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Purpose

This document has been developed to support the joint implementation of the SSF Guidelines and the Right to Food Guidelines through an integrated approach and to increase policy coherence and uptake. It examines the purpose and content of the SSF Guidelines and its interlinkages with the Right to Food Guidelines in the context of national food security and nutrition. In so doing it supports actors at all levels, from governmental stakeholders to small-scale fisheries stakeholders, in ensuring and securing the right to food.

The document provides an overview of the contents of the SSF Guidelines and the Right to Food Guidelines and identifies complementarities and potential synergies. It also explains the HRBA and discusses some key areas for attention when implementing these voluntary guidelines, with special attention to the specific roles and responsibilities of key actors in the promotion of the realization of the right to adequate food in the small-scale fisheries sector, in accordance with the provisions of both instruments.

This document is primarily directed at those involved in the integration of the SSF Guidelines and the Right to Food Guidelines into national policies and development programmes targeting the small-scale fisheries sector in the context of food security and nutrition. However, it can be equally interesting to other stakeholders who take part in the implementation of the provisions of both instruments in their day-to-day activities and who are concerned with the sustainability of the small-scale fisheries sector.
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# Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CFS</td>
<td>Committee on World Food Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFS RAI</td>
<td>CFS Principles for Responsible Investment in Agriculture and Food Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COFI</td>
<td>Committee on Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>civil society organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRBA</td>
<td>Human rights-based approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICESCR</td>
<td>International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO</td>
<td>International Labour Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHRI</td>
<td>National human rights institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANTHER</td>
<td>Participation, accountability, non-discrimination, transparency, human dignity, empowerment and the rule of law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right to Food Guidelines</td>
<td>Voluntary Guidelines to Support the Progressive Realization of the Right to Adequate Food in the Context of National Food Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDGs</td>
<td>Sustainable Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSF Guidelines</td>
<td>Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries in the Context of Food Security and Poverty Eradication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VGGT</td>
<td>Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Introduction

The adoption of the Voluntary Guidelines to Support the Progressive Realization of the Right to Adequate Food in the Context of National Food Security (hereafter Right to Food Guidelines) by consensus of the FAO Council in 2004, and the endorsement of the Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries in the Context of Food Security and Poverty Eradication (hereafter SSF Guidelines) by the FAO Committee on Fisheries (COFI) in 2014, were two major achievements in the effort to ensure food security and nutrition.

The Right to Food Guidelines, being the first instrument of its kind, paved the way for the elaboration of other international voluntary guidelines on specific issues and topics which impact food security and nutrition, such as the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security (VGGT), the CFS Principles for Responsible Investment in Agriculture and Food Systems (CFS RAI Principles), and finally the SSF Guidelines. The SSF Guidelines aim not only to achieve the responsible management and use of fisheries resources, but also to support the progressive realization of the right to adequate food and contribute to the food security and nutrition of small-scale fishers, fishworkers and their communities.

A common objective of these international instruments is to ensure that safe, nutritionally adequate, and culturally acceptable food is available; and to promote the empowerment and non-discriminatory participation of communities in decision-making processes, placing emphasis on the benefit of vulnerable and marginalized groups.

Small-scale fisheries are a very important source of food, nutrition, employment and livelihoods for millions of people around the world and are thus particularly relevant to the realization of the right to adequate food. They employ more than 90 percent of the world’s capture fishers and fishworkers, about half of whom are women (World Bank, 2012), with many belonging to indigenous groups as well. Moreover, 90 percent of small-scale fisheries operate in developing countries. Between 90 and 95 percent of all small-scale landings are destined for local consumption, providing a nutritious food source to communities that are facing many forms of vulnerability and marginalization.

The Committee on World Food Security (CFS) has repeatedly stressed the need to develop practical guidance tools to support the operationalization of the HRBA in the context of food security and nutrition and small-scale fisheries for the ultimate enjoyment of the human right to adequate food, as well to facilitate the implementation of already existing relevant guidelines. To that end, this document focuses on the Right to Food Guidelines and the SSF Guidelines and the many similarities that they share. Both instruments complement and reinforce one another, which allows for a synergetic implementation that increases the positive outcomes for the small-scale fisheries sector.
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1. Background

1.1 Understanding small-scale fisheries

The SSF Guidelines recognize the great diversity among small-scale fisheries around the world as an inherent characteristic of the sector. While there is no globally agreed definition, there are several widely shared characteristics that can be used to distinguish between small- and large-scale fisheries. Generally, and with nuances from country to country, the small-scale fisheries sector employs labour-intensive harvesting, processing and distribution technologies to exploit marine and inland water fishery resources, with activities being conducted full or part time, as well as seasonally. Many small-scale fishers and fishworkers are self-employed and tend to be embedded in local communities and contribute to local economies.

Small-scale fisheries contribute about half of global fish catches and employ more than 90 percent of the people employed in fisheries, about half of them women (mainly engaged in marketing and processing). They span a wide range of diverse cultures and practices including subsistence fishing, which uses small vessels to catch fish for household needs. An estimated 97 percent of the total employment in small-scale fisheries is concentrated in developing countries. Many small-scale fishing communities experiencing high levels of poverty and are often overlooked in decision-making processes, not only with regard to resource management but also in terms of broader social and economic development (FAO, 2020d). Small-scale fisheries are found in both marine and inland waters and include most inland capture fisheries, employing between 16.8 million and 20.7 million people worldwide (Funge-Smith, 2011). In both marine and inland contexts, small-scale fisheries provide nutritious food for local, national and international markets and generate income to support local and national economies, contributing about half of global fish catches. When considering catches destined for direct human consumption, the share contributed by the small-scale fisheries sector increases to two-thirds; thus, waste is often minimal.

There are a number of threats and challenges that small-scale fishers and their communities face on a daily basis. The livelihoods of many small-scale fishers, fishworkers and their communities – including vulnerable and marginalized groups – are directly dependent on maintaining access to fishery resources and land as well as obtaining tenure rights to coastal and waterfront areas. Unfortunately, the development paradigm applied in recent decades has in many cases led to overexploitation of resources, threatening the habitats and ecosystems on which small-scale fishing communities depend. Additionally, small-scale fishing communities tend to be located in remote and isolated areas and suffer from poor access to health, education and other social services, thus limiting their social development. Moreover, fishing communities are particularly vulnerable to the effects of climate change and to fierce and asymmetrical competition from other sectors, sometimes leading to forced displacement and/or eviction. These and other challenges that ultimately hinder their right to adequate food have long been reported by many stakeholders ranging from civil society organizations (CSOs) to international organizations, including the Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food.1

Despite their importance and their essential role in food security and nutrition, many small-scale fishing communities continue to be marginalized, and their contribution to food security and nutrition, poverty eradication, equitable development and sustainable resource utilization goes unrecognized – just as do many of their human rights, including their right to food.

1 For more information, see the following reports of the Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food: on the right to food and fishery workers, A/HRC/40/56 (https://undocs.org/A/HRC/40/56); on the right to food and fisheries, A/67/268 (https://undocs.org/A/67/268).
1.2 The Human Rights-Based Approach

The human rights-based approach (HRBA) is a conceptual framework for the process of human development that is normatively based on international human rights standards and operationally directed toward promoting and protecting human rights. It seeks to analyse inequalities which lie at the heart of development problems and redress discriminatory practices and unjust distributions of power that impede development progress.

Under an HRBA, plans, policies and processes of development are anchored in a system of rights and corresponding obligations established by international law. This helps to promote the sustainability of development work, empowering people themselves – especially the most marginalized – to claim their rights, participate in policy formulation, and hold accountable those who have a duty to act.

While there is no universal recipe for an HRBA, a number of United Nations (UN) agencies have nonetheless agreed on a number of essential attributes (UNSDG, 2003). However, each agency has its own interpretation of the approach and how it should be operationalized:

- As development policies and programmes are formulated, the main objective should be to further the realization of human rights.
- A human rights-based approach identifies right holders and their entitlements and corresponding duty bearers and their responsibilities and obligations, and works towards strengthening the capacities of the former to claim their rights and of the latter to meet their obligations.
- Principles and standards derived from international human rights treaties should guide all development cooperation and programming in all sectors and in all phases of the programming process. These human rights principles include the following: participation, accountability, non-discrimination, transparency, human dignity, empowerment and the rule of law, known at FAO by the acronym PANTHER (Box 1).

In a nutshell, the application of the HRBA in any policy, programmes, projects or thematic area should reflect the following dimensions of rights: the understanding of rights as goals and as process principles, and the identification of right holders and duty bearers.

### Box 1. The FAO PANTHER principles

- **Participation**: All stakeholders, particularly the most vulnerable, have the right to participate in the assessment, decision-making, implementation and monitoring of strategies, policies and programmes that affect their food security and nutrition. To satisfy human rights principles, participation must be full, free and meaningful.

- **Accountability**: Governments must be accountable to the people they serve. Rights can only be realized when they are effectively enforced. Achievement of effective accountability for the right to food is an opportunity, as it increases efficiency in the fight against hunger, and enables governments to account for their achievements in securing food security and nutrition in their countries. However, it also presents governments with a challenge, as it requires preventing impunity for right to food violations.

- **Non-discrimination**: Discrimination on the grounds of race, language, religion, sex or other status is prohibited under international human rights law. This principle must be implemented in laws, policies and programmes that aim to realize the right to food.

- **Transparency**: Transparency is closely related to accountability and the right to freedom of information. All stakeholders, particularly the most vulnerable, have the right to receive from the state all information related to decision-making processes about policies and programmes that might have positive or negative effects on the realization of their right to food.

- **Human dignity**: Human rights are meant to protect human dignity. The implementation and exercise of the right to food must therefore be in line with human dignity.

- **Empowerment**: Empowerment is the process of increasing the capacities of right holders, especially the most vulnerable, to demand and exercise their rights effectively and to hold duty bearers accountable.

- **Rule of law**: The rule of law principle holds that the government must obey the law in the same way as citizens do, and that any public institution taking action must have the legal authority to do so. The principle also relates to the availability of administrative, judicial and quasi-judicial recourse mechanisms, the independence of the judiciary, and the consistency of domestic laws with human rights.
1.3 The Right to Food Guidelines

“At the national level, a human rights-based approach to food security emphasizes universal, interdependent, indivisible, and interrelated human rights, the obligations of States and the roles of relevant stakeholders. Such an approach should take into account the need for emphasis on poor and vulnerable people who are often excluded from the processes that determine policies to promote food security and the need for meeting obligations to promote and respect human rights. A human rights-based approach requires not only addressing the final outcome of abolishing hunger, but also proposing ways and tools by which that goal is achieved.”

Right to Food Guidelines, pp. 6–7

Box 2. What does “right to adequate food” mean?

“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.”

Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights – General Comment no. 12, Right to Food

The Right to Food Guidelines were adopted by consensus of the FAO Council in November 2004. They represent the first attempt by governments to interpret an economic, social and cultural right and to recommend actions to be undertaken for its realization. Their objective is to provide practical guidance to states for the implementation of the progressive realization of the right to adequate food (Box 2) in the context of national food security. The Guidelines stem from the commitments made at the World Food Summit and the related goals of the World Food Summit Plan of Action, and are among a range of international voluntary tools developed to achieve these targets. They were later endorsed by CFS and became a core pillar of its Reformed Document in 2009.

In addition to member countries, relevant stakeholders can also be guided by the provisions contained in the Right to Food Guidelines. The Guidelines cover the full range of actions to be considered by governments at the national level to build an enabling environment for people to feed themselves in dignity and to establish appropriate conditions for those who are unable to do so. Based on human rights principles, they can be used to strengthen and improve current development frameworks, particularly with regard to social and human dimensions, putting people’s rights more firmly at the centre of development efforts. At the time of their adoption, the Right to Food Guidelines represented an important step towards integrating human rights into the work of agencies concerned with development and issues of social, economic and cultural rights. Now, more than 15 years on, they continue to be a very relevant instrument to combat hunger and poverty and to accelerate attainment of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).²

The Right to Food Guidelines are not the only instrument that addresses the right to adequate food. There have been many efforts at the international, regional and national levels to create

tools and instruments that can guide development processes in the context of the right to adequate food. For instance, great precursors to the Right to Food Guidelines can be found in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and in the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). However, the Right to Food Guidelines represent the first effort to go beyond the mere formulation of the right to effectively articulating guidance for states towards its actual achievement.

The Right to Food Guidelines are divided into three parts (Box 3). Part 1 provides background information on the precedents and goals of the instrument, situating the right to food in the wider context of the obligations that states have regarding human rights and international law. Part 2 details the enabling environment, assistance and accountability mechanisms required for the implementation of the right to adequate food. This can be considered the core section of the document, as it contains the 19 guidelines. Part 3 then delves into the international measures, actions and commitments that states and other relevant stakeholders should pursue, as well as actions to be carried out towards the achievement of the right to adequate food.

Box 3. The RtF Guidelines summarized

**Part 1. Objectives and guiding principles, with reference to basic instruments of international human rights law and the normative relation between the right to food and food security**

**Part 2. Enabling environment, assistance and accountability**

This section includes guidance for implementation in the following 19 policy areas:

1. Democracy, good governance, human rights and the rule of law
2. Economic development policies
3. Strategies
4. Market systems
5. Institutions
6. Stakeholders
7. Legal framework
8. Food safety and consumer protection
9. Nutrition
10. Education and awareness raising
11. National financial resources
12. Support for vulnerable groups
13. Safety nets
14. International food aid
15. Natural and human-made disasters
16. Monitoring, indicators and benchmarks
17. National human rights institutions
18. International dimension

**Part 3. International measures, actions and commitments**

This section highlights the role of the international community to further the progressive realization of the right to adequate food, through cooperation and unilateral measures, trade, development assistance and food aid, partnerships, and monitoring.

**THE HRBA AND THE RTF GUIDELINES**

As in the case of the SSF Guidelines, all provisions of the RtF Guidelines were developed from a human rights-based approach to food security, emphasizing universal, interdependent, indivisible and interrelated human rights, as well as the obligations of states towards right holders and the roles of relevant stakeholders.

Fulfilling the right to adequate food and achieving food security and improved nutrition require that all human rights principles be present and safeguarded. Along these lines, the RtF Guidelines list the following key principles as a requirement for the achievement of food security:

“[...] the need to enable individuals to realize the right to take part in the conduct of public affairs; the right to freedom of expression; and the right to seek, receive and impart information, including in relation to decision-making about policies on realizing the right to adequate food.” (Right to Food Guidelines, Preface §19).

According to the RtF Guidelines, states should meet their human rights-related obligations avoiding any type of discrimination while making sure that the needs of the poor and vulnerable are equally considered during policy-making processes. It must be noted that, in the same way as in the SSF Guidelines, the application of the HRBA must be integral to the entire implementation of the RtF Guidelines in order to safeguard the right to adequate food for all.

*A more comprehensive list of related instruments can be found in Chapter 3.6 of this document.*
1.4 The SSF Guidelines

“These Guidelines are based on international human rights standards, responsible fisheries standards and practices and sustainable development according to […] the Code and other relevant instruments, paying particular attention to vulnerable and marginalized groups and the need to support the progressive realization of the right to adequate food.”

SSF Guidelines, Guiding principle 3.1

The Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries in the Context of Food Security and Poverty Eradication (SSF Guidelines), endorsed by COFI in 2014, were developed to serve as complementary guidance with respect to small-scale fisheries in support of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries. The Guidelines are closely related to other international instruments such as the Right to Food Guidelines, the VGGT and the CFS RAI Principles.

The SSF Guidelines are the first internationally agreed upon instrument dedicated entirely to the small-scale fisheries sector. They were formulated through bottom-up consultations that involved more than 4 000 representatives of governments, small-scale fishers, fishworkers and their organizations, as well as academia, development partners and other relevant stakeholders from more than 120 countries. The Guidelines are considered one of the principal international instruments contributing to the sustainable and secure development of fisheries and a key tool to achieving various Sustainable Development Goals, such as SDG 1 “No Poverty”, SDG 2 “Zero Hunger”, SDG 5 “Gender Equality”, SDG 8 “Decent Work and Economic Growth”, SDG 13 “Climate Action”, SDG 14 “Life Below Water” (especially SDG 14.b: “Provide access for small-scale artisanal fishers to marine resources and markets”), and SDG 17 “Partnerships for the Goals”. Additionally, the SSF Guidelines have the overarching goal of enhancing the contribution of small-scale fisheries to global food security and nutrition and supporting the progressive realization of the right to food through the collaborative work of governments, small-scale fishers, fishworkers and their communities and other relevant stakeholders (FAO, 2015).

The SSF Guidelines are divided into three main parts. Part 1 establishes the objectives, nature, scope, and the guiding principles, which are based on international human rights standards and responsible fisheries standards and practices. The overall objectives of the Guidelines are summarized as follows:

> Enhance the contribution of small-scale fisheries to global food security and nutrition, and support the progressive realization of the right to adequate food.

> Contribute to the equitable development of small-scale fishing communities and poverty eradication, and improve the socio-economic situation of fishers and fishworkers within the context of sustainable fisheries management.

> Achieve the sustainable utilization, prudent and responsible management, and conservation of fisheries resources consistent with the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries and related instruments.

> Promote the contribution of small-scale fisheries to an economically, socially and environmentally sustainable future.

> Provide guidance for states and stakeholders for the development and implementation of ecosystem-friendly and participatory policies, strategies and legal frameworks for the enhancement of responsible and sustainable small-scale fisheries.

Part 2 of the SSF Guidelines on responsible fisheries and sustainable development covers the following five areas of major importance for the small-scale fisheries sector, representing the thematic heart of the document:
> sustainable resource utilization/stewardship and secure rights to fishery resources and land;
> social development dimension of the small-scale fisheries sector (e.g. access to social services); fair, decent and safe working conditions; employment and incomes;
> post-harvest sector and trade-related activities;
> gender equality and equity;
> vulnerability of the small-scale fisheries sector in the context of disaster risks and climate change.

Part 3 of the SSF Guidelines is centred on ensuring an enabling environment and supporting implementation. Here, provisions for policy coherence, institutional coordination and collaboration, communication, capacity development and monitoring are included to promote a policy and institutional context that favours the sustainable development of the sector.

If all those involved in the small-scale fisheries sector, including governments, bear in mind the provisions contained in each chapter of the SSF Guidelines, the livelihoods of small-scale fishers, fishworkers and their communities, as well as the overall sustainability of the small-scale fisheries sector, will benefit.

**Box 4. The SSF Guidelines summarized**

**Part 1. Guiding principles (below), objectives, nature and scope of the SSF Guidelines, based on human rights and the rule of law**

- human rights and dignity
- respect of cultures
- non-discrimination
- gender equality and equity
- equity and equality
- consultation and participation
- rule of law
- transparency
- accountability
- economic, social and environmental sustainability
- holistic and integrated approaches
- social responsibility
- feasibility and social and economic viability.

**Part 2. Responsible fisheries and sustainable development**

- governance of tenure in small-scale fisheries and sustainable resource management
- social development, employment and decent work
- value chains, post-harvest and trade
- gender equality
- disaster risks and climate change.

**Part 3. Ensuring an enabling environment and supporting implementation**

- policy coherence, institutional coordination and collaboration
- information, research and communication
- capacity development
- implementation support and monitoring.

**THE HRBA AND THE SSF GUIDELINES**

In the context of small-scale fisheries, the application of the HRBA includes the process of providing and securing the rights of small-scale fishers, actors and fishing communities such that they are allowed to participate in an active, free, meaningful and effective manner in the decision-making processes affecting their lives. Together with these rights, the HRBA calls for the appropriate formulation of duties and accountability procedures and mechanisms applicable to all small-scale fisheries actors and communities, with due recognition to national and customary legal systems (if applicable).

When the HRBA is applied to small-scale fisheries management, conservation and/or development initiatives and included in legislative and governance processes and frameworks, it is more likely that the participation of small-scale fishers, fishworkers and their communities will be more equitable, ultimately leading to overall improvements in their livelihoods and well-being.

The SSF Guidelines call for the application of the HRBA not only in relation to access and management of fisheries, but also in terms of broader issues that are vital for small-scale fisheries actors, such as health, education, food security and employment.
The overall narrative of the SSF Guidelines is based on international human rights standards and stresses that the achievement of its objectives is conditional upon the promotion of an HRBA that enables participation in decision-making processes. Moreover, the recommendations and provisions of the different sections of the SSF Guidelines build on a set of guiding principles that all have the HRBA at their core. The first guiding principle of the Guidelines, human rights and dignity, reads as follows:

“[...] Recognizing the inherent dignity and the equal and inalienable human rights of all individuals, all parties should recognize, respect, promote and protect the human rights principles and their applicability to communities dependent on smallscale fisheries, as stipulated by international human rights standards [...]” (SSF Guidelines, §3.1.1).

As previously stated in Chapter 3.2, the effective application of the HRBA requires the identification of right holders and their entitlements as well as the corresponding duty bearers and their responsibilities towards the sector. Accordingly, the SSF Guidelines include provisions to guide the actions of both right holders and duty bearers, especially the latter. A strong emphasis is placed on ensuring not only that duty bearers know and understand their obligations, but also that accountability mechanisms are in place for cases of non-compliance with such obligations.
1.5 The Right to Food Guidelines and the SSF Guidelines at a glance: synergies and similarities

**Right to Food GUIDELINES**

- Adopted, by consensus, at the 127th Session of the FAO council in 2004 after a biennium of highly participatory multistakeholder negotiations, and subsequently endorsed in 2009 by the Committee on World Food Security.
- First attempt by governments to interpret an economic, social and cultural right and to recommend actions to be undertaken for its progressive realization.
- Provides guidance to states in their implementation of the right to food over 19 different policy areas with an emphasis on participation, including access and sustainable management of natural resources.
- Affirms the human rights-based approach and application of human rights principles as integral to the process of ensuring the progressive realization of the right to food in the context of national food security.
- Opens the path for other guidelines targeting specific sectors, issues and topics, as in the case of the small-scale fisheries sector and the SSF Guidelines.
- Fundamental instrument for achieving the SDGs, especially SDG 2 “Zero Hunger”.

**SSF GUIDELINES**

- Endorsed at the 31st Session of the FAO Committee on Fisheries in 2014 after a bottom-up participatory process involving 4,000 small-scale fisheries sector representatives from more than 120 countries.
- First international instrument entirely dedicated to small-scale fisheries and to enhancing their contribution to global food security and nutrition and the realization of the right to adequate food.
- Provides guidance to states for the development and implementation of participatory policies, strategies, and legal frameworks for the enhancement of responsible and sustainable small-scale fisheries.
- Makes explicit reference to the obligations of states to respect, protect and fulfil human rights and bases its provisions on human right principles, which ultimately leads to the realization of the right to food.
- Further expands Right to Food Guideline 8 on “access to resources and assets”, while building on the premises of Guidelines 2, 3, 9, 10, 11 and 13.
- Fundamental instrument for achieving the SDGs, especially SDG 1 “Zero Poverty”, SDG 2 “Zero Hunger” and SDG 14 “Life Below Water”.

---

A number of common aspects inherent to both tools create a natural complementarity and can facilitate a holistic approach, while contributing to an understanding of what these instruments are asking all relevant stakeholders to do. The following is not an exhaustive list, but gives a clearer idea of the cornerstones of the SSF Guidelines and the Right to Food Guidelines:

- **The voluntary dimension** of the guidelines, which are non-binding but nevertheless based on binding international instruments (e.g. the ICESCR) and to this end are extremely powerful and customizable tools.

- The endorsement following a **global consultation process**, which allowed a large number of stakeholders to contribute to their contents.

- The focus on the **most vulnerable and marginalized groups**, while empowering both men and women to increase their participation in decision-making.

- The realization of **human rights as guiding process principles and goals** of policy actions.

- The call for ensuring **access to resources and assets** (and their sustainable management).

- The need for **sound legal frameworks** to ensure the protection of fisheries legislation targeting small-scale fisheries.

- The support for **human rights-based assessment and monitoring**, including the development of indicators for human rights-based disaggregation of data.

Both instruments offer specific policy entry points for providing concrete operational guidance to national small-scale fisheries stakeholders – including national policymakers, local communities and authorities, and civil society actors – to further their implementation and better contribute to food security and nutrition. These will be highlighted in following sections.

---


*For more information, see the FAO Right to Food Methodological Toolbox at http://www.fao.org/right-to-food/resources/rtf-methodological-toolbox.*
1.6 Other international instruments in support of the implementation of the SSF Guidelines and the Right to Food Guidelines

Although the SSF Guidelines and the Right to Food Guidelines are unique in their respective characteristics, both are backed by a series of binding and non-binding instruments relevant to the right to food and small-scale fisheries. Although these instruments can also be found at the regional and national level, for the purpose of this document only international instruments are be listed. Notwithstanding this, it must be noted that efforts at regional and national levels are equally important for the realization of the right to food and the sustainability of small-scale fisheries.

BINDING INSTRUMENTS

The following are several of the binding instruments at the international level that are relevant to the right to food and to the small-scale fisheries sector:

> Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees, 1951;
> International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, 1966;
> Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, 1979;
> Convention on the Rights of the Child, 1989;

NON-BINDING INSTRUMENTS

As already noted, even if non-binding instruments do not impose obligations on states, they are based on binding instruments and often influence the practice of states. Also, due to their inherent flexibility, they sometimes represent a better and faster route to obtaining legal commitments from states in comparison with the often-lengthy processes required to adhere to binding instruments. In the context of small-scale fisheries, the soft-law status of the SSF Guidelines has facilitated its inclusion in the political agenda of many countries around the world and has inspired many others in the formulation of their own legal frameworks in support of small-scale fisheries and their right to adequate food.

Within the category of non-binding instruments, international organizations have developed additional guidelines on several areas related to the right to food and the small-scale fisheries sector. One such example are the VGGT, which were endorsed by CFS in 2012. The VGGT lay out a human rights-based framework for states with the goals of fostering responsible governance of tenure of land, fisheries and forests; boosting sustainable livelihoods; rural development; environmental protection; and sustainable social and economic development and management of resources, ultimately leading to improved access to and availability of adequate food.

In 2014, the CFS endorsed the CFS RAI Principles, which establish a set of fundamental principles for governments, intergovernmental organizations, finance institutions and donors, research organizations and academia, smallholders, business, CSOs, workers and their organizations, communities, and consumer organizations in relation to responsible investments for achieving food and nutrition security. A responsible investment refers to an investment, financial or otherwise, which is aimed at supporting the realization of food security, nutrition and sustainable development, and that respects, protects and promotes human rights. These principles can easily be applied to the context of small-scale fisheries.

Additional non-binding instruments in support of the right to food and which can potentially contribute to an overall increase of the sustainability of the small-scale fisheries sector are:

> Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 1948;
> Universal Declaration on the Eradication of Hunger and Malnutrition, 1974;
> UN Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities, 1992;
> UN Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action, 1995;
> FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries, 1995;
> Rome Declaration on World Food Security, 1996;
> UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, 2007;
> UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, 2011;
> Rome Declaration on Nutrition and Framework for Action, 2014;
2. Considerations for a synergetic implementation

The SSF Guidelines and the Right to Food Guidelines offer major opportunities for synergetic implementation. Promoting complementary application of these two normative tools, together with other international voluntary instruments such as the VGGT and the CFS RAI Principles, can greatly improve policy coherence for food security and nutrition in the small-scale fisheries sector and beyond.

As already mentioned earlier, both instruments are guided by a human rights-based approach (HRBA) which requires sustainable effort over time, maximum use of available resources, and the empowerment of the main target groups – in this case small-scale fishers, fishworkers, and their organizations – so that they may voice their needs, concerns and interests. Power imbalances should be dealt with by empowering those with currently weak bargaining positions in order to ensure more equitable benefits and income.

Accordingly, these two documents include a set of functional areas that guide stakeholders through all steps of policy-making, from design to monitoring, on how to implement the HRBA in a way that fosters an enabling environment for sustainable food systems. These functional areas are key for implementation, but can also be catalysts for maintaining high-level political engagement, power balances, and inclusivity:

- stakeholder assessment
- right to food assessment
- human rights-based monitoring
- capacity development
- awareness raising
- gender equality.

2.1 Stakeholder assessment: identification and analysis

STAKEHOLDER IDENTIFICATION

Key stakeholders in the small-scale fisheries sector can include a variety of individuals, groups, customary organizations and authorities, such as: CSOs and most vulnerable groups (such as women and youth), fishing communities, government parliamentarians, the private sector, national public institutions, national human rights institutions, regional organizations and networks, academia, law centres/clinics, legal-aid centres, and last but not least, all actors along the value chain (i.e. fishers and fishworkers such as processors, vendors, traders, suppliers, intermediaries, retailers, exporters, consumers).

The proper and thorough identification of the main actors in the sector as well as their functions and tasks allows for ensuring adequate participation, accountability and empowerment of all concerned stakeholders. Such identification, in order to be in line with the HRBA, will also need to differentiate right holders from duty bearers and set out their specific roles and responsibilities.
RIGHT HOLDERS

It must be highlighted that everyone is a right holder. All human beings have rights, and by virtue of being human can claim minimum standards of treatment, coverage, services and opportunities. Every human being holds therefore a right to adequate food. However, taking into account the principles of equity and non-discrimination that are enshrined in international human rights law, the SSF Guidelines and the Right to Food Guidelines, local action should focus primarily on the most vulnerable individuals and groups who are usually excluded from decision-making processes.

In light of the facts stated above, small-scale fishers, fishworkers and their communities hold a prominent position within the right-holders category. These actors need to be empowered so that they can claim, promote and defend their rights vis-à-vis state and non-state actors, and participate fully in consultations affecting their livelihoods. However, their rights also come with obligations towards the short-, medium- and long-term conservation and sustainable use of the natural resources that form the basis:

> reaffirm their rights;
> claim non-realized rights;
> inform civil society representatives about their needs and concerns;
> participate in public debates on rights issues;
> participate in grassroots-level organizations and movements to voice their concerns.

DUTY BEARERS

The primary duty bearer is the state, as it has the obligation to respect, protect and fulfil the right to adequate food. To the full extent of its available resources, the state is required to adopt appropriate legislative, institutional, budgetary, administrative and other measures for the progressive realization of the right to food. This duty extends to all state functions, such as parliament (including regional parliamentarian organizations – Box 6), government departments/ministries, local authorities, courts, the police, nurses, teachers and any other workers delivering a service on behalf of the state. The state also has a duty to ensure that third parties act within the law and, in the case of breach, are held accountable and provide redress.

One vital responsibility for states is to develop adequate legislation and/or policies to protect the small-scale fisheries sector, to ensure ongoing monitoring and oversight of the exercise of rights or implementation of such policies, and to provide an adequate budget to facilitate their fulfilment. While the state is the ultimate duty bearer for the right to food as well as other human rights, other institutions, groups and individuals such as the private sector are also considered duty bearers and have intermediate responsibilities. In this context, the state has the additional responsibility of ensuring compliance by third parties with their obligations as duty bearers, and in the event of non-compliance, intervening to safeguard the rights of right holders.

The following are additional stakeholders from the small-scale fisheries sector that, depending on the specific context, may need to be identified and whose functions and roles (including in the implementation of the SSF Guidelines) must be taken into consideration:

Box 5. Parlatino and the Model Law on Small-Scale Fisheries

The Latin American and Caribbean Parliament (Parlatino) is a regional organization composed of members of parliament from 23 Latin American countries. It has been at the forefront in the fight against hunger, food insecurity and malnutrition in the region through regional political processes aimed at achieving national political commitments towards the improvement of human rights for all peoples, including the human right to adequate food for all. In 2017, Parlatino created the Model Law on Small-Scale Fisheries, a legal framework that states can use as reference to adopt, strengthen and supplement their own policies with the overall goal of increasing the sustainability of the small-scale fisheries sector and the degree of enjoyment of the right to adequate food. Although PARLATINO does not hold legislative power, it is a great example of states working together towards the regional promotion of human rights.
Civil society organizations: CSOs have a role to play in the implementation of the SSF Guidelines (Box 7), especially in regard to awareness raising and capacity building for the protection and promotion of the human rights of small-scale fishing communities, and also for strengthening governance mechanisms. CSOs at the international level can collaborate with the UN Secretariat and its agencies such as FAO, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) and the International Labour Organization (ILO) to promote the human rights of small-scale fisheries. CSOs at the national level can, in collaboration with national human rights institutions, for example, seek coordination and coherence across ministries and departments that have duties relating to the rights to food, health, education, housing and decent work, thus ensuring that the voices of small-scale fishing communities are heard and their particular characteristics considered across high-level policies and programmes. CSOs can also collaborate in the development of indicators for the progressive realization of human rights of fishing communities (e.g. educational levels, access to health services, quality of life, human rights violations, women’s participation, and availability of social protection).

Box 6. CSOs in South Africa: small-scale fisheries class action

In post-apartheid South Africa, the Marine Living Resources Act 18 (MLRA) of 1998 established individual transferable quotas (ITQs) to broaden resource access by allocating small quotas to new entrants. Small-scale fishers, however, remained unrecognized by the Act. Then a group of about 5 000 small-scale fishers, led by a civil society organization (Masifundise) linking fisherfolk with activists and academics, launched a class action in the High Court and in the Equality Court in Cape Town against the ITQ system, based on their right to food.

The fishers argued that the implementation of the MLRA of 1998 violated their right to food, a right that is protected in the South African Constitution of 1996. In 2007, the Minister of Environmental Affairs and Tourism issued a decision, granting traditional fishers the right to catch and sell West Coast rock lobster for commercial purposes. This decision followed an order by the Equality Court in May 2007 – issued after an agreement among the parties – that small-scale fishers were entitled to some form of interim relief through fishing until the government had finalized its new subsistence fishing policy. That same year, an out-of-court settlement with the claimants led to 1 000 interim relief permits being allocated to artisanal fishes and the development of a new small-scale fisheries policy for South Africa (Isaacs, 2013).

National human rights institutions (NHRI):7 The powers, functions and monitoring mechanisms of NHRIs can promote and protect the human rights of vulnerable groups and sectors, such as that of small-scale fisheries. With adequate resources and capacity, they can review international treaties and make recommendations to the government regarding their implementation. NHRIs can respond to collective rights violations at the national, local, and even grassroots level, and may receive, investigate and respond to complaints of violations of human rights, or of negligence or dereliction of duties in the prevention of such violations by public servants. They can also seek leave to intervene in any proceedings concerning human rights before judicial organs. NHRIs are expected to spread human rights awareness in society and can undertake and promote research in the field of human rights. In addition, they are expected to encourage the efforts of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and CSOs working in the field of human rights. NHRIs can take up the arrest and detention of fishers in neighbouring countries with the respective ministry of foreign affairs which, in turn, can take up such issues with its counterparts in other countries. It must be highlighted that all these powers and capabilities may vary from country to country. However, irrespective of where they are, their capacity across the world should be built up to protect and promote the human rights of small-scale fishing communities.

Academia and research institutions: These institutions are fundamental partners in advancing the right to adequate food as well as having huge potential for collaboration, support and investigation concerning small-scale fisheries. In addition to the disciplines that are traditionally of use to small-scale fisheries (marine biology, geography, aquaculture, environmental science and other courses), there are less obvious but remarkably empowering connections to be found in disciplines such as law that can serve small-scale fishing communities by way of advising and representation. One example is the use of legal departments within academic institutions for research into legislative or policy processes or opportunities for development.

7 For more information on the role and importance of NHRIs, see: https://www.ohchr.org/EN/Countries/NHRI/Pages/NHRIMain.aspx.
Box 7. The Right to Food Observatory

The Right to Food Observatory (ODA) is a regional network of academics in support of the right to food in Latin America and the Caribbean. It includes participants from more than 50 academic institutions and from disciplines such as law, nutrition, agriculture, human rights and political science. Operating in 17 different countries, the ODA carries out academic investigations, research and teaching concerning the right to food. In many countries, the academics have close ties to local communities and are able to act – to some extent – as monitors and evaluators of policy implementation on the ground. They also partner with the regional and national Parliamentary Fronts Against Hunger to work on national policy or plans to advance the right to food.

to further promote the rights of small-scale communities. This could include carrying out research projects or participating in multi-stakeholder consultations with governments to develop national plans, legislation or programmes and policies (Box 7).

Regional small-scale fisheries networks and organizations: These entities are important forums to support the small-scale fisheries sector and for its direct participation. They can connect local or community-based fishers with a wider market or pressure group capable of influencing policy legislation at the national level, or take up the cause of a particular group and raise it to the global or regional platform. Such networks can have important links with regional organizations such as regional human rights courts, the European Court on Human

Rights or the Interamerican Court on Human Rights, who can consider cases on behalf of a local group or fishing community. Tapping into regional networks can also support access to markets and to funding opportunities. Other examples are regional networks of consumers that put additional pressure on national parliaments to incentivize the adoption of nutritional diets, improve nutritional content in fish markets, and ensure fair prices for decent work. Such connections can also support learning opportunities for small-scale fishers, fishworkers and their communities.

The following table (1) summarizes the roles and responsibilities of additional stakeholders regarding the small-scale fisheries sector and the right to food of small-scale fishers, fishworkers and their communities.

Table 1. Roles and responsibilities of small-scale fisheries stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder category</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Local government authorities          | > Identify capacity gaps and training needs of local public services in relation to the small-scale fisheries sector.  
                                         | > Formulate and monitor local policies and plans.                                 |
|                                       | > Administer and allocate financial resources.                                   |
|                                       | > Carry out advocacy in relation to central authorities’ responsibilities towards the sector. |
| Public policy and programme decision makers | > Monitor the fulfilment of state obligations – goals, benchmarks, etc.             |
|                                       | > Plan budgets.                                                                  |
|                                       | > Formulate and monitor sector plans and programmes.                             |
|                                       | > Formulate development strategies and plans.                                    |
|                                       | > Plan public services.                                                          |
|                                       | > Report periodically on the realization of economic, social and cultural rights – nationally and internationally. |
| Legislators                           | > Formulate legislative bills on social and economic policy.                     |
|                                       | > Allocate public resources.                                                     |
|                                       | > Monitor public policies and programmes.                                        |
|                                       | > Monitor the effective utilization of public funds.                             |
| Legal system operators                | > Monitor the access to justice and rights of small-scale fishers, fishworkers and their communities. |
|                                       | > Monitor the impact of judicial decisions on rights promotion.                  |

Table 1. Roles and responsibilities of small-scale fisheries stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mass media</td>
<td>Prepare print articles, radio and television reports, policy debates and events on food security and nutrition issues in the small-scale fisheries sector.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Training institutions | Carry out training needs assessments of small-scale fishers, fishworkers and their communities.  
                      | Prepare capacity development initiatives in accordance with the training needs assessments. |
| Donors                | Formulate and monitor technical cooperation projects.                         
                      | Allocate resources.                                                          |

STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS

Once the main small-scale fisheries actors and other relevant stakeholders have been identified, the next step is to analyse the relationships and respective power balances between them, as well as the relative incentives and potential conflicts. It is important to highlight that there is no single best method to conduct a stakeholder analysis; instead, it must be tailored to the specific context and actors to be analysed. During the analysis, it is crucial to include all actors, with special attention to not exclude the most vulnerable.

The following are some of the questions that can be used to conduct the stakeholder analysis, on the basis of which policymakers can then inform their decisions and foster the sustainability of the small-scale fisheries sector and support the progressive realization of the right to adequate food:

- How is each stakeholder group affected by policies relevant to the small-scale fisheries sector and the right to food?
- Is there any stakeholder on whom these policies have a negative impact? Could they oppose them? How?
- How does each stakeholder group perceive these policies? What conflicts may arise or have already arisen from these policies?
- What responsibilities does each stakeholder group have regarding these policies?
- How can each stakeholder group be involved in order to ensure effective and meaningful participation?
2.2 Right to food assessment

FAO continues to generate knowledge to support the implementation of the SSF Guidelines and the Right to Food Guidelines in order to facilitate uptake at the country level. A careful rights-based assessment of existing national legislation, policy and administrative measures relevant to the small-scale fisheries sector is a powerful tool which can help identify existing systematic constraints and availability of resources: i.e. the who, where and why of food insecurity in the country. Such assessments are of particular importance as they frequently help countries in obtaining the information necessary not only for designing right to food strategies in the longer term, but also for deciding on immediate measures to ensure freedom from hunger and to foster an enabling legal, policy and institutional environment.

Assessments are often conducted on the food security situation in the country and do not specifically focus on or include the right to food dimension and the state obligation to respect, protect and fulfill the right to food. The small-scale fisheries sector is often overlooked, and thus tends to be excluded from food security and nutrition assessment altogether. To change this in the future and to enable more states to assess the right to food situation in their countries, assessments of legal texts relevant to small-scale fisheries should be done coherently with those relating to food security and nutrition assessment altogether. To help formulate the assessment, a number of guiding questions from the Right to Food Assessment Checklist have been adapted to address the right to food in the small-scale fisheries sector:

> Is there space – at the local, regional and national level – given to small-scale fishing communities, CSOs and NGOs, and to groups representing the interests of the most food insecure, for participation in designing, reviewing and monitoring the food security and nutrition strategies, policies and programmes that affect them (e.g. school feeding programmes/national nutrition plans, market access)?

> Which mechanisms are in place to guarantee coherence of strategies, policies and programmes relevant to the small-scale fisheries sector and with the overall objective to realize the right to adequate food at national, regional and subregional levels?

> Which are the relevant public institutions responsible for the implementation and monitoring of the right to food and other related human rights of the small-scale fisheries sector at the national, regional and subregional levels? To what extent are these institutions monitoring the food insecurity situation of vulnerable groups, especially women, children and indigenous groups? Is the food insecurity experience scale being used to measure hunger by people's experience linked to SDG2?

> Are there processes/tools through which the impact of legislation, strategies, policies and programmes are regularly reviewed in view of their contribution to the realization of the right to food and other relevant human rights of small-scale fishers, fishworkers and their communities?

> Are accountability mechanisms established, accessible and understood (e.g. by translating them into local languages) by duty bearers and right holders? How is it ensured that the duty bearers and right holders know about these accountability mechanisms (transparency of reporting, information-sharing, inclusion in decision-making policy processes, etc.)?

> Do state officials (duty bearers) know about the right to food and are they aware of their obligations to respect, protect and fulfill it?

> Do right holders, especially the food insecure, know about their human rights and the means to holding the state accountable for protecting them?

> What redress mechanisms exist in case of breaches of rights – to land, water, food – and are these mechanisms accessible to all at the local level (e.g. courts, legal representation, arbitration, compensation, restoration, redress)?

*See: http://www.fao.org/3/a-bs906e.pdf.*
2.3 Human rights-based monitoring

The human rights-based approach to monitoring can be considered from two complementary perspectives: rights-centred monitoring (referring to what is monitored) and rights-based monitoring (referring to how monitoring is performed) (FAO, 2014a).

Rights-centred monitoring involves monitoring to check whether human rights principles have been applied in the design, funding and implementation of relevant policies, programmes, projects and activities, and whether they have had significant impact on the realization of rights. This monitoring approach therefore includes:

> Monitoring the development and implementation processes of measures expected to have an impact on the realization of a human right, in this case on the right to adequate food.

> Monitoring the results achieved with these measures (which may be policies, programmes, projects, etc.) and their contribution to the progressive realization of rights.

> Monitoring the final impact obtained in terms of increasing the degree of respect, protection, and fulfilment of rights, particularly the right to food.

> Monitoring potential retrogressions that could occur in the realization of the right to food and related rights.

Rights-based monitoring implies that the monitoring process itself is based on and consistent with human rights principles; is transparent, inclusive and participatory; helps to empower right holders; and strengthens the capacities of duty bearers, providing both groups with valuable information for decision-making aimed at the realization of rights. Rights-based monitoring should include methods and approaches based on human rights and their principles.

Monitoring the right to food within a country involves regular collection, analysis, interpretation and dissemination of relevant information and data to assess progress in realizing the right to adequate food for all members of society, and whether this progress is being made in accordance with human rights principles and approaches. This is also valid in the context of the small-scale fisheries sector, as it contributes greatly to food security and nutrition.

With regards to rights-based monitoring, the SSF Guidelines and the Right to Food Guidelines include provisions that guide its implementation and use:

> Incorporation of the human rights-based approach into ongoing monitoring processes: The ultimate goal of monitoring based on respect for human rights is for it to become part of normal everyday activity. Rights-based monitoring should begin with the small-scale fisheries monitoring activities already under way, and then add value to these processes through the introduction of rights-based approaches.

> Institutional capacity building: The professional responsible for or involved in monitoring measures related to the right to adequate food in small-scale fisheries must have the capacity to adequately assume their responsibilities.

> Institutional responsibility and state–non-state actor partnerships: Rights-based monitoring should take full advantage of government–civil society partnerships and appropriately incorporate relevant methodologies used by non-governmental organizations and other relevant non-state actors at all levels. In some countries, CSOs and research institutions (e.g. Right to Food Observatory) play a significant role in monitoring the realization of the right to adequate food.

Human rights-based monitoring, as in any other type of monitoring, should use a series of indicators to track particular aspects of a programme, project or policies. These indicators measure the contextual dimensions of local-level policies, programmes and actions (through structural indicators) to identify not only what is occurring (through the outcome indicators traditionally utilized in food security and...
nutrition), but also why/how it is occurring (through process indicators, which need to be incorporated into local level activities):

> **Structural indicators** measure the extent to which the right to food is included in legal and institutional frameworks and development and poverty reduction strategies that affect the implementation of policy measures and food security and nutrition outcomes. These indicators are integrated into food security and nutrition programmes that aim to bring changes in national policies, laws or strategies. For example, a local small-scale fisheries plan may aim to achieve legal access to resources for women, or prioritization of the most vulnerable in development strategies.

> **Outcome indicators**, also referred to as results indicators, monitor progress towards targets and provide alerts when progress is not reaching the expected levels. If monitoring is limited to outcome indicators and does not also examine the process of reaching those outcomes, there will be no information about what remedial actions are needed to enhance progress.

> **Process indicators** provide information to verify the scope and quality of the action and access services for communities, families and individuals; ensure that attention is given to the most vulnerable; and inform on how support is provided. Process indicators identify the need for corrective policy, legal, administrative and/or operational measures for improving implementation and aligning it with human rights principles and approaches. These indicators are also referred to as indicators of conduct, as they inform on duty bearers’ performance in meeting their respective responsibilities (FAO, 2014a).

The establishment of indicators should be participatory, inclusive, transparent, empowering of those involved – especially those most affected by a negative situation at the local level (limited or discriminatory access to resources, for example) – and conducted in a way that helps ensure accountability of local authorities. These indicators should also be periodically reviewed and updated following the same process, therefore in direct consultation with right holders. Finally, these indicators should:

> Be disaggregated to detect inequities and discrimination, among characteristics such as sex, age, educational attainment, ethnicity and race, location, income quintile, and other relevant social criteria.

> Identify the form and quality of participation through the participation mechanisms available to communities, and of which communities are aware; regularity of participation; attendance rates; and composition of participation.

> Detect government responses through the extent to which the government acts on recommendations.

> Measure levels of satisfaction with access to services, resources and remedies, among affected communities.

> Be easy to understand for non-technical people, such as parents, teachers and children in a local community.

**PARTICIPATORY APPROACHES TO MONITORING**

In the case of rights-based monitoring, the process should be participatory and inclusive, using methodologies adapted by and for the people involved in the monitoring process. Right holders can participate directly or indirectly through organizations that represent their interests, such as advocacy and consumer protection organizations and community-based organizations. Many are the benefits of the utilization of participatory monitoring in the context of small-scale fisheries and the right to adequate food, the main one being that it allows for a more precise evaluation of current progress, and thus facilitates the early identification of required adjustments. Additionally, it allows for continued feedback from small-scale fishers, fishworkers and their communities from the field throughout the duration of the project, programme or intervention.

The extent to which monitoring is participatory can be seen in the people from whom information is requested as well as those who are consulted on certain issues, and may be evident in monitoring processes already under way and assumed by the population directly benefiting from the results of the monitoring. In the latter case, the people are empowered through learning, their capacity for self-determination is respected and their ability to claim their rights and demand accountability from governments is enhanced.

Although participatory monitoring can be introduced at any stage of the project, programme or activity, it is more useful when introduced at the beginning stage. This allows for a better degree of inclusion in later stages of the monitoring, as small-scale fishers, fishworkers and their communities can participate in decisions on who will be responsible for data collection and when and how periodic analyses will take place, among others. Notwithstanding these earlier benefits, participatory monitoring can still provide many benefits to the process if applied only at a later stage.

---

2.4 Capacity development

In Part 3 para. 12 of the SSF Guidelines, a number of measures and actions are recommended that can be taken to create an enabling environment whereby small-scale fishers, fishworkers and their communities can gain greater access to their rights, improve their visibility and representation, ensure their food and nutrition security, become more resilient in the face of climate change, and improve their livelihoods. These measures in many ways echo those already cited in complementary voluntary guidelines instruments, particularly the Right to Food Guidelines (Guideline 11). They are examined in Figure 1.

Empowering stakeholders through capacity development and institutional strengthening is among the most effective ways to ensure small-scale fishing communities and their organizations can become partners at all stages of the implementation of the SSF Guidelines and the Right to Food Guidelines.

Capacity development should occur not only at the national level, but also locally and at the grassroots level, targeting relevant stakeholders (see previous stakeholder analysis) and networks in order to strengthen the ability and opportunities to engage directly in relevant decision-making processes. Legal empowerment of communities and their organizations is another vital element to enable them to defend their rights and to access legal support and institutions.

Governments and fishing communities should work jointly at the national and local levels, and together with other stakeholder groups, to ensure sustainable and secure small-scale fisheries and the realization of the right to adequate food.

This requires attention to organizational structures as well as to fair representation in local, national and regional processes. Accordingly, capacity development should be the backbone of implementation of both the SSF Guidelines and the Right to Food Guidelines and will be required at different levels for different stakeholders, and with respect to their different abilities (e.g. technical skills, organizations skills, business development).

Capacities developed at the individual dimension lead to changes in skills, behaviours and attitudes among a wide range of actors in the small-scale fisheries sector. Training, knowledge sharing, and networking are all ways of strengthening capacities at this dimension. Strengthening capacities at the
organizational dimension, on the other hand, consists of taking measures to improve the overall functioning and performance of an organization. This dimension has a direct impact on how individuals within the organization develop their competencies and use their capabilities.

The enabling environment is the context in which individuals and organizations put their capabilities into action, and where capacity development processes occur.

It includes:

- political commitment and vision
- policy, legal and economic frameworks
- budget allocations and processes
- governance and power structures
- incentives
- social norms.

This environment will help create the key building blocks for a long-term process of continuous improvement towards secure and sustainable small-scale fisheries governance and development.

Recommended capacity development activities include, for example:

- Identifying needs for organizational development and strengthening at different levels, and providing support to address these needs.
- Assisting communities to establish cross-sectoral linkages, partnerships and dialogue with government agencies, research institutions and other development partners.
- Sensitizing and training of government officials and development partners in issues related to the implementation of the SSF Guidelines, in particular with regard to the human rights-based approach to development and participatory management of natural resources.

Strengthened capacities and institutions enable targeted actors to work towards ensuring secure and sustainable small-scale fisheries for the benefit of small-scale fishers, fishworkers and their communities, as well as for society at large.

The capacity development approach and tools to be chosen will vary depending on the stakeholders, their needs, and the context in which they are located, and also building upon existing capacities, knowledge and skills. When deciding the approach or tool to be used, special attention should be paid to ensure the equal participation of women and men throughout the entire learning process. If necessary, separate and appropriate spaces and mechanisms should be provided to women, especially when dealing with issues that are particularly relevant to them. The following are among the most extended capacity development approaches and tools used in the small-scale fisheries sector:

- **Stakeholder workshops:** The main objective of these workshops is to provide an appropriate forum for all stakeholders in which they can identify and/or discuss issues that affect them both as individuals and as a group. Some of the stakeholders that can be involved are government representatives, staff and policymakers, representatives from fishing communities and CSOs, and academics, to name a few. One of the main benefits of this approach is that, through direct participation, all stakeholders can increase their sense of ownership and empowerment regarding the issue at stake. FAO has considerable experience in the use of stakeholder workshops in the context of small-scale fisheries and in the implementation of both the SSF Guidelines and the Right to Food Guidelines. These workshops are organized at regional and national levels and are tailored to the specific needs of participants.

- **Training courses:** These courses are often used to familiarize participants with more specific topics and/or skills. In the context of small-scale fisheries and their right to adequate food, training areas can vary widely from context to context and can include topics such as value chain improvements, responsible governance of tenure, and participatory resource management.

- **Networking and knowledge sharing:** Establishing networks of stakeholders from the sector can be highly beneficial for small-scale fishers, fishworkers and their communities, as this allows them to exchange experiences and information and to facilitate their involvement in relevant policy- and decision-making processes. The establishment of networks can be equally beneficial for other small-scale fisheries stakeholders (e.g. professional associations, fisheries cooperatives and CSOs).

- **Organizational development:** Small-scale fishers, fishworkers and their communities are more likely to successfully defend their livelihoods when they are organized. Undergoing organizational development training allows small-scale fisheries organizations and cooperatives to build their organizational capacity through the development and improvement of their strategies, structures and processes, which allows them to reinforce their position within the sector and policymaking processes that affect their livelihoods and their right to adequate food.
Awareness raising involves communicating knowledge and information, which is needed for local stakeholders to take part in decision-making processes and to facilitate policy coherence. When a global instrument such as the SSF Guidelines is adopted, as was done in the context of the Right to Food Guidelines, special efforts need to be made to ensure that those concerned are able to learn about it and how it should be implemented, in complementarity with other available global guidance (such as the VGGT\textsuperscript{11} and CFS RAI Principles\textsuperscript{12}). This includes ensuring that the purpose of the SSF Guidelines is known: i.e. its goals of achieving food security and nutrition, poverty eradication, equitable development and sustainable resource utilization, with the ultimate goal of enjoyment of human rights. Therefore, the importance of the general principles and the roles and responsibilities of all actors involved must be communicated.

Awareness raising on the right to food must be carried out as part of activities in support of the implementation of both the SSF Guidelines and the Right to Food Guidelines, and should involve all relevant actors at all levels. Both right holders and duty bearers require knowledge about the right to food to strengthen duty bearers’ knowledge of their obligations while assisting communities and right holders in demanding accountability. Right holders need to be empowered so that they are able to demand their rights and participate effectively in decision-making processes related to their food and nutrition situation.

Awareness raising can take many different forms and involve distribution of printed material and the organization of stakeholder workshops and training courses, as well as communication strategies and materials, communication for development, videos, and radio listening groups. Different approaches are required for different stakeholder groups, and may need to be carried out in different steps. Awareness raising requires information and the use of the right tools for the particular audience that is targeted. It must count on adequate budgeting to facilitate appropriate forms of communication, such as information provided in different languages, and radio spots to reach communities with little or no access to technology.


2.6 Gender equality

Women contribute substantially to the sustainability of the small-scale fisheries sector and participate in all stages of the value chain, especially in the post-harvest subsector, often in processing and selling fish. Notwithstanding their crucial role in the sector, their contribution is often neglected, and their needs and concerns as right holders are not properly addressed by duty bearers, which ultimately hinders their enjoyment of their right to adequate food. Despite representing up to half of the workers of the sector, their work is frequently the lowest value, least visible and most disenfranchised (FAO, 2016b). Due to discriminatory practices, women’s claims on decent work, tenure, access to markets or highly prized and limited fisheries resources end up being prioritized by men, or are indeed dependent upon relationships with men (for example through fathers or husbands). Furthermore, sometimes community practices may also prevent women from holding or inheriting land. Women who work the land in rural communities are often the poorest and most marginalized. They are unfairly remunerated for their work and frequently lack formal title, educational opportunities, and access to fair markets and systems of credit. Moreover, they frequently take on primary responsibility for the daily subsistence needs of the family (FAO, 2013).

In the case of the SSF Guidelines, the principles of gender equity and equality are among their core objectives and guiding principles. In fact, while the guiding principle of gender equity and equality addresses this concept directly, every guiding principle underpinning the SSF Guidelines also lends support, either directly or indirectly, to the concept of gender equality. Likewise, the Right to Food Guidelines recognize the discrimination that women continue to face in particular in areas of food security and nutrition, in both rural and urban contexts. They recommend that states take measures to promote the full participation of women in the economy and implement gender-sensitive policies to promote and protect women’s security of land tenure through legislation protecting their full and equal right to own land, including their right to inherit it.

To ensure food security and nutrition and the realization of the right to adequate food, both voluntary guidelines instruments recommend that states enact gender-equitable policies and legislation, as well as implementing the relevant instruments in support of women’s rights to which states are party under international human rights law. These include, inter alia, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) and the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action. Additionally, both instruments stress the need for women to participate actively, meaningfully and effectively in discussions and negotiations relating to decision-making processes. Mainstreaming gender throughout these policymaking and legislative processes is vital to further sustainable development and leaving no one behind. Moreover, it will also support countries in meeting their targets under the SDGs.

The following are proactive measures for gender-equitable decision-making that states can implement to enhance their economic, social and cultural development:

- Ratify and ensure the application of international conventions and regional instruments, including those specifically on women’s rights.
- Recognize women’s customary rights to fisheries resources, where appropriate, and facilitate registration processes for women to record their land and fishing rights on an equal basis to men.
- Encourage women’s participation in fisheries governance, local resources administration, planning and management initiatives and institutions, and consider introducing measures for affirmative action.
- Assess and revise policies and legislation to mainstream gender across related areas, adopting legal and policy reform processes that include gender-equitable, participatory and inclusive consultations.
- Organize public debates and awareness raising on the importance of women’s involvement in the fisheries sector through consultations with the public, including with traditional community leaders, public officials, the judiciary and society at large, through diverse measures making provision for regional, linguistic and education differences.
- Ensure adequate budgeting is provided to facilitate gender-equitable measures, and that women have access to financial resources as well as fisheries.
- Strengthen data collection and analysis, enabling disaggregation for gender to allow for evidence-based decision-making and strategies.
3. Concluding remarks

The small-scale fisheries sector plays a pivotal role in food security and poverty eradication. However, small-scale fishers, fishworkers and their communities often face innumerable challenges and constraints, from unequal power relations and lack of access to services and resources to lack of participation in decision-making processes that affect their lives and livelihoods – all of which, if unaddressed, hinder the realization of their right to adequate food.

In this context, FAO endorsed the SSF Guidelines in 2014, which were developed through bottom-up participatory consultations including small-scale fisheries stakeholders from all over the world, to serve as guidance to states and other stakeholders and help them secure the overall sustainability of the small-scale fisheries sector and support the progressive realization of the right to adequate food. With a similar goal and approach but a decade prior to the endorsement of the SSF Guidelines, the Right to Food Guidelines were adopted in 2004. Although the Right to Food Guidelines provide practical guidance to states for the implementation of the progressive realization of the right to adequate food, their scope is not centred in the small-scale fisheries sector, as in the case of the SSF Guidelines. A similarity of both instruments is that they were developed and are to be implemented following a human rights-based approach (HRBA) and that all their provisions must be accompanied by safeguarding of the following human rights principles: participation, accountability, non-discrimination, transparency, human dignity, empowerment and rule of law.

These instruments must not be considered in isolation, but as part of a wider spectrum of international, regional and national instruments, both binding and non-binding. When the SSF Guidelines and the Right to Food Guidelines are applied consistent with other legal instruments such as the ICESCR, CEDAW, and the Rome Declaration on Nutrition and Framework for Action, their positive outcomes are likely to increase. Not only should they be considered in relation to other international instruments, but also to one another, as they share many similarities that allow for a synergetic implementation. For example, both instruments were developed using an HRBA, which requires stakeholder assessments that not only differentiate right holders from duty bearers and their role in the sustainability of the small-scale fisheries sector and the realization of the right to adequate food, but also evaluate power relations and potential conflicts among small-scale fisheries stakeholders.

A recommendation shared by both the SSF Guidelines and the Right to Food Guidelines is that their integration into national policies should be accompanied by an assessment of existing national legislation, policies and administrative measures that are relevant to the small-scale fisheries sector, with special attention to those relating to the right to food of small-scale fishers, fishworkers and their communities. This kind of assessment is of great help for countries, since the results can guide the implementation process and identify important policy gaps that hinder the realization of the right to adequate food of small-scale fisheries stakeholders.

Monitoring systems are a crucial implementation element addressed in both instruments. Monitoring allows for tracking and assessing the implementation process to identify required measures and understand how far policies are from reaching their objectives. In order to maximize the effectiveness of the integration of the SSF Guidelines and the Right to Food Guidelines into national legislation, monitoring needs to be participatory, inclusive, transparent and human rights-based – that is, it must monitor whether or not human rights principles have been considered and included in the implementation process.

Implementing both instruments also requires empowering stakeholders through capacity development so that they can effectively participate in the implementation process in a meaningful and effective manner and take part in decision-making processes that affect their lives and livelihoods. Capacities should be developed at all levels, from the national to the local and grassroots levels. Capacity development should be carried out hand in hand with awareness raising so that all stakeholders are
familiar with the content of the guidelines and truly understand their role in the implementation process.

Last, gender considerations should be present throughout the entire implementation process of both the SSF Guidelines and the Right to Food Guidelines. Such implementation should be done with due respect for international and regional instruments that address gender equality and contributing to the eradication of any type of gender-based discrimination. Similarly, gender should be equally taken into consideration in all the functional areas for implementation discussed in Chapter 4. For instance, stakeholder assessments should always strive to include all vulnerable groups, in which women tend to be included; right to food assessments should try to gauge whether women’s right to adequate food is fulfilled to the same degree as their counterparts; and capacity development should be equally accessible to both women and men.

When all the functional areas discussed in this document are included, the implementation of the SSF Guidelines and the Right to Food Guidelines is likely to be far more successful and inclusive, allowing all actors of the small-scale fisheries sector to equally enjoy their right to adequate food.
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## The SSF Guidelines summarized

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PART 1</th>
<th>Chapter 3</th>
<th>Guiding principles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives, nature and scope</strong></td>
<td>The SSF Guidelines are voluntary, global in scope, and focus on the needs of developing countries. They are relevant to small-scale fisheries in both marine and inland waters. This includes men and women working in the full range of activities along the value chain, and in pre- and post-harvest activities.</td>
<td>The SSF Guidelines are underpinned by human rights principles, which are reflected in their guiding principles: human rights and dignity; respect of cultures; non-discrimination; gender equality and equity; equity and equality; consultation and participation; rule of law; transparency; accountability; economic, social and environmental sustainability; holistic and integrated approaches; social responsibility; and feasibility and social and economic viability.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PART 2</th>
<th>Chapter 5</th>
<th>Governance of tenure in small-scale fisheries and resource management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship with other international instruments</strong></td>
<td>The SSF Guidelines should be interpreted and applied consistent with existing rights and obligations under national and international law and with due regard to voluntary commitments under applicable regional and international instruments. The Guidelines may be used to guide amendments and inspire new or supplementary legislative and regulatory provisions.</td>
<td>Aquatic biodiversity and natural resources should be used in a responsible and sustainable manner so that both present and future generations can enjoy them. In order to ensure such enjoyment, small-scale fishing communities need to have secure tenure rights to those resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 6</th>
<th>Social development, employment and decent work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value chains, post-harvest and trade</strong></td>
<td>States should meet the socio-economic requirements of small-scale fishers, fishworkers and their communities and ensure that they have proper access to education, health services, financial services, social protection, public infrastructure and other public services. States should also promote decent working conditions for all small-scale fisheries workers in both the formal and informal sectors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 7</th>
<th>Gender equality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender equality</strong></td>
<td>Gender equality should be improved throughout the entire fisheries value chain, promoting the participation of women in decision-making processes, facilitating access to appropriate technologies, and improving the availability of sex-disaggregated data to better inform policies and programmes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


---
The SSF Guidelines summarized

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PART 2</th>
<th>Chapter 9</th>
<th>Disaster risk and climate change</th>
<th>Small-scale fishing communities from many parts of the world are among the most vulnerable to the impacts of climate change and natural disasters. States should support affected small-scale fisheries communities and develop policies to mitigate existing risks and avoid the emergence of new ones, as well as developing emergency response and disaster preparedness plans that meet the specific needs of small-scale fishing communities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PART 3</td>
<td>Chapters 10, 11, 12 and 13</td>
<td>Ensuring an enabling environment and supporting implementation</td>
<td>As the small-scale fisheries sector is embedded in a wider policy and institutional context, it must be integrated into broader development processes, policies and strategies. Decision-making processes need to be guided by accurate bioecological, social, cultural and economic information, both newly generated and from traditional knowledge. When gaps in capacities are identified, governments should provide tailored capacity-development measures that are appropriate to small-scale fishers, fishworkers and their communities. Monitoring, which should inform policy-making processes, must be supported by national and regional platforms and CSOs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex 2

### The Right to Food Guidelines summarized

| Guideline 1 | Democracy, good governance, human rights and the rule of law | Promote and safeguard a peaceful, stable and enabling economic, social, political and cultural environment. Safeguard democracy, the rule of law, human rights, sustainable development and good governance. Empower citizens and ensure equal legal protection and due process. |
| Guideline 2 | Economic development policies | Promote economic policies for food security and sustainable development, and reduce hunger and poverty through non-discriminatory practices in agriculture, fisheries, forestry, and land use. Enact land-reform policies; improve access to land, water, technologies and financial resources; include poor rural and urban communities. |
| Guideline 3 | Strategies | Adopt transparent, inclusive, non-discriminatory and comprehensive national strategies to combat hunger, reduce poverty and realize the right to food, addressing all aspects of the food system, including the production, processing, distribution, marketing and consumption of safe food. Ensure primary education for all, basic health care, clean drinking water, adequate sanitation, and justice. |
| Guideline 5 | Institutions | Improve institutions so that they contribute to the right to food, and build national intersectoral coordination mechanisms. Include private and public participation and consultation, especially those most affected by food insecurity. Ensure accountability and transparency with mechanisms for monitoring and review. |
| Guideline 6 | Stakeholders | Bring together different stakeholders to find multidisciplinary solutions to food insecurity, involving all relevant stakeholders including civil society and the private sector. Make optimum use of their experience and knowledge to facilitate the most efficient use of resources. |
| Guideline 7 | Legal framework | Enact legislation to ensure the realization of the right to adequate food and consider administrative, quasi-judicial and judicial mechanisms to provide remedies. Ensure the public is informed. Strengthen laws so that women have access to poverty reduction and nutrition security. |
| Guideline 8 | Access to resources and assets | 8. States should guarantee an adequate standard of living in rural and urban communities. |
| 8a | Labour | a. Ensure decent work in accordance with ICESCR, ILO and human rights standards; provide adult education classes to aid employment. |
| 8b | Land | b. Protect equitable security of land tenure, giving special attention to sustainability, conservation and the rights of indigenous peoples. |
| 8c | Water | c. Safeguard drinking water quality and ensure sustainable water use and allocation of water access. |

---

To access the full Right to Food Guidelines, see: [http://www.fao.org/3/a-y7937e.pdf](http://www.fao.org/3/a-y7937e.pdf)
## The Right to Food Guidelines summarized

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guideline</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8d</td>
<td>Genetic resources for food and agriculture</td>
<td>d. Bring in policies, legislation and supporting mechanisms to ensure conservation and sustainable use of genetic resources for food and agriculture; protect traditional knowledge; ensure equitable participation in resulting benefits; seek participation of local and indigenous communities and farmers in national decision-making processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8e</td>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>e. Protect ecological sustainability and ecosystems, prevent water pollution, protect soil fertility, and promote the sustainable management of fisheries and forests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8f</td>
<td>Services</td>
<td>f. Support development of efficient food production by all farmers, particularly poor farmers, through private/public sector initiatives for innovative tools, technologies, research, extension, marketing, rural finance and microcredit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guideline 9</td>
<td>Food safety and consumer protection</td>
<td>Establish food control systems to ensure food safety throughout the food chain, including using scientifically based (Codex) standards for food safety and good practices in packaging, labelling and advertising of food. Champion consumer education and choice, and ensure appropriate information on food and recourse for any harm caused by unsafe food.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guideline 10</td>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td>Improve nutrition and dietary diversity, including food fortification. Promote healthy diets and exclusive breastfeeding for infants. Provide education, information and labelling regulations to prevent overconsumption and unbalanced diets leading to malnutrition, obesity and degenerative diseases. Consider the special nutrition needs of people in situations of vulnerability and cultural dietary requirements, ensuring participation and non-discrimination in policy and practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guideline 11</td>
<td>Education and awareness raising</td>
<td>Promote education on the Guidelines, including food sustainability, nutrition, food safety, human rights, environment and agriculture, for equal and informed participation in food-related policy decisions. Boost academic facilities in developing countries for science and agriculture-related disciplines and business. Empower civil society to participate in implementation of the Guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guideline 12</td>
<td>National financial resources</td>
<td>Allocate sufficient budgeting and financial resources for zero hunger and food security. Ensure effectiveness of social protection and expenditure for food security of the most vulnerable, even at times of budget cuts. Ensure accountable and transparent spending and investment for food security.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guideline 13</td>
<td>Support for vulnerable groups</td>
<td>Establish disaggregated Food Insecurity and Vulnerability Information and Mapping Systems (FIVIMS), identifying those most vulnerable to food insecurity and why. Take targeted measures for food security, channelling support through women.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guideline 14</td>
<td>Safety nets</td>
<td>Establish social/food safety nets for the most vulnerable, building on community capacities including local procurement to guarantee the right to food. Implement non-discriminatory support for food and nutrition security, including access to clean water, sanitation, health care and nutrition education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guideline 15</td>
<td>International food aid</td>
<td>Donor states must support national food and nutrition security plans, and ensure food safety and adherence to international conventions and norms on food aid. Ensure participatory planning, monitoring and evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guideline 16</td>
<td>Natural and human-made disasters</td>
<td>Food must not be a weapon of war, political or economic pressure. In conflict, food and medicine must be guaranteed. Refugees/displaced persons must have adequate food. The Geneva Convention(^\text{15}) must be respected. Establish early warning systems for natural/human-made disasters and emergency preparedness measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guideline 17</td>
<td>Monitoring, indicators and benchmarks</td>
<td>Establish mechanisms to monitor and evaluate implementation of the Guidelines. Consider right to Food Impact Assessments and benchmarks related to international commitments (e.g. SDGs). Monitor food security of vulnerable groups and ensure full participation/consultation in the evaluation process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guideline 18</td>
<td>National human rights institutions (NHRIs)</td>
<td>Establish NHRIs to incorporate food insecurity monitoring and verification tasks in the right to food mandate. Encourage civil society organizations to contribute to monitoring activities undertaken by NHRIs relating to the right to adequate food.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guideline 19</td>
<td>International dimension</td>
<td>Consider all relevant international measures, tools, trade, aid, partnerships, and international cooperation to support national efforts to secure the right to food and food and nutrition security.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{15}\) 1949 Geneva Convention IV Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War.
SMALL-SCALE FISHERIES AND THE HUMAN RIGHT TO ADEQUATE FOOD

Making the connection: exploring synergies in the implementation of the SSF Guidelines and the Right to Food Guidelines

The adoption of the Right to Food Guidelines in 2004 and the SSF Guidelines in 2014 were two major achievements in the effort to ensure food security and nutrition.

This handbook has been developed to support the joint implementation of the SSF Guidelines and the Right to Food Guidelines through an integrated approach and to increase policy coherence and uptake. The document provides an overview of the contents of these voluntary guidelines and identifies potential synergies. It also explains the human rights-based approach and discusses some crucial areas, with special attention to the specific roles and responsibilities of key actors.

This document is primarily directed at those involved in the integration of the SSF Guidelines and the Right to Food Guidelines into national policies and development programmes targeting the small-scale fisheries sector in the context of food security and nutrition. However, it can be equally interesting to other stakeholders who take part in the implementation of the provisions of both instruments in their day-to-day activities and who are concerned with the sustainability of the small-scale fisheries sector.
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