of food security, livelihoods, climate resilience, and early warning activities proven to contribute to the prospects of peace and of peacebuilding interventions proven to strengthen food security, livelihoods, and climate resilience;
- Coordinated and more effective fundraising for activities proven to contribute to the prospects of peace and sustainably strengthen food systems in conflict-affected areas.

Impact:

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

Assumptions:

- National governments and regional bodies of conflict-affected countries and regions will allow for the establishment of a Food and Peace Facility, and will permit the facilities to carry out their work unimpeded;
- Facilities may face political resistance as they will highlight drivers of fragility, such as poor governance, poor economic performance, uneven national allocation of resources, disenfranchisement, erosion of human rights, etc.;
- Facilities will not lose political buy-in with changes in governments;

- Key actors will be ready to integrate their networks, fixed assets and regional presence to support the emerging of these facilities;
- Donor governments will provide sustainable, long-term funding for Food and Peace Facilities;
- Scientific, humanitarian, development and peacebuilding actors will work together effectively, and will consolidate or amalgamate activities, where appropriate;
- Actors will incorporate analyses and measurement indicators in their interventions.

WHY DOES THIS SOLUTION ALIGN TO THE DEFINITION AND CRITERIA FOR A 'GAME CHANGING SOLUTION' DEVELOPED BY THE SUMMIT?

By consolidating and amalgamating existing interventions across the HDP nexus, Food and Peace Facilities allow for cross-learning, which will magnify the impact of interventions and ultimately ensure a high return on investment. Serving as multidisciplinary hubs, the Facilities are flexible and rely on existing actors and ongoing work, meaning that – with long-term funding – they are a sustainable and nimble solution. Moreover, by including humanitarian, development and peacebuilding actors, the Facilities will ensure that interventions across all Action Tracks are sustainable and effective in conflict-affected and at-risk settings.

Food and Peace Facilities are a true departure from the current siloed approach of working in conflict settings, as they ensure that peacebuilding activities strengthen food systems and that food system interventions contribute to the prospects of peace. By involving local, national, regional and international actors, the Facilities will also build consensus on the context-specific relationship between food insecurity and violent conflict, helping to eliminate the economic and political self-interest of actors from interventions.

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 need for conflict-sensitive approaches and greater conflict analysis is clearly stated in all three publications noted in section 2.2. The FAO published *Sowing the Seeds of Peace for: Disentangling the nexus between conflict, food security and peace* further stresses the need for action across sectors and by multiple actors to address the relationship between land, water and food security with peace.

SIPRI's preliminary research on WFP's programming highlights the need for a holistic approach that accounts for the complexity of networks and relationships, particularly in conflict settings. It also emphasizes the need for partnerships across sectors and disciplines to better understand and respond to this complexity. Lastly, it stresses the importance of ensuring that food security actors systematically and effectively measure their contributions to the prospects of peace.

WHAT IS THE CURRENT AND/OR LIKELY POLITICAL SUPPORT FOR THIS IDEA?

Many countries, regional and international bodies are likely to support this idea. These include:

- **The Netherlands, Côte d'Ivoire, Kuwait, and Sweden** – penholders of UNSCR 2417, which highlights the relationship between war and hunger.
- **Denmark**, who funds the SIPRI-WFP knowledge partnership, which focuses on improving the evidence base for the relationship between food and security.
- **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 (CFS-FFA).
- **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 OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC)**, whose 2019 *Recommendation on the Humanitarian-Development-Peace Nexus* notes the importance of “coherent and complementary coordination, programming and financing of humanitarian, development and peace actions”.
- 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**
- UN organizations and NGOs working on issues related to land/water/food security or violent conflict

The **World Bank** in particular may support this solution given their 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?

A Food and Peace Facility should be established in every country or region (when there are clear linkages between food and conflict challenges experienced by neighbouring countries) affected by risk, reality or aftermath of violent conflict. Fragile contexts, including post-conflict settings experiencing negative peace, are also well suited for Food and Peace Facilities.

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 three key levels to ensure the establishment and long-term success of Food and Peace Facilities:

- National and regional:
 - To counter potential political resistance, as well as ensure sustainability and effectiveness, each facility should ensure political buy-in and ownership at national and regional levels.
 - Regional bodies (e.g. African Union, ASEAN, CELAC, etc.) should promote facilities with their respective member states to ensure national buy-in. This could potentially be facilitated, where appropriate, through a specific mechanism developed by the regional organization.
- Donors:
 - Long-term, sustainable funding is required to ensure the success of this solution.
 - Where appropriate, the findings and recommendations of the facilities should inform other donor decisions made in the country or region.
 - National governments and regional bodies should also be encouraged to provide funding to deepen their ownership of facilities in their country/region.
- Local and international actors working across the humanitarian-development-peace nexus
 - Scientific, humanitarian, development and peacebuilding actors must work together effectively, and consolidate or amalgamate activities, where appropriate.
 - Actors should incorporate analyses and measurement indicators in their interventions.