



Open Ended Working Group (OEWG)

Monitoring

CFS OEWG-Monitoring/2018/06/15/02/rev.2

Revised version of the document after 15 June meeting

CFS OEWG-Monitoring

Date: 15 June 2018

Time: 09:30-12:30

Location: German Room, FAO (Building C, 2nd Floor)

COMMITTEE ON WORLD FOOD SECURITY

Forty-fifth Session

"Making a Difference in Food Security and Nutrition"

Rome, Italy, 15-19 October 2018

EXPERIENCES AND GOOD PRACTICES IN THE USE AND APPLICATION OF THE VOLUNTARY GUIDELINES TO SUPPORT THE PROGRESSIVE REALIZATION OF THE RIGHT TO ADEQUATE FOOD IN THE CONTEXT OF NATIONAL FOOD SECURITY - SUMMARY AND KEY ELEMENTS

SUMMARY AND KEY ELEMENTS

The Committee:

- a) A total of 50 submissions were received from CFS stakeholders to inform the Global Thematic Event (GTE) at the 45th Session in October 2018 on the use and application of the Voluntary Guidelines to Support the Progressive Realization of the Right to Adequate Food in the Context of National Food Security (the Guidelines). Of the 47 submissions used for this report, 38 submissions document individual experiences reported by governments, UN organizations, civil society, NGOs or academia. Nine submissions document the results of multistakeholder events organized at national, regional or global level to share experiences and good practices in line with the Terms of Reference to share experiences and good practices in applying CFS decisions and recommendations through organizing events at national, regional and global levels (TORs)¹.

¹ CFS 2016/43/7 Terms of Reference to share experiences and good practices in applying CFS decisions and recommendations through organizing events at national, regional and global levels, 2016, <http://www.fao.org/3/a-mr182e.pdf>

- b) The submissions received document how the Guidelines were used and applied since they were endorsed by CFS and subsequently adopted by consensus of FAO Council in 2004. The submissions span several regions (Africa, Asia, Europe, Latin America and the Caribbean). The experiences were supported by diverse stakeholders (governments, UN Organizations, civil society and non-governmental organizations, academia, sometimes organized in multistakeholder platforms). This shows that even if Member States have the primary responsibility for implementing the Guidelines, many other stakeholders have been very active in contributing to their implementation as well.
- c) The experiences have been classified into six approaches, based on the objectives and activities documented in the submissions, namely:
- awareness raising activities to sensitize stakeholders to the existence and/or implementation of the Guidelines;
 - capacity development to strengthen the ability of stakeholders to implement the Guidelines;
 - establishment of multistakeholder mechanisms to leverage synergies of multi-stakeholder partnerships; reform of legal and policy frameworks to better and more sustainably contribute to the realization of the right to adequate food;
 - addressing violations of the right to food including establishing public remedy mechanisms; and
 - initiatives to monitor the right to food through assessment and monitoring.
- d) The good practices that are documented include empowering stakeholders through increased awareness of their right to food and capacity building amongst other activities; facilitating development of multistakeholder mechanisms where stakeholders, especially those most affected by food insecurity and malnutrition, are involved in the dialogue and decision-making process; forming partnerships with key institutions, encouraging establishment of multistakeholder dialogue forums, and monitoring elements related to achieving the right to adequate food; fostering community-based food security and nutrition programmes; and making healthy, nutritious and low-cost food available, with adequate information to the population.
- e) This CFS effort to document the use and application of the Guidelines worldwide builds on previous work in 2014, when for the first time CFS invited its constituencies to provide inputs to support the sharing of national experiences in implementing the Guidelines. This led to the adoption of the Decision Box “Right to Food – Ten Year Perspective” at the 41st Session of the CFS. While this document is not a baseline for future monitoring as it is unlikely to show the full range of activities that are implementing the Guidelines, it is in line with the CFS role of promoting accountability and good practices, and can be used as a reference for similar exercises in the future.

Contents

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| EXPERIENCES AND GOOD PRACTICES IN THE USE AND APPLICATION OF THE VOLUNTARY GUIDELINES TO SUPPORT THE PROGRESSIVE REALIZATION OF THE RIGHT TO ADEQUATE FOOD IN THE CONTEXT OF NATIONAL FOOD SECURITY - SUMMARY AND KEY ELEMENTS | 1 |
| I. BACKGROUND | 5 |
| II. CFS AND THE RIGHT TO FOOD..... | 6 |
| III. SUBMISSIONS DOCUMENTING THE USE AND APPLICATION OF THE GUIDELINES THAT WERE REPORTED INDIVIDUALLY | 9 |
| A. Submissions received..... | 9 |
| B. Grouping of experiences | 10 |
| C. Results obtained under each of the six approaches..... | 13 |
| D. Key catalysts | 14 |
| E. Constraints and Challenges | 15 |
| F. Good Practices | 17 |
| G. Observations..... | 18 |
| IV. SUBMISSIONS DOCUMENTING MULTISTAKEHOLDER EVENTS ORGANIZED ON THE USE AND APPLICATION OF THE GUIDELINES, IN LINE WITH THE TORS..... | 19 |
| A. Submissions received on events..... | 19 |
| B. Approaches and results of experiences discussed during the events | 21 |
| C. Key catalysts of experiences discussed during the events | 22 |
| D. Constraints and challenges of experiences discussed during the events..... | 24 |
| E. Good practices of experiences discussed during the events | 25 |
| Annex 1: List of Submissions | 27 |

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| CAP | Common Agricultural Policy |
| CFS | Committee on World Food Security |
| CFS-RAI | CFS Principles for Responsible Investment in Agriculture and Food Systems |
| CSOs | Civil Society Organisations |
| CSM | Civil Society Mechanism |
| FAO | Food and Agriculture Organization |
| GSF | Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition |
| GTE | Global Thematic Event |
| ICESCR | International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights |
| IFAD | International Fund for Agricultural Development |
| KHANI | Food Security Network Bangladesh |
| NGOs | Non-Governmental Organizations |
| OAS | Organization of American States |
| OHCHR | Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights |
| RBA s | Rome-based Agencies: FAO, IFAD & WFP |
| SDGs | Sustainable Development Goals |
| SG-SFS | European Economic and Social Committee's Permanent Study Group on Sustainable Food Systems |
| The Guidelines | Voluntary Guidelines to Support the Progressive Realization of the Right to Adequate Food in the Context of National Food Security |
| TORs | Terms of Reference to share experiences and good practices in applying CFS decisions and recommendations through organizing events at national, regional and global levels |
| UN | United Nations |
| UNCESCR | United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights |
| UNDP | United Nations Development Programme |
| VGGT | Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security |
| WFP | World Food Programme |
| WHO | World Health Organization |

I. BACKGROUND

1. Based on a request formulated at the 1996 World Food Summit and following years of intergovernmental discussions, the Voluntary Guidelines to Support the Progressive Realization of the Right to Adequate Food in the Context of National Food Security (the Guidelines) were endorsed by the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) at its 30th Session in October 2004, and subsequently adopted by the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) Council at its 127th Session in November 2004.
2. The Guidelines represent the first attempt by governments to pragmatically interpret an economic, social and cultural right and to recommend multisectoral actions to be undertaken for its progressive realization. The 19 guidelines (Table 2) provide practical guidance to States and other key stakeholders in developing and adopting a wide range of measures – including national strategies, institutions, legal frameworks, access to resources and assets, nutrition, national financial resources, and monitoring – that positively contribute to the progressive realization of the right to adequate food.
3. The Guidelines take into account a wealth of important considerations and principles, including equality and non-discrimination, participation and inclusion, accountability and human dignity, and remind stakeholders that all human rights are universal, indivisible, interrelated and interdependent². They also support global efforts to end hunger and malnutrition, including subsequent efforts in the context of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development especially SDG 2 “*end hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition*”.
4. Originally introduced at the global level in the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the right to adequate food became binding upon States Parties to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), which has so far been ratified by 168 States Parties³, with its adoption in 1966 and its subsequent entry into force in 1976. Since then, additional international and regional instruments have taken effect to ensure further protection of the right to adequate food for specific groups, such as women⁴, children⁵ and persons with disabilities⁶.
5. By way of its General Comment 12 in 1999, the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights provided the authoritative interpretation of the right to adequate food – as guaranteed by article 11 of ICESCR which includes, among others, that “*the right to adequate food is realized when every man, woman and child, alone or in community with others, has physical and economic access at all times to adequate food or means for its procurement*”⁷. Moreover, the commitment of States Parties to the ICESCR entails three types of obligations; “*to respect, to protect and to fulfil [which] in turn, the obligation to fulfil incorporates both an obligation to*

² Voluntary Guidelines to support the progressive realization of the right to adequate food in the context of national food security, 2004, <http://www.fao.org/3/a-y7937e.pdf>

³ As of 23 May 2018 – https://treaties.un.org/Pages/ViewDetails.aspx?src=TREATY&mtdsg_no=IV-3&chapter=4&clang=en

⁴ Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, 189 Parties as of 23 May 2018 – https://treaties.un.org/Pages/ViewDetails.aspx?src=TREATY&mtdsg_no=IV-8&chapter=4&clang=en

⁵ Convention on the Rights of the Child, 196 Parties as of 23 May 2018 –

https://treaties.un.org/Pages/ViewDetails.aspx?src=TREATY&mtdsg_no=IV-11&chapter=4&clang=en

⁶ Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, 177 Parties as of 23 May 2018 –

https://treaties.un.org/Pages/ViewDetails.aspx?src=TREATY&mtdsg_no=IV-15&chapter=4&clang=en

⁷ Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. 1999. General Comment 12. Paragraph 6. consulted on 23 May 2018 and available in all official UN languages at:

http://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=E%2fC.12%2f1999%2f5&Lang=en

*facilitate and an obligation to provide*⁸.

6. Thereafter, in 2000, the role of the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food was created “*in order to respond fully to the necessity for an integrated and coordinated approach in the promotion and protection of the right to food*”⁹. Furthermore, recent years have witnessed an important number of countries making constitutional amendments or adopting new constitutions guaranteeing the right to adequate food¹⁰, or developing laws, strategies, policies and programmes to further the realization of the right to adequate food at national level. The CFS acknowledged and welcomed such efforts in 2014 while it further encouraged a renewed commitment by all CFS stakeholders towards achieving the progressive realization of the right to adequate food.¹¹

II. CFS AND THE RIGHT TO FOOD

7. The importance of the right to adequate food in the context of national food security is reflected in the vision of the reformed CFS to “*strive for a world free from hunger where countries implement the voluntary guidelines for the progressive realization of the right to adequate food in the context of national food security*”.¹² This was an important development, as recognizing the human right to adequate food is fundamental to achieving food security. The realization of this right, and its related norms, are also part of the foundation and overarching frameworks of CFS, as outlined in the Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition (GSF) and CFS-endorsed policy guidelines and recommendations such as the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security (VGGT) and the CFS Principles for Responsible Investment in Agriculture and Food Systems (RAI)¹³.

⁸ Idem. Paragraph 15 states: “The obligation to *respect* existing access to adequate food requires States parties not to take any measures that result in preventing such access. The obligation to *protect* requires measures by the State to ensure that enterprises or individuals do not deprive individuals of their access to adequate food. The obligation to *fulfil (facilitate)* means the State must proactively engage in activities intended to strengthen people’s access to and utilization of resources and means to ensure their livelihood, including food security. Finally, whenever an individual or group is unable, for reasons beyond their control, to enjoy the right to adequate food by the means at their disposal, States have the obligation to *fulfil (provide)* that right directly. This obligation also applies for persons who are victims of natural or other disasters.”

⁹ OHCHR. Overview of the mandate. Consulted on 23 May 2018 and available at:

<http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Food/Pages/Overview.aspx> Among its main duties, the Special Rapporteur on the right to food: monitor the situation of the right to food throughout the world; identify general trends; undertake country visits; communicate with States on related allegations; promote the realization through dialogue with relevant actors; and present annual reports to the Human Rights Council and to the General Assembly on the implementation of its mandate.

(<http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Food/Pages/FoodIndex.aspx>).

¹⁰ Approximately 30 countries have an explicit constitutional protection of the right to adequate food while a greater number of countries have also one of the following in their respective constitution: an implicit protection of the right to adequate food through broader human rights, a directive principle of State policy on the right to adequate food, or a constitutional inclusion of ratified international commitments pertaining to the right to adequate food. More information is available at <http://www.fao.org/right-to-food-around-the-globe/en> and http://www.fao.org/faolex/collections/en/?search=adv&subj_coll=Constitutions.

¹¹ Report of the 41st Session of the Committee on World Food Security (Rome, 13-18 October 2014), page 14.

¹² Reform of the Committee on World Food Security, 2009, <http://www.fao.org/tempref/docrep/fao/meeting/018/k7197e.pdf>

¹³ Among the key provisions of the aforementioned documents that explicitly identify the realization of the right to adequate food as an overarching objective are: Guideline 1 of the VGGT that stresses that they “seek to improve governance of tenure of land, fisheries and forests [...] for the benefit of all, with an emphasis on vulnerable and marginalized people, with the goals of food security and progressive realization of the right to adequate food”; and Principle 1 of the RAI that states how they support “States’ obligations regarding the progressive realization of the right to adequate food in the context of national food security, and all intended users’ responsibility to respect human rights” while their Objective “is to promote responsible investment in agriculture and food systems that contribute to food security and nutrition, thus supporting the progressive realization of the right to adequate food”. Each document built upon and supports the implementation of the Right to Food Guidelines while several other provisions have direct and indirect relations with the realization of the right to adequate food.

“The reason that hunger and malnutrition persist is not because there is not enough food for everyone. Hunger persists because of poverty, social and economic inequality and inaccessibility to vital resources, as well as the adverse impact of trade rules in developing countries and the predatory nature of economic globalization. Many of the root causes of world hunger cannot be overcome without the existence and implementation of normative principles of human rights.

The Committee of Food Security (CFS) is a unique international institutional framework within which civil society is strongly represented after revolutionary restructuring in 2009. [...] Repeating a commitment to a human rights approach needs to foreground in every document released by CFS.”

- Hilal Elver, the Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food, 2017¹⁴

8. At its 44th Session in 2017, CFS agreed to hold a second GTE to share experiences and take stock of the use and application of the Guidelines at its 45th Session in 2018. This decision is in line with the Guidelines, which invites States to “*report on a voluntary basis on relevant activities and progress achieved in implementing the Voluntary Guidelines to support the Progressive Realization of the Right to Adequate Food in the Context of National Food Security, to the FAO Committee on World Food Security (CFS) within its reporting procedures*”¹⁵.
9. This GTE builds on lessons learnt from the first GTE to share experiences and take stock of the use and application of the VGGT, including amongst others, the importance of ensuring effective representation of the main beneficiaries in multistakeholder dialogue, and the need for sufficient time to prepare for the GTEs, allowing interaction with stakeholders at national and regional levels in line with the approach recommended in the TORs, endorsed in October 2016.
10. The GTE also builds on previous work to share experiences on the use and application of the Guidelines at the 41st Session of the CFS, which provided the opportunity for three Member States (El Salvador, India and Jordan) to share their national experiences. During the same session, all CFS Members reaffirmed their commitment to implement the Guidelines and strive for the realization of the right to adequate food for all in the years to come through the consensually adopted Decision Box: Right to Food – Ten Year Perspective¹⁶. A ten-year retrospective on the Guidelines was produced with the objective of enabling stakeholders to take stock and understand what has and has not worked, and why, where the bottlenecks lie, and how governments and their partners can be most effective in the fight against hunger and malnutrition¹⁷.
11. In line with the decisions made at the 41st Session of CFS to strengthen mechanisms “*that facilitate informed, participatory and transparent decision-making in food security and nutrition policy processes, including effective monitoring and accountability,*” the GTE provides an opportunity for an inclusive, multistakeholder dialogue to share global, regional and national experiences and good practices in the use and application of the Guidelines. The objectives of

¹⁴ Hilal Elver, Special Rapporteur on Right to Food at The Right to Adequate Food Event – Written text of the video message from Hilal Elver, Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food, Rome, 24 January 2017, <http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/Food/Event24Jan2017.pdf>

¹⁵ Voluntary Guidelines to support the progressive realization of the right to adequate food in the context of national food security, 2004, <http://www.fao.org/3/a-y7937e.pdf>

¹⁶ CFS 2014/41/7 Right-to-Food Ten-year-Perspective, <http://www.fao.org/3/a-ml774e.pdf>

¹⁷ The Right to Food: Past commitment, current obligation, further action for the future: a ten-year retrospective on the Right to Food Guidelines, 2014, <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i4145e.pdf>

the GTE are to:

- Foster the adoption, adaptation and scaling up of good practices and learning from experiences in implementing CFS policy guidelines;
- Monitor progress (qualitatively and quantitatively) in implementing CFS policy guidelines at national, regional and global levels;
- Draw lessons to improve the relevance and effectiveness of CFS work, including for the achievement of food security and nutrition national goals;
- Increase awareness and understanding of CFS and CFS-endorsed policy guidelines.

12. The TORs recommend an approach for food security and nutrition stakeholders to contribute to CFS GTEs which are planned to be organized every two years within CFS Plenary sessions to take stock of the use and application of CFS policy guidelines. The approach promotes the principles defined in the GSF for monitoring and accountability systems¹⁸, including the organization of events that are country-owned, participative and inclusive (involving the full range of stakeholders concerned with food security and nutrition and food insecure and vulnerable communities). The approach also foresees collaborating with existing CFS-like platforms and coordination mechanisms and documenting the results of the event in consultation with all groups of stakeholders.

13. Recognizing that coordinated action and measures by State and non-State actors were required to address hunger and malnutrition, CFS issued two calls for inputs to all CFS stakeholders¹⁹ to contribute to the GTE on the Guidelines at the 45th Session of CFS in 2018. Opening the online calls to all CFS stakeholders gave an opportunity to share and discuss their experiences and good practices in an inclusive and multistakeholder platform, and ensure a comprehensive and transparent review of all actions related to the implementation of the Guidelines. These stakeholders included not only States who hold the primary responsibility to fulfil their obligations relating to the Guidelines, but also UN organizations, civil society and non-governmental organizations, the private sector, academia, donors and other stakeholders.

14. The first call for inputs invited stakeholders to report their experiences related to the Guidelines and was issued through the FAO Food Security and Nutrition Forum (FSN Forum) closing on 30 November 2017. Thirty-eight complete submissions (with all requested information provided in a template) were received and analysed for this report. The second call for inputs invited stakeholders to share their experience through multistakeholder events organized at national, regional and global levels and document it collectively, in line with the TORs. Nine submissions were received and analysed for this report.

15. The TORs clarify that the good practices should be consistent with values promoted by CFS, as applicable, including:

- **Inclusiveness and participation:** all main relevant actors were involved and participated in the decision-making processes related to the practice, including all those who have or could have been affected by the decisions;
- **Evidence-based analysis:** the effectiveness of the practice in contributing to the objectives of CFS products was analysed on the basis of independent evidence;

¹⁸ CFS Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition 2017, <http://www.fao.org/3/MR173EN/mr173en.pdf>

¹⁹ CFS stakeholders include CFS Member Countries, Participants (UN agencies and bodies, civil society and non-governmental organizations and networks, international agricultural research systems, international and regional financial institutions and private sector associations and philanthropic foundations) and Observers.

- **Environmental, economic and social sustainability:** the practice contributed to achieving its specific objectives, without compromising the ability of addressing future needs;
- **Gender equality:** the practice promoted equal rights and participation for women and men and addressed gender inequalities;
- **Focus on the most vulnerable and marginalized people and groups:** The practice benefitted the most vulnerable and marginalized people and groups;
- **Multi-sectoral approach:** all main relevant sectors were consulted and involved in implementation;
- **Resilience of livelihoods:** the practice contributed to building households and communities resilient to shocks and crises, including those related to climate change.

16. This report is exclusively based on the 47 submissions received from CFS stakeholders, documenting either individually or collectively (through the organization of events at national, regional and global levels), their experiences on the use and application of the Guidelines.

III. SUBMISSIONS DOCUMENTING THE USE AND APPLICATION OF THE GUIDELINES THAT WERE REPORTED INDIVIDUALLY

A. Submissions received

17. A total of 41 submissions were received of which 38 submissions were complete and analysed. Of the 38 submissions, 28 were country-specific, 7 were regional and multi-country, and 3 were global submissions, covering a wide geographical area. The list of submissions and an overview of the information provided in these submissions are provided in Annexes 1 and 2 respectively. The full submissions are available on the CFS 45 web page in original language²⁰.
18. The most represented region is Latin America and the Caribbean with a total of 19 submissions received (16 country-specific, 3 regional and multi-country), 9 submissions report African experiences, while 3 submissions came from Asia and the Pacific. While 4 submissions were received from Europe, all of them were from Spain.

Table 1: Submissions by Region

| Region/global | Country-level | Regional & multi-country level | Total |
|---------------------------------|---------------|--------------------------------|-------|
| Africa | 6 | 3 | 9 |
| Asia and the Pacific | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| Europe | 4 | - | 4 |
| Latin America and the Caribbean | 16 | 3 | 19 |
| Global | | | 6 |
| Total | 28 | 7 | 41 |

19. Submissions were received from a wide range of stakeholders. Seventeen submissions were received from governments and 7 from UN organizations, which include platforms and partnerships consisting of governments and UN organizations. Seven were from civil society and NGOs, 6 from academia, and 1 from a multistakeholder forum (S25 which was submitted by a platform which consists of more than one category of stakeholders). Most of the submissions indicated the involvement of several groups of stakeholders in implementing the activities (e.g. government, donors, Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), and grassroots movements). No

²⁰ <http://www.fao.org/cfs/cfs45>

submissions were received exclusively from the private sector or donors.

20. Nearly 63% of the experiences were completed by 30 September 2018. The rest of the experiences were on-going and expected to be completed in the longer-term. 85% of the experiences involved those most affected by food insecurity, and around 55% of the submissions indicated that monitoring mechanisms were established as a result of the experiences.

B. Grouping of experiences

21. The experiences have been classified according to the specific guidelines used, and most experiences documented the use of more than one guideline. Guidelines 5 (Institutions), 6 (Stakeholders), 7 (Legal Framework), 8 (Access to resources and assets), 10 (Nutrition) and 11 (Education and awareness raising) were most frequently used. Thirteen experiences used all the Guidelines while there was no experience documented that used Guideline 15 (International food aid).

Table 2. Grouping of experiences by the guideline(s) used

| Guideline of the Voluntary Guidelines to support the Progressive Realization of the Right to Adequate Food in the Context of National Food Security | | Number of experiences that used this Guideline |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | Democracy, good governance, human rights and the rule of law | 5 |
| 2 | Economic development policies | 7 |
| 3 | Strategies | 9 |
| 4 | Market systems | 6 |
| 5 | Institutions | 12 |
| 6 | Stakeholders | 16 |
| 7 | Legal Framework | 18 |
| 8 | Access to resources and assets | 11 |
| 9 | Food safety and consumer protection | 5 |
| 10 | Nutrition | 14 |
| 11 | Education and awareness raising | 17 |
| 12 | National financial resources | 6 |
| 13 | Support for vulnerable groups | 10 |
| 14 | Safety nets | 8 |
| 15 | International food aid | 0 |
| 16 | Natural and human-made disasters | 4 |
| 17 | Monitoring, indicators and benchmarks | 11 |
| 18 | National human rights institutions | 3 |
| 19 | International dimension | 3 |
| All guidelines | | 13 |

22. A summary of the experiences classified into the six approaches above, is provided below. Most submissions document more than one approach.

- **Awareness raising:** the approach focused on sensitizing stakeholders to the existence and/or implementation of the Guidelines, right to food and its main issues. These efforts targeted a broad range of stakeholders, especially those most affected by food insecurity, as well as civil society and governments. Examples of activities included, but are not limited

to: communication campaigns; advocacy; conferences; roundtable discussions; dialogues and events; and production of publication and information materials.

- **Capacity development:** the approach focused on strengthening the ability of stakeholders to implement the Guidelines. These efforts were, in most cases, strongly linked and complementary to awareness raising activities, and targeted a broad range of stakeholders, especially civil society and governments but also lawyers, human rights activists and media. Examples of activities included, but are not limited to: training; workshops and courses; technical support and presentations; provision of handbooks and advocacy tools; experience sharing and learning from best practices.
- **Establishment of multistakeholder mechanisms:** the approach includes a wide range of partnerships, leveraging synergies of multistakeholder platforms. Examples of initiatives that brought together a wide range of stakeholders aiming to work jointly on the implementation of the Guidelines included, but are not limited to: institutionalized multistakeholder councils, and other non-institutionalized modalities such as fora for dialogue.
- **Reform of legal and policy frameworks:** the approach focused on interventions to bring the right to adequate food more prominently into legal and policy frameworks, or to draft legal and policy frameworks to strengthen their positive contribution to the realization of the right to adequate food. Examples of initiatives included, but were not limited to: drafting of legislation that includes or references the right to food; formulation and/or implementation of laws, policies, programmes and operational actions related to right to food issues; promotion of framework laws on the right to food, food security and nutrition, and/or food sovereignty; and development of legislative guidelines for the progressive realization of the right to food; undertaking multi-sectoral jurisprudence assessments on the right to food.
- **Addressing violations of the right to adequate food:** the approach focused on experiences which establish or pursue the establishment of recourse mechanisms for violations of the right to adequate food. Examples of initiatives included: research; study; assessment; documentation; analysis of right to food violation cases and issues; and facilitating communities in claiming their right to food.
- **Initiatives to monitor the right to food:** the approach focuses on the assessment and monitoring of experiences related to the implementation of the Guidelines, the progressive realization of the right to food, and its impact on food security and nutrition at local, national, regional or global level. Examples of initiatives include: design of quantitative and qualitative research techniques to assess food governance and identify vulnerable groups; interviews, surveys and analysis; impact evaluation; legislative analysis; studies and reports; adopting harmonized multi-sectoral monitoring frameworks on the right to food.

23. The distribution of the submissions by affiliation and approach is as follows:

- Awareness raising: This was one of the main approaches undertaken as **more than half of the experiences documented by each category of stakeholder focused on awareness raising** (governments: 76%; UN organizations: 71%; civil society/NGOs: 71%; academia: 67%; and stakeholders with more than 1 affiliation: 100%).
- Capacity development: This approach was also one of the main approaches undertaken by

majority of the stakeholders, with **more than half of the experiences documented by each category of stakeholder focused on capacity development** (governments: 94%; civil society/NGOs: 86%; UN organizations: 57%; and academia 17%).

- Establishment of multistakeholder mechanisms: This approach was **undertaken by the governments (47%), UN organizations (43%), academia (17%), and civil society (14%), characteristic of the collaboration between these stakeholders and the multistakeholder nature** of these participatory mechanisms.
- Reform of legal and policy framework: This approach was undertaken by the majority of the stakeholders, with the **governments documenting more than half (11 out of 19 submissions), in line with their role in implementing reforms of a legal and policy nature.**
- Addressing violations of the right to food: This approach was **undertaken exclusively by the civil society/NGOs (2 submissions) and academia (1 submission).**
- Initiatives to monitor the right to food: This approach was undertaken by governments (5 out of 17 submissions), UN organizations (3 out of 7 submissions), civil society/NGOs (4 out of 7 submissions) and academia (5 out of 6 submissions).

Table 3: Submissions by affiliation and approaches

| Approach | Governments (17 subs) | UN Organizations (7 subs) | Civil Society / NGOs (7 subs) | Academia (6 subs) | More than 1 affiliation (1 sub) | Total | Total (%) |
|-----------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|--------------|----------------------|
| Awareness raising | 13 | 5 | 7 | 4 | 1 | 30 | 28% |
| Capacity development | 16 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 27 | 25% |
| Establishment of multi-stakeholder mechanisms | 8 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 13 | 12% |
| Reform of legal and policy framework | 11 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 19 | 18% |
| Addressing violations of right to food | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1% |
| Initiatives to monitor right to food | 5 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 17 | 16% |

Note: Most submissions document more than one approach

C. Results obtained under each of the six approaches

24. The stakeholders were asked to provide both qualitative and quantitative information on achieved and/or expected results in the short and medium to long term, as well as the most significant changes as a result of their experiences. All submissions reported qualitative results, while 68% (26 out of 38 submissions) reported quantitative results either for the short or medium to long term, or for both timeframes. Despite guidance towards a common measurement for quantitative inputs for the short (number of people involved directly) and medium to long term (number of people expected to be indirectly affected by activities), the information received was not standardized and therefore, the results are indicative and may not represent the full impact of the experiences.

25. The results by approach and timeframe, are the following²¹:

- **Awareness raising:** A great number of activities that aimed to raise awareness and reinforce knowledge on implementing the Guidelines, and more broadly, on the progressive realization of the right to adequate food, were implemented. In some cases, this further led to increased commitment as well as the drafting and establishment of laws on the right to food. The targeted audiences include legislators, journalists, CSOs, community leaders and members, and students. More than 800,000 people were reported to have been directly reached and made aware of the right to food in the short-term, with a potential indirect impact of increased awareness of more than 50,000,000 people expected in the medium to long term. Estimates were provided for medium to long-term results as the potential impact *“depends on the dissemination carried out by each actor as well as the network surrounding each one of them”* (S30).
- **Capacity development:** In the short term, approximately 39,000 individuals were reported to have improved their capacity to understand and implement the Guidelines as a direct result of training, workshops, courses, technical support and presentations, provision of handbooks and advocacy tools, experience sharing, and/or learning from best practices. These include participants from the government and parliament, CSOs, human rights institutions, bar associations, media, religious associations, communities, and the private sector. In the medium to long term, indirect results ranged from increased empowerment and food production, improved household incomes and reduction in child malnutrition and mortality, to increased commitment from decision makers, leading to the formulation of national laws and legal frameworks, as well as plans and programmes.
- **Establishment of multistakeholder mechanisms:** Seven (out of 13) submissions report the establishment of institutionalized multistakeholder and inter-sectoral platforms, such as Food and Nutrition Security Councils, Parliamentary Fronts against Hunger, to manage resources and/or public policies related to food issues. The other six submissions report non-institutionalized alliances, partnerships, processes, working groups, and fora for dialogue, including possible commitment to create networks of stakeholders to work together on the progressive realization of the right to adequate food and the implementation of the Guidelines. Despite on-going efforts to involve those most affected by food insecurity and malnutrition in discussions and decision-making processes, *“it should be acknowledged that those most affected are not usually involved in the debate on public policies and their legal frameworks. This is due to their limitations and the social and economic barriers they face”*

²¹ Examples of relevant submissions are indicated as S1, S2, S3, etc. and the figures used are based on the summation of quantitative results reported from the 38 submissions.

(S28). Most experiences reported led to the drafting of national plans, policies and laws, and the estimated potential impact in the medium to long term would be reduced food insecurity and malnutrition for approximately 250,000,000 people.

- **Reform of legal and policy frameworks:** The submissions report the use of the Guidelines in efforts to mainstream the right to food into legal and policy frameworks. Results include, but are not limited to: drafting of right to food legislation, for example, the integration of the right to food as a fundamental right in the newly adopted Nepalese Constitution (S8), in Brazil's Food and Security Nutrition law (S16); formulation and/or implementation of laws, policies, programmes, and operational actions related to right to food issues, for example, the enforcement of the Guidelines was incorporated into cooperation policies of the Spanish government and several regional and local governments (S9); promotion of a framework law on the right to food, food security and nutrition, and/or food sovereignty; school feeding programmes; development of legislative guidelines for the progressive realization of the right to food; commitment to international initiatives related to the progressive realization of the right to food, such as the Milan Urban Food Policy Pact (S10). Estimates provided on results in the medium to long term were largely for the whole country populations, attributed to the large-scale impact as a result of reforming legal and policy frameworks.
- **Address violations:** Short-term results include identifying and documenting and reporting right to food violations (S2). Indirect results in the medium to long term are changing perceptions and increasing awareness of communities vulnerable to the violation of their right to adequate food, empowering and supporting them to claim their right to food; recognition of communities and their demand by governments; policy advocacy work; and mainstreaming the right to food in laws and plans (S7).
- **Initiatives to monitor the right to food:** Results include the establishment of monitoring mechanisms; creation of research centres and observatories; information tools, reports and publications; development of enabling environments for understanding the benefits of the Guidelines and the legitimacy of requesting their implementation; and greater understanding of existing constitutional provisions around the world that provide protection and incentives towards the realization of the right to food. For example The Right to Food around the Globe developed by FAO which provides a platform where information on what is constitutionally committed to on the right to adequate food at national level can be easily accessed (S36).

D. Key catalysts

26. This section provides an overview of the key catalysts of all submissions received, and includes elements of analysis of the recurring key catalysts which take into account country-level individual submissions (S1-S28) only, in respect of the focus of the Guidelines at the national level.
27. The submissions highlight several recurring key catalysts, i.e. externalities which were conducive to the positive outcome of the implemented activities. These key catalysts are in line with the reaffirmation by the United Nations Human Rights Council that *“a peaceful, stable and enabling political, social and economic environment at both the national and international levels is the essential foundation that will enable States to give adequate priority to food security and*

poverty eradication”²².

- **Institutional and legal frameworks and reforms** such as legislation on the right to adequate food; existence of food security and nutrition laws, programmes, action plans; empowered permeable local institutions; established participatory mechanisms; presence of institutions (e.g. submission S17). Among the country-level submissions, 14 out of 28 (50%) included the presence of institutional and legal frameworks and reforms as a catalyst conducive to a positive outcome.
- **Enabling environment** including collaborative and supportive relations among involved actors, stakeholders’ awareness of the right to adequate food and the importance of the Guidelines; collaborative and supportive relations among involved actors; community engagement and participation; media support; presence of international initiatives such as Hunger-Free Latin America and the Caribbean 2025 initiative, and the World Food Day (e.g. S1, S7, S9, S10, S12, S28, S32). Among the country-level submissions, 24 out of 28 (86%) included the presence of an enabling environment as a catalyst conducive to a positive outcome.
- **Political will and commitment, including dedicated public budget** to implement the Guidelines and contribute to the elimination of hunger (e.g. S3, S4, S8, S27, S35, and S36). Among the country-level submissions, 23 out of 28 (82%) included the presence of political will and commitment, including a dedicated public budget, as a catalyst conducive to a positive outcome.
- **Technical support** from UN Organizations to facilitate processes (such as the UN Development Programme (UNDP), the World Food Programme (WFP), the World Health Organization (WHO), and the FAO Right to Food Team) and specialized agencies. The UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food also invited countries to take action towards the realization of the right to food (e.g. S5 and S6). Among the country-level submissions, 16 out of 28 (57%) included technical support as a catalyst conducive to a positive outcome.
- **Evidence-based analysis, information and monitoring systems** to evaluate the impact of results achieved and recourse mechanisms (e.g. S15, S21). Among the country-level submissions, 12 out of 28 (43%) included evidence-based analysis, information and monitoring systems as a catalyst conducive to a positive outcome.
- **Conjectural events** such as the financial and economic crises spurred the creation of dedicated policies for the right to food (e.g. S29, S33). Among the country-level submissions, 1 out of 28 (less than 4%), included conjectural events as a catalyst conducive to a positive outcome.

E. Constraints and Challenges

28. This section provides an overview of the constraints and challenges of all submissions received, and includes elements of analysis of the recurring constraints and challenges which take into account country-level individual submissions (S1-S28) only, in respect of the focus of the Guidelines at the national level.

²² United Nations General Assembly, Thirty-Seventh Session of the Human Rights Council, Agenda Item 3, A/HRC/37/L.21

29. The submissions also highlighted some major constraints and challenges. The majority of national submissions report country-specific limitations. However, they do report recurrent difficulties that would be valid in other contexts.

- **Absence of key catalysts** such as an institutional and legal framework guaranteeing the right to food (e.g. S7, S8); an enabling environment such as the absence of information exchange/sharing, collaboration and coordination of action among stakeholders (e.g. S15, S29); and political will and commitment (e.g. S3) to end hunger and malnutrition. Among the country-level submissions, 15 out of 28 (54%) included the absence of key catalysts as a constraint and challenge.
- **Vulnerabilities** due to the impact of climate change; food crises; population growth and urbanization; inadequate agriculture practices; and shortcomings in food health and safety (e.g. S6, S25). Among the country-level submissions, 5 out of 28 (18%) included vulnerabilities as a constraint and challenge.
- **Lack of dedicated public budget/funding** such as scarce financial support to implement the Guidelines effectively and for food security related policies and programmes (e.g. S5, S9, S12, S21, S25, S28, and S32). Among the country-level submissions, 10 out of 28 (36%) included lack of dedicated public budget/funding as a constraint and challenge.
- **Limited or unequal access to markets, land and natural resources** for small scale food producers and indigenous peoples (e.g. S1, S7). Among the country-level submissions, 4 out of 28 (14%) included limited or unequal access to markets, land and natural resources as a constraint and challenge.
- **Lack of awareness and the need for education** regarding the right to adequate food, **and lack of capacity and technical expertise**; misunderstanding the concept of right to adequate food; (e.g. S2, S10, S11, S27 and S30). Among the country-level submissions, 13 out of 28 (46%) included lack of awareness and the need for education, and lack of capacity and technical expertise as a constraint and challenge.
- **Discrimination** such as gender, race, ethnicity, religion, and class, as well as inequality and poverty. Only 4 submissions shared a gender perspective (e.g. S4, S17, S31 and S34) while the majority of submissions do not make specific reference to gender, despite the fundamental link between gender equality and the realization of the right to food. Among the country-level submissions, 3 out of 28 (11%) included discrimination as a constraint and challenge.
- **Lack of accountability and/or recourse mechanisms** has a direct impact on the implementation and realization of the right to adequate food, as highlighted in S17, S24 (“*lack of data and information to clearly determine the level of realization of the human right to food [...] and at the same time, to reinforce its enforceable nature*”) and S38 (“*As articulated in SDG17, ensuring effective accountability requires a clear understanding of and advancement in data collection as well as systematic tracking systems at both country and global level.*”). Among the country-level submissions, 12 out of 28 (43%) included lack of accountability and/or recourse mechanisms as a constraint and challenge.

F. Good Practices

30. This section provides an overview of the good practices of all submissions received, and includes elements of analysis of the recurring good practices which take into account country-level individual submissions (S1-S28) only, in respect of the focus of the Guidelines .at the national level.
31. The submissions outlined a number of good practices that contributed to making the experiences successful. These include, but are not limited to:
- **Empowerment of stakeholders** through increased awareness of their right to food (e.g. S3, S4, S7, S32), capacity building (e.g. S5), generation of knowledge and information sharing, health and nutrition trainings, promotion of and strengthened self-advocacy (e.g. S7), promotion of food governance leading to improved social justice, and reduced social inequality (e.g. S11). Among the country-level submissions, 25 out of 28 (89%) included empowerment of stakeholders as a good practice.
 - **Facilitate the development of participatory mechanisms** where stakeholders, including those most affected by food insecurity and malnutrition, civil society, media and academia, take part in the dialogue (e.g. S36) and decision-making process (e.g. S3, S17), and in the management of resources (e.g. S1) in an equal, collaborative and transparent manner (e.g. S25). Among the country-level submissions, 9 out of 28 (32%) included facilitating the development of participatory mechanisms as a good practice.
 - **Form partnerships with key institutions** capable of supporting capacity development and technical support on the right to food, such as FAO (e.g. S28, S35), as well as other specialized UN agencies supporting right to food policy making and implementation. Among the country-level submissions, 14 out of 28 (50%) included forming partnerships with key institutions as a good practice.
 - **Encourage establishment of multistakeholder dialogue forums** to channel disagreements and opposing views and reach consensus (e.g. S23, S26), and to support academic research, and socialization (e.g. S15, S21). Among the country-level submissions, 15 out of 28 (54%) included encouraging the establishment of multistakeholder dialogue forums as a good practice that contributed to making the experience successful.
 - **Monitor elements related to achieving the right to adequate food**, including set up of monitoring institutions/other ad hoc bodies, and access to recourse mechanisms (e.g. S12, S22, and S30). Among the country-level submissions, 13 out of 28 (46%) included monitoring elements related to achieving the right to adequate food as a good practice.
 - **Foster community-based programmes** (e.g. S5, S34) to address malnutrition and to promote sustainable and agro-ecological farming, crop diversification through the use of indigenous seeds, and small livestock management (e.g. S6, S17). Among the country-level submissions, 6 out of 28 (21%) included fostering community-based programmes as a good practice.
 - **Make healthy and low-cost food available** (physically and economically), with adequate information to the population (e.g. S27). Among the country-level submissions, 1 out of 28 (4%), included making healthy and low-cost food available as a good practice.

G. Observations

32. The analysis of the country-level submissions (S1-S28) highlights some observations based on the premises, process and outcomes described in each country experience which in more than one instance recalls the importance of the progressive realization of the right to adequate food in the context of national food security. These submissions show the importance of long-term awareness raising and capacity development efforts to foster political commitment and accountability. It is also important to undertake appropriate legal and policy reforms as well as establishing monitoring mechanisms. These all significantly contribute to the realization of the human right to adequate food. These observations include, but are not limited to the following:

Legal and policy framework reform processes

33. 11 countries (Bolivia, Brazil, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Malawi, Nepal, Spain, Togo and Zambia) indicated that legal and policy framework reform processes are to be/have been taking place.

- In these 11 countries, **awareness raising and capacity development were used, either alone or the two approaches together**. Furthermore, in 6 countries of the Latin America & the Caribbean region, plus Spain, legal and policy framework reforms have been/are always **accompanied by the establishment of participatory mechanisms**, whereas this is not (yet) the case of the countries in Africa (Togo, Malawi, Zambia) and Asia (Nepal) where such reforms are currently taking/have taken place and involve exclusively awareness raising and capacity development.
- 6 countries indicated that **ongoing initiatives to monitor the right to food** are taking place/have taken place alongside the legal and policy framework reform processes.
- 9 countries indicated that **political will and commitment was the main catalyst for success**, followed by an enabling environment, technical support and evidence-based analysis, information and monitoring systems.

34. In 7 countries where no legal and policy framework reform process was included as ongoing/taking place, **lack of awareness/capacity/technical expertise was described as the main constraint/challenge for success**, followed by lack of accountability and/or recourse mechanisms, lack of dedicated public budget/funding and vulnerabilities.

Initiatives to monitor the right to food

35. 9 countries (Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Malawi, Nepal, Spain and Tanzania) have indicated that initiatives to monitor the right to food are to be/have taken place.

- Of these 9 countries, 8 of them used **awareness raising and capacity development approaches, either one of them or the two approaches together**.
- **An enabling environment was the main catalyst for success**, followed by political will and commitment, technical support and institutional and legal frameworks and reforms.
- **Lack of awareness/capacity/technical expertise was also described as the main**

constraint/challenge for success, followed by lack of accountability and/or recourse mechanisms, absence of key catalysts, and lack of dedicated public budget/funding.

IV. SUBMISSIONS DOCUMENTING MULTISTAKEHOLDER EVENTS ORGANIZED ON THE USE AND APPLICATION OF THE GUIDELINES, IN LINE WITH THE TORS

A. Submissions received on events

36. Nine submissions were received to document the results of these multistakeholder events. The list of submissions is provided in Annex 1. Events differ in terms of geographic coverage (1 sub-national, 4 national, 2 regional and 2 global), scope and participation. All events were attended by several groups of food security and nutrition stakeholders including governments, CSOs, academia, UN organizations and the private sector. Communities affected by food insecurity and malnutrition were either represented or directly participated in all national and sub-national events.

37. The events are briefly presented below.

E1. Sub-national - Belgium (Walloon region) – Walloon Forum on Sustainable Food Systems (June 2017 – December 2018)

38. During the first phase (June 2017 - May 2018), more than 80 key stakeholders including farmers' unions, consumer organizations, CSOs, local authorities, academia and the private agri-food sector were engaged in a participatory process to elaborate a comprehensive framework on a sustainable food system in Wallonia. The result was presented in a public event in May 2018. A second phase will start in May 2018 for consultation with citizens with the objective to eventually have new policies adopted by the Walloon government.

E2. National - Bangladesh – Right to Food Congress 2018 (29 April 2018)

39. More than 300 people from civil society, academia and national parliament participated in the event organized by the Food Security Network (KHAN). Participants interacted on three important issues: situation of food security and nutrition, recently drafted legislation called The Right to Food Act 2017 and the application of The Guidelines in Bangladesh.

E3. National - Burkina Faso – Right to Food workshop (27-28 April 2018)

40. Thirty-nine people from the government, CSOs and farmers' organizations representing those most impacted by food insecurity attended the workshop. The objective was to assess the realization of the right to food in Burkina Faso in light of The Guidelines. Discussions focused on the process for creating food and agriculture policies in the country and food assistance programmes.

E4. National - Colombia – Event organized by UN organization and Action against Hunger (10 April 2018)

41. Four events were organized in Bogota at sub-national level during the first quarter of 2018 to prepare for the final event that was attended by about 200 participants from the government, UN organizations, CSOs, academia and the private sector. The objective was to discuss and analyse the status of the right to food in the country and opportunities and challenges in advancing it. The process leading up to the event and the event itself linked around 300 people from different

sectors of civil society to platforms/mechanisms for discussion and analysis of the status of the right to food in the country and opportunities and challenges in advancing it. Government institutions and policymakers were also familiarized with FAO's recommendations on this issue, so that they are aware of the situational context and the challenges and opportunities inherent to advancing the guarantee to the right.

E5. National - Malawi – National Monitoring Event (7-8 May 2018)

42. A data collection exercise involving various stakeholders was held in April 2018 to prepare for the event which was attended by the government, UN organizations, CSOs, academia and donors. The event allowed for a multi-actor assessment of past and ongoing efforts, including the process of developing the draft Right to Food Bill, which began in 2003 and is to be concluded in December 2018 (see submission S2), as well as in implementing broad based food security interventions using the Guidelines as a benchmark.

E6. Regional - EU – Meeting convened by the European Economic and Social Committee's Permanent Study Group on Sustainable Food Systems and CFS Civil Society Mechanism, focal point for Western Europe (12 April 2018)

43. The meeting was attended by representatives of the European Economic and Social Committee's Permanent Study Group on Sustainable Food Systems (SG-SFS), the CFS Civil Society Mechanism (CSM), academia and the private sector. The discussion focused on the potential role of the Commission in the implementation of right to food policies in the EU. It was reaffirmed that coherent national or regional human rights-based approaches to the right to food could not be seen exclusively from the perspective of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) or from the perspective of EU policies combatting social exclusion but would have to touch several policy areas simultaneously: agriculture, the fight against poverty and social exclusion, health, environment and policies determining access to land, seeds and other resources.

E7. Regional - Organization of American States – 6th round of the sessions of the Protocol of El Salvador (May 2018)

44. The Protocol of El Salvador bolsters the right to adequate food by reinforcing evaluations that are based on objective empirical evidence and through specific recommendations as per the resolutions of the General Assembly of the Organization of American States (OAS). Reports on the right to adequate food were presented by countries for the first time in December 2016. Subsequent cycles of monitoring will be undertaken every three years, starting in June 2019 when Member States that have ratified the Protocol (16 as of February 2018) will present their indicators for all the rights outlined in the Protocol and progress on follow-up will be evaluated.

E8. Global - Event organized by government (Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation) and academia (27 March 2018)

45. The event was attended by the government, UN organizations, CSOs and academia. The objective was to review the contribution of Geneva-based international institutions in supporting the use of the Guidelines at national and global levels. Geneva-based international institutions presented recommendations and proposed guidance to states and other stakeholders to support the implementation of the Guidelines, as well as numerous UN reports and NGO guidelines developed between 2004 and 2014. The event also discussed country visits made by the UN special Rapporteur on the Right to Food including his recommendations on how to better support the application of The Guidelines at country level and in FAO work.

E9. Global – event organized by the informal “Friends of the Right to Food Group” in Rome and CSM (23 March 2018)

46. The workshop examined how the Guidelines have been used towards the implementation of the right to food at the national level and the actors and means involved in promoting their use. It contributed to building an understanding on what kind of support is effective and needed to strengthen the implementation of right to food frameworks. The workshop was attended by 90 participants representing governments, CSOs, Rome-based Agencies, Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (UNCESCR) and the Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food.

B. Approaches and results of experiences discussed during the events

47. The experiences discussed during the events reflect similar approaches to those documented in experiences submitted individually (Sections III B and C). Some examples based on the submissions are presented below:

- FAO support was provided at the request of the government of Colombia in 2017 to improve knowledge and **develop technical capacity** on right to food, leading to **improved understanding and awareness** of government institutions and policy makers of the challenges and opportunities inherent to advancing right to food. In the medium to long-term, expected results include *“improved understanding of duty-holders (government) and right-holders (citizens) of the obligations of the state regarding right to food and the fundamental role of civil society”*.
- **Right to Food legislation** in Bangladesh was initiated in 2016 by the Law Commission of Bangladesh. The Food Security Network (KHANI) organized a series of consultations in 2017 at decentralized level to ensure wide participation of food insecure people, CSOs and NGOs. A consultation was also held at national level with all groups of stakeholders and the draft legislation was critically reviewed from the perspective of the Guidelines. The draft legislation has now 12 different chapters with 54 clauses. A special workshop was also organized to increase understanding of the Voluntary Guidelines and to reflect on the implementation of the Guidelines. Specific achievements of the Congress were reported: *“Grassroots organizations fighting for establishing the right to food in their respective areas/ regions found the opportunity to interact with the national level policy makers”* and *“NGOs, CBOs and civil society groups have successfully identified their roles and realized the importance of their engagement in the process of rights-based policy formulation and monitoring of activities of the governments.”*
- In Malawi, The Guidelines have been used to mainstream the right to food in the preamble of Malawi’s **Food Security Policy** at a general level and the **Food and Nutrition Bill** at a more specific level. This has been critical in elaborating the normative content of the Human Right to Adequate Food as well as outlining State Accountability in terms of state obligations. In the medium to long term, expected results include the *“adoption of the legislative framework on the Right to Food by the parliament, which will potentially impact the entire population of about 17 million people”*.
- Geneva-based institutions presented a number of recommendations and proposed guidance to states on the implementation of the right to food and the Guidelines. Food First

Information and Action Network (FIAN) International elaborated manuals to guide states and civil society organizations in the implementation of the Guidelines. FIAN also produced reports to **monitor the implementation** of the Guidelines in UN Member States including Brazil and Guatemala. OHCHR defined human rights indicators, including right to food indicators at all levels in 2010.

- The European regional meeting convened by the SG-SFS and the CSM discussed the potential role of institutions in the implementation of the right to food, and how to **address the problem of thematic isolation of the various components of the right to food**, which remains an important obstacle **for the development of more coherent policies**. The need for coordination and ensuring coherence within and between different policy-making areas, and the importance of meaningfully associating affected groups to policy deliberations was emphasized.
- The joint workshop by the Friends of the Right to Food in Rome and the CSM provided a space for dialogue on the use and application of the Guidelines. This included examination of how the Guidelines have been used towards the implementation of the right to adequate food at the national level, and the actors and means involved in the promotion of their use; lessons learned about the role of UN agencies, especially the RBAs in the use and application of the Guidelines; the achievements, challenges and gaps in the use and application of the Guidelines; different methodologies for the participation in right to food policy making and monitoring; how the Guidelines have contributed to fostering accountability of governments and policies geared towards the people most affected by food insecurity and malnutrition. It resulted in **building understanding of what kind of support is effective and needed in the future to strengthen implementation of right to food frameworks**.
- The Walloon forum aimed to elaborate a sub-national strategy on the right to food and sustainable food systems through the organization of thematic workshops, online communication platforms and the organization of local forums for citizens and community organizations. The first phase of the forum saw more than 80 organizations participating in the process and more than 100 organizations and citizens participating in the public event. The second phase of the forum (May – September 2018) will result in *“new policies adopted by the Walloon government”* which will *“impact more than 3.5 million people”*.
- The Working Group for the analyses of national reports established under the Protocol of San Salvador will **monitor the indicators** for all the rights which are outlined in the Protocol, including the right to adequate food.

C. Key catalysts of experiences discussed during the events

48. The experiences documented in the events submissions highlight several recurring key catalysts consistent with those indicated in the experiences submitted individually (Section III D).
- **Institutional and legal frameworks and reforms:** Geneva-based institutions shared experiences in Guatemala, where *“the Law on the National System for Food and Nutritional Security was adopted in 2005, defining the right to food and correlative states obligations. [...] In the same country, judges started to protect the right to food after having received training conducted by FIAN International.”*

- The importance of an **enabling environment** was highlighted, particularly the need to “create a real participatory process, ensuring that those people who are most affected by food insecurity are involved, and can interact with the representatives of the government” (Burkina Faso). For example, in Colombia, “this was a key element in analyzing the current status of the right and allowed for a more integrated understanding of accomplishments, lessons learned, challenges, and proposals for the fuller realization of the right to food in the country,” in Bangladesh “NGOs and civil society recognized that the Bangladesh Law Commission who initiated the process of drafting the Right to Food Act have set an example of ensuring the participation of civil society in the drafting process [...] it was exemplary particularly in the context of Bangladesh [...] where formulations of policies and legislations are recognized as the exclusive domain of bureaucrats and consultants,” and in Malawi “creating space for vulnerable groups particularly women and linking it to village level understanding and internalization of the Voluntary Guidelines influenced the results.” In Brazil, the enabling environment was key to reach consensus on the importance of the human right to adequate food for the overall development of the country. In fact, the commitment towards human rights became a strong catalyst for Brazil which became one of the first countries to reach the first Millennium Development Goal of reducing undernourishment by a half.
- **Political will and commitment, including dedicated public budget** is required to implement the Guidelines and contribute to the elimination of hunger. Geneva-based institutions highlighted the importance of having “political will and commitment at the highest level and active collaboration between Governments, UN institutions and civil society organizations for the national implementation of the Voluntary Guidelines. The State of Burkina Faso has set up a National Food Security Council (CNSA), one of whose missions is to coordinate the mobilization of resources for the food security system. CNSA’s funding tool is the Food Security and Support Fund.”
- **Technical support** from UN organizations and specialized agencies, as well as financial support were emphasized to facilitate processes at the national level. In Burkina Faso, “the State and its partners in the field of food security that are technical and financial partners, FAO, WFP, NGOs such as Oxfam, set up an annual response and support plan for populations vulnerable to food insecurity and malnutrition in 2011.” In Malawi “the joint Civil Society project on the Right to Food funded by the Government of Flanders added to the momentum to fast-track the enactment of the draft Food and Nutrition Bill.” “In 2017, the Colombian Government requested FAO’s support in generating knowledge regarding the Human Right to Food and needs related to technical capacity building.”
- **Evidence-based analysis, information and monitoring systems** are important to evaluate the impact of results achieved and recourse mechanisms. In Bangladesh, “creating a central ‘information cell’ of the right to food situation and establishing linkages with the national and local media to disseminate information related to vulnerability and food insecurity to bring to the attention of the government” and CSOs being “engaged in fact-finding missions as a methodology to monitor the rights of the most marginalized groups” are part of the draft Right to Food bill which “will have components which create an impetus and framework for national monitoring.” The National Commission of Human Rights in Burkina Faso is “an extra-judicial institution empowered to make findings on alleged violations of economic, social and cultural rights and to make recommendations to the State of Burkina Faso.” In Malawi “the creation of the National Right to Food Monitoring Working Group comprising local NGOs, community action groups, woman coalitions,

development partners and government ministries will be a central collective feature in monitoring the Right to Food in Malawi.” Geneva-based institutions shared that “the Office of the High Commissioner on Human Rights defined human right indicators, including right to food indicators at global level in 2010 and at regional and national levels since 2010, including in collaboration with Governments and civil society organizations in Brazil, Bolivia, Ecuador, Mexico, Paraguay, Nepal and Kenya. UN human rights mechanisms, including the UN Special Rapporteur on the right to food and the UN CESCR, play a key role in monitoring the right to food and the use of the Voluntary Guidelines at the national level.”

D. Constraints and challenges of experiences discussed during the events

49. The experiences documented in the events submissions highlight several recurring constraints and challenges that are consistent with those in the experiences submitted individually (Section III E)²³.

Policy and Legal Frameworks:

- Right to food is not enshrined in national legislation (Submissions E1 and E3)
- Institutional and sectoral fragmentation of food and agricultural policies (e.g., between the federal government and regional governments, E1)
- Competing legal and policy frameworks and organizational mandates (E3 and E8)
- Lack of conflict resolution and judicial structures to address alleged violations (E3)
- Lack of accountability mechanisms (E5)
- Lack of continuity in Government commitments to implement the Guidelines – for example when there is a change of government (E8)

Rising levels of poverty, food insecurity and malnutrition:

- Rising level of poverty (more demands for food aid) (Submissions E1 and E4)
- Rising level of malnutrition and overconsumption (E1)
- Difficulties of farmers (social exhaustion, indebtedness, burn out, suicide, etc.) (E1)

Lack of awareness, information and education:

- People in general are not aware of the right to food as a human right (Submission E2)
- Misunderstanding the concept of right to food by those working in food insecure areas (E2)
- Promoting project-based approaches to address the food insecurity problem rather than from the perspective of right to food (E2).
- Lack of capacity of the organizations of those most affected by food insecurity to participate in policy processes (E2)

Lack of technical support and adequate funding:

50. This is also highlighted in catalysts (Section D above), but was also cited as a major constraint/challenge identified in several submissions, especially referring to technical support from specialized UN agencies, in particular FAO (Submissions E8 and E9).

²³ Examples of relevant submissions are indicated as E1, E2, E3, etc. and the list of submissions can be found in Annex 1.

E. Good practices of experiences discussed during the events

51. The experiences documented in the events submissions outlined a number of good practices that contributed to making the experiences successful, consistent with those in the experiences submitted individually (Section III F). These include, but are not limited to:

- **Empowerment of stakeholders** through promotion of food governance leading to improved social justice is seen in the case of Burkina Faso, where *“in support of the most vulnerable groups, the State of Burkina Faso has planned a mechanism led by the Executive Secretariat for Food and Nutrition Security.”* In Malawi *“Accentuating the feminization of the Right to Food as a strategy to priorities the voice of women as key food producers in Malawi and integration of Right to Food gender perspectives in the design and implementation of food security intervention is considered central to changing the paradigm.”*
- **Facilitation of the development of participatory mechanisms** where stakeholders, including those most affected by food insecurity and malnutrition, civil society, media and academia, take part in the dialogue in an equal, collaborative and transparent manner. In Belgium, the experience was *“done through a transparent and participatory process,”* and in Bangladesh, the experience involved *“effective participation of civil society in formulating policies and legislation related to food and nutrition.”*
- **Establishment of partnerships** with key institutions capable of supporting capacity development and technical support on the right to food, such as FAO, as well as other specialized UN agencies supporting right to food and human rights policy making and implementation. Brazil and Guatemala were cited as positive examples of *“the successful collaboration between Governments, UN institutions and civil society organizations for the implementation of the Voluntary Guidelines [...] between 2004 and 2014”* by the Geneva-based institutions. A roundtable jointly held by the Friends of the Right to Food in Rome and the CSM also shared that *“the OHCHR plays an important role in providing support to national policy processes and supporting national monitoring frameworks.”*
- **Monitoring of elements related to achieving the right to adequate food**, including the setup of monitoring institutions/other ad hoc bodies, and access to recourse mechanisms. In Bangladesh, *“creating a central ‘information cell’ of the right to food situation and establishing linkages with the national and local media to disseminate information related to vulnerability and food insecurity to bring to the attention of the government”* and CSOs being *“engaged in fact-finding missions as a methodology to monitor the rights of the most marginalized groups”* are part of the draft Right to Food bill which *“will have components which create an impetus and framework for national monitoring..”* The National Commission of Human Rights in Burkina Faso is *“an extra-judicial institution empowered to make findings on alleged violations of economic, social and cultural rights and to make recommendations to the State of Burkina Faso.”* In Malawi, *“the creation of the National Right to Food Monitoring Working Group comprising local NGOs, community action groups, woman coalitions, development partners and government ministries will be a central collective feature in monitoring the Right to Food in Malawi.”* In Guatemala, also thanks to the empowerment of relevant stakeholders, in 2005, *“the national ombudsperson and civil society organizations started to monitor the right to food after the visit of the UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food and the adoption of the Law on National System for Food and Nutritional Security, which defined the right to food and correlative states*

obligations. Judges also started to protect the right to food after having received training conducted by FIAN International”.

- **Participatory processes leading to the integration of right to food in policy frameworks and processes.** The experience in Colombia shows that advancing the right to food depends to a large degree on whether public policy is based on a participatory process involving guarantors and holders of the right, with a firm foundation in the human rights approach. *“The experiences and lessons learned by all sectors (civil society, state institutions, and academia) who represent different interests vis-à-vis the Right to Food should be incorporated in the entire public policy cycle.”* Malawi is rolling out a broad based national forum (Right to Food Monitoring Working Group) *“specifically aimed at engaging with spaces at the policy process/environment, ensuring a clear policy pathway/participation and broadly linked to international level process (CFS)”*

Annex 1: List of Submissions

Submissions documenting multistakeholder events organized on the use and application of the Guidelines, in line with the TORs

| SUB-NATIONAL LEVEL EVENTS | |
|------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| E1. | BELGIUM: “Assises wallonnes de l’alimentation durable” – Walloon Forum on sustainable food systems |
| COUNTRY LEVEL EVENTS | |
| E2. | BANGLADESH: Implementation Status of the Voluntary Guidelines on the progressive realization of the right to adequate food in the context of national food security and the role of civil society in Bangladesh |
| E3. | BURKINA FASO: Assessing the realization of the right to food in Burkina Faso in light of the Voluntary Guidelines to support the progressive realization of the right to adequate food in the context of national food security |
| E4. | COLOMBIA: Colombia’s experience in the application of the Voluntary Guidelines on the Right to Food |
| E5. | MALAWI: National Monitoring Event – Malawi |
| REGIONAL AND MULTI-COUNTRY EVENTS | |
| E6. | REGIONAL: European regional meeting convened by the EESC and CSM |
| E7. | REGIONAL: Protocol of San Salvador – Country Reports |
| GLOBAL LEVEL EVENTS | |
| E8. | GLOBAL: Contributions of Geneva-based international institutions in supporting the use of the Right to Food Guidelines at national and global levels |
| E9. | GLOBAL: Joint Workshop by Friends of the Right to Food and the CFS Civil Society Mechanism |

Submissions documenting the use and application of the Guidelines that were reported individually

| COUNTRY LEVEL SUBMISSIONS | |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Africa | |
| S1. | BURUNDI: Participatory management of halieutics resources, the case of Lake Tanganyika |
| S2. | MALAWI: Use and application of the Voluntary Guidelines on the Right to Adequate Food in Malawi |
| S3. | TOGO: Implementation of the project "promotion of the right to food and good governance in relation to food security" |
| S4. | TOGO: Reinforcement of the knowledge of Members of Parliament about the Voluntary Guidelines |
| S5. | UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA: Promotion of good nutrition in the first 1000 days of child development through participatory mechanisms – Mwanzo Bora “Good Start” Nutrition Program |
| S6. | ZAMBIA: Focus on the most vulnerable and marginalized people and groups |
| Asia and the Pacific | |
| S7. | NEPAL: Facilitating a Process towards Strengthening of the Human Right to Food in Nepal |
| S8. | NEPAL: The progressive realization of the human right to adequate food in the Democratic Republic of Nepal |

| Europe | |
|-----------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| S9. | SPAIN: Campaign “Right to Food. URGENT” |
| S10. | SPAIN: Popular base in a Municipal Legislative Initiative (ILM) in favor of the Right to Food |
| S11. | SPAIN: Experiences and good practices of the University of Oviedo on Global Food Governance |
| S12. | SPAIN: The implementation of the Milan Urban Food Policy Pact in the city of Valencia |
| Latin America and the Caribbean | |
| S13. | BOLIVIA: Implementation of a project to “Strengthen and Build the Capacity of Health Networks / Provide Advice to the Departmental Food and Nutrition Council of La Paz” |
| S14. | BOLIVIA: Experience of CT CONAN in the development of institutional and multisectoral public policies on food security and sovereignty |
| S15. | BOLIVIA: Law No. 622 on School feeding within the framework of food sovereignty and plural economy |
| S16. | BRAZIL: Brazilian experience and its good practices in the Voluntary Guidelines for the Right to Adequate Food in the context of National Food Security |
| S17. | BRAZIL: Community gardens to food democracy: Right to Adequate Food, higher education and awareness raising through the approach of sustainable food systems in Brazilian northeast |
| S18. | COLOMBIA: Day of technical support on the Human Right to Food |
| S19. | COLOMBIA: Territorial management of food and nutrition security within the framework of the Right to Food - Caribbean Region and Chocó Department |
| S20. | COLOMBIA: Self-directed virtual training course - Policies and approaches to Food and Nutrition Security in Latin America and the Caribbean and their PROJECTION in Colombia |
| S21. | COLOMBIA: Sustainable school food system in Manizales |
| S22. | COLOMBIA: Voluntary Guideline no. 8 on the Right To Food in the public policies of Nariño |
| S23. | COSTA RICA: Generating agreements for the approval of the Framework Law on the Human Right to Food and Food and Nutrition Security - File 20076 |
| S24. | COSTA RICA: Drafting and presentation of the Draft Framework Law on the Human Right to Food and Food and Nutrition Security (Legislative File No. 20 076) |
| S25. | DOMINICAN REPUBLIC: Law No. 589-16 creating the National System for Food and Nutritional Sovereignty and Security in the Dominican Republic |
| S26. | EL SALVADOR: Actions to promote the discussion and approval of the proposed law on food and nutrition sovereignty and security of El Salvador |
| S27. | EL SALVADOR: Promoting food and nutritional education at the local level |
| S28. | GUATEMALA: Accompaniment to the process of elaboration, discussion and approval of the Guatemala School Feeding Law |
| REGIONAL AND MULTI-COUNTRY SUBMISSIONS | |
| S29. | AFRICA: Action and Communication project for food security and nutrition in West Africa |
| S30. | AFRICA: Regional workshop on awareness and strengthening of capacities for civil society organizations on the right to food and the Zero Hunger ECOWAS initiative |
| S31. | AFRICA: Support to the implementation of the national component for the regional project « Integrate the right to an adequate food and good governance to the center of policies, legislation and national institutions» |
| S32. | ASIA: The South Asian Dialogue on the Right to Food |
| S33. | LATIN AMERICA: Analysis of the performance of the institutions coordinating food and nutrition security in Latin America |

| | |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| S34. | LATIN AMERICA: Realization of the right to food at the local level in rural Andean areas of Peru and Bolivia |
| S35. | LATIN AMERICA & THE CARIBBEAN: Development of legislative guidelines for the progressive realization of the Right to Food in Latin America and the Caribbean: model laws of the PARLATINO |
| GLOBAL LEVEL SUBMISSIONS | |
| S36. | GLOBAL: The Right to Food around the Globe |
| S37. | GLOBAL: The role of the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food (UNSR RTF) in providing regional fora for dialogue on the right to food |
| S38. | GLOBAL: The UN Decade of Action on Nutrition – a window of opportunity for the realization of the right to adequate food in the context of national food security and nutrition |

Other submissions documenting the use and application of the Guidelines that were reported individually:

| | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| GLOBAL LEVEL SUBMISSIONS | |
| O35. | GLOBAL: 10 years of the Right to Adequate Food Guidelines – Progress, Obstacles and the Way Ahead |
| O36. | GLOBAL: 2014 - Ten Years of the Right to Food Guidelines: Gains, Concerns and Struggles |
| O37. | GLOBAL: Good nutrition is a human right and the foundation of well-being |