**Call for experiences and good pratices in the use and application of the Voluntary Guidelines for the Right to Adequate Food in the Context of National Food Security**

**Template for submissions (approximately 1000 words in total)**

 **Please use this**[submission form](http://bit.ly/2nAitb1)**to share your experiences and good practices in the use and application of the Voluntary Guidelines for the Right to Adequate Food in the Context of National Food Security.  For the necessary background and guidance, please refer to the topic note:** <http://www.fao.org/fsnforum/activities/open-calls/CFS_right_to_food>.

**You can upload the completed form tothe**FSN Forum**(**[www.fao.org/fsnforum](http://www.fao.org/fsnforum))**or send it via email to** fsn-moderator@fao.org**.**

**Title of the experience**

|  |
| --- |
| **'Facilitating a Process towards Strengthening of the Human Right to Food in Nepal'** |

**Geographical coverage**

(E.g. national, or regional if several countries of the same region, or global if several countries in more than one region)

|  |
| --- |
| National  |

**Country(ies)/Region(s) covered by the experience**

(E.g. Kenya, Tanzania and Malawi)

|  |
| --- |
| Nepal  |

**Your affiliation**

(Please indicate government, UN organization, civil society/NGO, private sector, academia, donor or others)

|  |
| --- |
| NGO– FIAN Nepal  |

**How have the VGRtF been used in your context? Which specific guidelines of the VGRtF were most relevant to your experience?**

(E.g. VGRtF have been used to develop legislative framework on the Right to Food, with specific reference to Guideline 7)

|  |
| --- |
| VGRtF have been used as a strong reference during advocacy and lobby work with: * Policy makers to ensure RtF as a fundamental right in Constitution of Nepal 2015, with specific reference to Guideline No 7.
* Nepal Law Commission during formulation of draft 'Right to Food Bill' -Guideline 7.
* 'Environment Protection Committee' of Parliament to amend 'National Park & Wildlife Conservation Act' from RtF Perspective **-** Guideline 8.
* Formulation of 'District Food Security Plan from RtF perspective' in collaboration with 'District Agriculture Development Office' as a pilot basis - Guideline 7 & 13
* Providing technical inputs to National Human Rights Commission while developing 'Monitoring Framework for Implementation of Human Right to Adequate Food in Nepal'- Guideline 17.
* Research, study, assessment, documentation and analyzing of RtF Violation cases and issues - Guideline 11 & other related guidelines.
 |

**Brief description of the experience**

|  |
| --- |
| FIAN Nepal is a member-based human rights organization to promote and advocate for the realization of human right to food in Nepal. We first indentify RtF violation cases, document & analyze from RtF perspective, which shows that whether Government has violated RtF of certain community or not. Once the government violates RtF, then, we facilitate community to claim their RtF under 'Casework Process' through empowering them; carry out policy advocacy work to fulfill the gaps in policy or gap in implementation based on evidence generated in the field. At the same time focus is given to strengthen capacity of RtF Networks who further engage to support RtF Vulnerable Communities for Casework and monitor RtF at local level. FIAN Nepal has documented more than 75 RtF violation cases, adopted 30 cases under 'Casework' to support Communities to claim their RtF & out of which 15 RtF Vulnerable Communities got success to claim their RtF. Contributed for ensuring RtF in constitution as fundamental rights and formulation of RtF Act etc including amendment of existing laws/policies in line with RtF. **Note: Brief about FIAN's Casework Approach** 'Casework' is 'Step by Step Action' taken by RtF Vulnerable Communities in support of FIAN/other supporting organizations to hold responsible Government accountable towards fulfilling of its obligations (Respect, Protect & Fulfill) for addressing right to food of RtF Vulnerable Communities that involves into three stages: Stage-1: Documentation of RtF violation casesStage-2: Analysis of Cases from Legal/Human Rights PerspectiveStep-3: Develop Strategy, Interventions & Case Work Plan for 'Advocacy Actions'It involves to capacitate RtF vulnerable communities to empower them to lead their issue on by own and sensitizing of key stakeholders on their duty & responsibility. |

**Who was involved in the experience?**

(Please indicate as many as relevant e.g. government, UN organization, civil society/NGO, private sector, academia, donor or others)

|  |
| --- |
| * Government Officials from Central to Local level
* Members of Parliament & Parliamentary Committees
* Political Leaders
* Right to Food Networks
* CSOs & Media people
* FIAN International
* ETO consortium
* Global Network on RtF
* Lawyers etc.
 |

**How were those most affected by food insecurity and malnutrition involved?**

(E.g. participation of CSOs representing food insecure and malnourished segments of the population in all training)

|  |
| --- |
| RtF Vulnerable Communities remains at the core of 'Casework'. A 'Joint Advocacy Plan' among community, RtF Network & FIAN Nepal is made to support community to carry out advocacy actions on the lead of RtF Affected Community.  |

**Main activities**

(E.g. training of CSOs, lawyers, parliamentarians, government)

|  |
| --- |
| * RtF violation case Documentation
* Meeting, interaction, Orientation/Training on RtF concept, Advocacy & Leadership Skill to RtF Affected Communities
* 'Advocacy Actions' by Communities: delegations, lobby, rally, etc.
* Orientation/WS to CSOs & government on RtF concept, law & policies
* Fact Finding Mission
* Filing of RtF Violation cases
* Research Studies of RtF related policies & programs etc.
 |

**Timeframe**

(Please specify starting date, and ending date/or if ongoing)

|  |
| --- |
| From 2015 and ongoing  |

**Results obtained/expected in the short term, with quantitative aspects where feasible (estimate of the number of people that have been or will be affected)**

(Please indicate the number of people that have been directly involved in activities, e.g. 6 training sessions involving 250 people)

|  |
| --- |
| **Direct Beneficiaries: 4800*** Members of RtF Affected Communities: 1500 (Training, WS, delegations etc)
* Government authorities: 350 (Training, WS etc)
* RtF Network Members: 450 (Training, WS etc)
* CSOs including Media People, Bar Association, Political leaders etc: 2500
 |

**Results obtained/expected in the medium to long term, with quantitative aspects where feasible (estimate the number of people that have been or will be affected)**

(Please indicate the number of people that have been or are expected to be indirectly affected by activities e.g. training leading to drafting legislative framework that was adopted by parliament and has potential impact on entire population of about 5 million people)

|  |
| --- |
| **Indirect Beneficiaries: Approximately 1 Million**RtF vulnerable communities & their family members, RtF promoters, HR defenders, media, legal practitioners, RtF Network members, political leaders, Law Makers government stakeholders, CSOs members etc |

**Results obtained – most significant changes to capture**

(Please indicate any significant change that resulted from the activities, e.g. change in the behavior of local authorities regarding the inclusion of civil society stakeholders in decision making, or the participation of vulnerable groups in the implementation of some programs, or a national ombudsperson/human rights institutions that started to include the Right to Food in their reporting, or changes in the access to justice, conflict resolution or administrative processes)

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Significant Change/Achievement in 'Casework':**
2. **Change in the Perception of RtF Affected Community:** RtF Violated Communities becomes aware on their right to food and initiated linking their problem from RtF perspective. For example:
* Laxmanpur Barrage Affected Community, had perception that flood problem facing by them is created due to effect of natural disaster; however, after getting aware on RtF from 'ETO perspective, they realized that problem is created due to breach of ETO by Indian Government through constructing Laxmanpur Barrage which obstructed natural flow of river creating flood.
1. **Increased level of Empowerment:** Communities are 'united & empowered' for organized struggle. For instance:
* Of the total of 30 RtF Violated Communities, 15 Communities succeeded to claim demand accessing resource/services.
1. **Recognition of Communities & their Demand by Government:** 'For example:
* Concerned Local Government invited members of 15 RtF Affected Communities to speak up their issues in Councils, and further rectified to overcome RtF violation.
1. Order **of supreme court to government to enlist Sonaha in the list of endangered Indigenous group ensured access to** facility/rights to improve livelihood.
2. **Significant Change/Achievement in 'Policy Advocacy Work':**
3. **Guaranteeing of RtF as a 'Fundamental Right' in Constitution of Nepal, 2015:**

'CSOs led by FIAN Nepal, created continuous pressure as well as supportive role to Government through organizing 'Collective Advocacy Actions/Campaigns' in the past demanding to ensure RtF as a fundamental right in constitution. 1. **Initiated formulation of 'Right to Food Act':**

To initiate the process for the formulation of 'Right to Food Act', Nepal Law Commission (Nepal Government) has made public the draft of 'Right to Food Bill, 2017 incorporating more than 75 % of demands/voice of RtF Vulnerable Communities and CSOs. FIAN Nepal, on behalf of Civil Society of Nepal, has played coordinating role with 'Nepal Law Commission' to draft 'RtF Bill' in line with international standards in the context of Nepal.1. **Amendment of 'National Park & Wildlife Conservation Act' from RtF Perspective:**

As a result of collective lobby work jointly with RtF Affected Communities, Parliament rectified National Park Act 2029 (1072) from RtF perspective recognizing traditional livelihood of communities residing in buffer zone of protected areas such as fishing, forest based food products like mushroom, green vegetables, etc. 1. **Formulation of 'District Food Security Plan' from RtF perspective a**s a pilot basis in collaboration with District Agriculture Development Office which identified vulnerable groups from right to food perspective and developed plan to secure those vulnerable communities from food insecurity.
 |

**What are the key catalysts that influenced the results?**

|  |
| --- |
| * Guarantee of RtF in the constitution & RtF law making process
* 'Generation of evidences' to carry out evidence-based advocacy
* Strategic engagement with government authorities & political leaders
* Multi-party alliance at both local and central level for issue base advocacy work
* Media partnership
* Mobilization of RtF Network at local and nation level
* Networking from Local to International level to highlight the issue
 |

**What are the major constraints/challenges for achieving the Right to Food?**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Lack of claiming mechanism due to delay in RtF Law Making Process although RtF is guaranteed in constitution.
2. Casework Approach: ‘Time & resource consuming’ to achieve expected result
3. Process of restructuring state under Federal Structure making gap in laws, policies & accountable institutions.
4. Newly elected local bodies who are unknown about right to food etc.
5. Political unrest along with transfer of Government Officials
6. Post Earthquake: Priority of Government for ‘Need Based’ than ‘Right Based’ program shrinking space of Civil Societies.
 |

**What mechanisms have been developed to monitor the Right to Food?**

|  |
| --- |
| * CSO Mechanism: RtF Food Network of CSOs at districts & central
* RtF Monitoring Framework that has been endorsed by NHRC
* NHRIs: NHRC, Women Commission, Dalit Commission, Farmers Commission etc
* District Food Security Network
 |

**What good practices would you recommend for successful results?**

|  |
| --- |
| * Promote and strengthen for 'Self-advocacy' by affected community to claim their rights & support technically for 'Policy Advocacy'.
* Institutionalize the struggle of affected community for sustained advocacy until demand is addressed.
* Promote to build linkage between community and concerned government.
* Bringing ownership to the issue by the concerned stakeholders at their level.
* Initiate advocacy/lobby work through generating evidences
* Empowering right holders on their right & responsibilities and sensitizing duty bearers towards obligations
* Theme based 'Collective Initiatives' of CSOs for policy advocacy.
 |

**Links to additional information**

|  |
| --- |
| FIAN Nepal's Website: [www.fiannepal.org](http://www.fiannepal.org) Email: info@fiannepal.org  |