

ANNEX 4.

AN EXAMPLE: RIGHTS-FOCUSED ASSESSMENT AND MONITORING OF SCHOOL FEEDING PROGRAMMES

School feeding programmes (SFP) include any organized programme through which children of different ages receive, while at school, meals, or a food product or/and a drink. This includes school lunches, breakfast, mid-morning/mid-afternoon snacks, glass of milk, etc.

Module 1: Food and Nutrition Security Situation

General food and nutrition problems – geographic and demographic dimensions

(What are the main food and nutrition problems? Which population groups are most affected? Where are these located? What are the principal causes of these problems?)

Food and nutrition problems of school-age children from food insecure and vulnerable households

(Which food and nutrition problems affect school-age children, by age and gender? Where are these problems most severe? What livelihood characteristics do the households have to which food insecure and vulnerable children belong?)

Module 2: Policy, Legislative and Budgetary Framework of the Programme

What is the policy basis for the SFP? Is school-based feeding seen as a nutrition programme or a social relief programme? How does the SFP relate to policy priorities? What legislative mandate exists for the Programme? What budgetary

appropriations are made, and are these included in the regular budget or a special budget. What is the funding history in terms of budgetary allocations and expenditures? Which are the budgetary contributions, obligations or commitments of the different levels of government to the programme?

Module 3: Institutional Framework of the Programme

Which institutions at national and local levels are responsible for designing, implementing, managing and monitoring the SFP?

What is the capacity of these institutions in their respective roles? Are their roles clearly mandated? How strong are inter-institutional linkages and coordination?

Are their mechanisms in place that effectively allow rights holders' representatives and other duty bearers to hold these institutions accountable for non or poor performance?

Module 4: Normative Basis of the Programme

What are the programme norms and standards with respect to:

Intended beneficiaries?

National nutrition guidelines (RDAs for energy and nutrients), approved national menu options, food diversity, conformity with local eating habits

Provision of nutritional benefits?

Food delivery and handling (food types, school-based infra-structure (kitchen, food storage, eating space), trained kitchen staff, food preparation hygiene)?

Associated school-based infrastructure: access to clean drinking water, basic sanitation?

Food quality and safety?

Food acquisition: sources of food acquisition; use of commercial foods; protection from marketing of processed foods in school?

Associated curricular and non-curricular activities?

Per child allocation of funds?

Handling of funds and accounting of expenditures?

Module 5: Social Control Mechanisms

Is there a social control instrument to monitor the implementation and quality of the Programme? In case there is, what is the mandate of this council or committee? What is its composition? How are the members selected or appointed? Is there direct representation of parents, local producers and of the different duty bearers? What are the instruments available to the council/committee to promote remedial actions in programme implementation, or to promote compensation for a violation, in case it is needed?

Module 6: Recourse Instruments and Institutions

Are there any claim or recourse instruments available to students and parents in case the public sector does not meet its obligations under the Programme? Which institution(s) is (are) in charge of receiving, analysing and providing an official response to claims that are received?

Module 7: Programme Design

What food and nutrition problem(s) is/are to be addressed

(Is the programme designed to address one or more major food/nutrition problem that affects a majority of children?)

Intended programme impacts

(What are the intended food-based and non-food based impacts of the programme? Do these intended impacts reflect a holistic approach, recognising linkages among the fulfilment of several rights over and above the right to adequate food, like the rights to education, health, enjoyment of leisure, etc.?)

Objectives

(How does the programme propose to contribute to decreasing the food and nutrition problems among school-age children? Does the programme have other, non-food objectives, for example, increased school enrolment, enhancement of active learning capacity, improved school attendance, increase children's access to non-curricular learning activities, reduce school drop-out rates, or greater understanding of broader social problems?)

Targeted rights holders

(Is the programme designed to target children who suffer most from food and nutrition problems and food related diseases – celiac disease, diabetes, etc.?)

Targeting scheme and criteria, eligibility, entry and exit criteria

(What criteria and indicators are used for targeting (individual, geographic, nutritional status, etc.)? Are targeting criteria well described and do these reflect equality of access to the SFP? How well are duty bearers at different levels, and rights holders' representatives aware of and understand these criteria? Did rights holders' representatives participate in establishing these criteria? If entry and exit criteria are involved, how well are these understood by duty bearers and rights holders?)

Community participation

(Does the programme design anticipate community participation in programme decision making and/or implementation, and if so, in what ways? What mechanisms for joint decision making and monitoring of school feeding guidelines are in place, and are these effective? What will be done to maintain constant communication between duty bearers and the community?)

Funding mechanisms

(How are programme costs at school level covered? Is the community required to contribute, and if so, in what form(s) and did the community participate in deciding what its contribution should be? Are there fluctuations in funding availability, and if so, how does this impact on delivery?)

Module 8: Programme Duty Bearers

National authorities.

Local/community authorities.

School authorities and staff.

Parents.⁵⁵

(Do different duty bearers understand their respective responsibilities with respect to the programme, and is there evidence that they act accordingly? Is there evidence that duty bearers have actually been asked to account for their performance? If so, with what results? Do rights holders' representatives understand the responsibilities of different duty bearers? Do duty-bearers and rights holders' representatives know of, and understand, the norms and standards that are to be applied in the programme? Does the programme routinely assess duty bearers' capacity to assume their responsibilities, and makes efforts to strengthen capacities? If so, whose capacities are strengthened, and is there evidence that it leads to better performance? In case clear patterns of violations

⁵⁵ *The duties of parents towards the school feeding programme are of a different nature than those of public authorities. Parents have responsibilities with respect to the adequate feeding of children within their means. See Annex 1 regarding responsibilities of non-State actors.*

are identified, are there provisions to adopt remedial procedures or, at least, review these patterns?)

Module 9: Programme Implementation

Conformity to defined norms and standards

(To what extent does programme implementation conform to norms and standards – see Module 4 above? Where are there divergences, and what explain this? Is there evidence that efforts were made in the past to bring programme implementation closer in line with norms and standards?)

Geographic diversity in programme implementation

(Are there differences in implementation processes and procedures among geographic areas, and if so, what explains these differences? Is there evidence that efforts were made to correct this?)

Targeting efficiency

(How well is the targeting scheme applied, and how effective is it in ensuring programme coverage of the intended target groups? Are undercoverage and leakage rates high or low? Are there geographic differences in programme coverage rates, and if so, what explains this? Is there evidence that efforts have been made to improve effective coverage rates of the target groups, and if so, with what results?)

Programme monitoring

(Does programme monitoring take place, and if so, at what level(s) and who participates in programme monitoring? What purpose(s) does programme monitoring serve? Is there evidence that monitoring results have had an impact on changing programme design and/or implementation, or external to the programme on policy formulation, institutional changes and/or legislative priorities? Is the acquisition of food items for the programme made from local agricultural producers? In case it is not, what are the implications of these “food imports” for local eating habits and production? What is the impact of these purchases on local food and nutritional security?)

Module 10: Programme Impacts

What are the food and non-food related programme impacts

(What are the programme impacts, and how do these compare with programme objectives? Are there unforeseen programme impacts, and who do these affect?)

Are there negative programme effects, and if so, who do these affect? Is there evidence that participation in the programme has led to empowerment of non-programme persons, and if so, who has benefited and in what ways?)

Geographic diversity in programme impacts

(Do programme impacts differ among various geographic areas, and if so, what may explain this? Were efforts made, for example by changing the programme design, to correct this?)

Demographic and socio-economic diversity in programme impacts

(Do programme impacts differ by gender, age group, or socio-economic levels? If so, what may explain this, and is there evidence that efforts were made to correct this?)

Programme impacts in relation to prioritised needs

(Is there evidence that the programme impacts are in line with the priorities of the community?)

Sustainability of programme impacts

(Are the programme design and the implementation process flexible enough so that the programme can adjust to future needs and changing priorities? Is it likely that the availability of programme resources will outlast a given political mandate? Will part of the programme be institutionalised in sector activities, or be incorporated in sector plans? Are human and other resources likely to be sufficient to sustain the programme and its desirable impacts?)

HUMAN RIGHTS “GOLD STANDARD” NATIONAL SCHOOL FEEDING PROGRAMMES

Module 2: Policy, Legislative and Budgetary Frameworks of the SFP

- The goals and objectives of the SFP are directly linked to national priorities as expressed in national development and poverty reduction strategies, food security and nutrition policies, and in relevant sector policies.
- The goals, objectives and implementation procedures of the SFP are in accordance with norms and principles found in right to adequate food framework law, the national constitution as well as in legislation related to the realisation of other economic, social and cultural rights.
- The goals, objectives and implementation procedures of the SFP are in accordance with any and all existing jurisprudence that is relevant to the SFP.

- SFP managers, administrators and other decision makers are fully aware of the policy context and the legislative basis of the SFP, and have the capacity and authority to make decisions, and formulate and implement actions that are in accordance with policy priorities, relevant legislation and existing jurisprudence.
- Mechanisms of inter-sectoral coordination are in place to guide sector policy harmonisation with respect to SFP, and to coordinate implementation of sector based actions so as to optimise the use of resources from different sources in support of the SFP.
- Civil society organizations or networks have access to sufficient information about relevant policy priorities, legislative and legal basis, and SFP budgetary allocations and actual expenditures, to allow them to monitor the implementation of the SFP and compare the results to policy priorities, established implementation norms and standards and established budgetary allocations.
- A specific law is in place that authorises budgetary allocations for SFP and clearly defines what the funding contributions are for each level of government (national, state or provincial, municipal or district), what the budgetary allocation is per participating student or per meal, the criteria that are to be applied in case of differential budget allocations for specific groups of students or school locations (based on health conditions, ethnic or cultural considerations, area-specific incidences of child malnutrition), cost shares for food and non-food expenditures, and institutional responsibilities and procedures for auditing of actual expenditures.
- Actual budget allocations from different sources are sufficient to cover all costs of providing to all eligible students food that fully meets all established norms and standards with respect to food quantity, nutritional content, food safety and hygiene and at school conditions for food preparation and delivery, as legislated. There are no gaps between budgetary allocations and actual expenditures in any given year.
- Budget planners and decision makers are fully aware of SFP impacts and results, and of the need for changes in budgetary allocations that are directly linked to modifications in the design and implementation of the SFP.
- Students and the general public are at all times well informed about the goals and objectives of the SFP and its funding, and mechanisms are in place for the general public to dialogue about the programme with SFP coordinators and managers, and to offer suggestions and share experiences.

Module 6: Recourse Mechanisms

- Students, parents and community members are fully informed and understand the norms, standards and implementation rules and regulations that cover the SFP at the schools in their community and the schools that the students attend.
- Students, parents and community members have access to all the necessary information that allows them to compare and monitor the actual implementation practices and procedures against the established SFP norms, standards and implementation rules and procedures, to detect differences (“implementation gaps”) and monitor the implementation of actions to eliminate those gaps.
- There are clearly defined procedures by which students, parents and community members can present cases (“complaints”) in which they have detected implementation gaps at school level. These procedures are fully known to students, parents and community members and include such things as: (i) forms in which a case has to be presented, (ii) which individual and/or institution is responsible for receiving a case, (iii) institutional hierarchies for presenting cases, ranging from informal ways to presentation to judicial institutions, (iv) responsible institution for verification of the complaint, and (v) individual and/or institution responsible for defining and implementing remedial actions.
- There are clearly defined procedures by which the complaint-receiving individual or institution has to respond to complaints received, and these procedures are fully known to students, parents and community members. Such procedures cover, among other things: time period within which an action-oriented response has to be provided; to whom the institutional response is to be provided, and in what form (written, oral).
- Cases that involve complaints that transcend implementation gaps at school level, but instead involve implementation gaps at higher administrative levels, such as municipality, state or nation, are brought by representatives of students, parents and/or communities. The rules and procedures to present such cases are known to those organizations and cover the same areas as indicated above for school level.
- Representative organizations fully participate in defining and implementing remedial actions at appropriate administrative level and have the capacity to monitor the actual implementation of remedial actions and their effects at municipal, state or national levels.

REFERENCE SOURCES:

- ❖ Suraiya Ismael, Maarten Immink, Irela Mazar and Guy Nantel. *Community-Based Food and Nutrition Programmes - What Makes Them Successful? A review and analysis of experiences*. Rome, FAO, 2003.
- ❖ Suraiya Ismail, Maarten Immink and Guy Nantel. *Improving Nutrition Programmes – An Assessment Tool for Action*. Revised Edition. Rome, FAO, 2005.
- ❖ FAO. *Incorporating Right to Food Principles and Approaches in Programme Assessment. A Supplement to the Assessment Tool for Action*. (Draft), 2008.
- ❖ NORAD. *Handbook in Human Rights Assessment – State Obligations Awareness and Empowerment*. Oslo, February 2001.