

## **FIAN International Project**

**“Strengthening Right to Adequate Food Implementation,  
Accountability and Coherence for Sustainable Access to Nutritious  
Food and Effective Governance on Food Security and Nutrition”**

**(7F-09181.01)**

## **Internal Evaluation**

## **Final Report**

**José Parra, Team leader  
Andrea Ferrante, Consultant**

**Geneva, Rome, June 2017**

---

## Summary

### The internal evaluation

The internal evaluation of the SDC-supported project of FIAN International seeks to identify achievements and lessons learned from its first phase of implementation (2015-2017), to support the elaboration of the second phase (2018-2020).

### Overall achievements

- Strengthened of a people-centered global governance of food security
- Consolidated the Global Network on the Right to Adequate Food and Nutrition.

### Recommendations to FIAN International and the Global Network

About national implementation of the right to food and nutrition, the evaluation recommends to:

- Consider a stronger focus on local work in contexts of shrinking political space
- Base the choice of priority country on robust analysis, limited number and flexibility
- Increase the use of recent international standards and policies
- Strengthen communication tools

With regard to monitoring the right to food, the evaluation recommends to:

- Expand capacity building for local actors, including through South-South cooperation
- Build capacities for and develop strategic litigation
- Further develop educational material
- Assess the format of the Watch to enhance its impact for different audiences
- Develop regional work by the Global Network in support to national implementation

With regard to policy coherence, the evaluation recommends to:

- Reflect on strategies to ensure collective mobilization on diverse issues
- Make full use of existing participatory mechanisms to preserve them
- Continue to offer technical support for social movements' international participation

With regard to gender equality, the evaluation recommends to:

- In-depth understanding of gender equality
- The Global Network could establish a working group on gender equality
- Build further alliances with women organizations and networks

### Open questions

- How to address additional issues having immediate negative impact on the right to food?
- How to ensure the project is informed by an in-depth gender equality analysis?
- How to address the persistent implementation gap

## 1. Introduction

The FIAN International six-year SDC-supported project is reaching the end of its first phase in December 2017. The present internal evaluation seeks to contribute to the **strategic steering** of the remaining of the current phase and the preparation of the second phase (2018-2020). The internal evaluation is consequently prospective.

The internal evaluation firstly explores the main **achievements and lessons learned** of the project. The evaluation focuses on what have been achieved, and how, including the identification of challenges and obstacles regarding the following outcomes of the project:

1. National application of the right to food-based global frameworks at the country levels;
2. Strengthened right to food accountability
3. Improved policy coherence.
4. Promoting gender equality

Secondly, the evaluation **assesses how the international and national contexts** have changed in a manner that requires changes, adaptation and innovation to be factored in the project design, in particular regarding the intervention strategy. The internal evaluation is a **learning exercise** designed to contribute to identify relevant adjustments. Finally, prospective in scope, the evaluation also includes **conclusions and recommendations** for the second phase.

In this respect, the evaluation is informed by the underlying **impact hypothesis** of the project. Effective participation of rights-holders – those most affected by hunger, food insecurity and malnutrition - in policies and governance mechanisms promoting the right to adequate food leads to the closing of implementation, accountability and policy coherence gaps.<sup>1</sup>

### Box 1. Outcomes (Objectives) of the phase<sup>2</sup>

1. Increased knowledge, use and application of right to food-based global frameworks in 60 countries, including newly approved right to food policies or legislative documents in at least 20 countries.
2. Strengthened right to food accountability through human rights-based monitoring by civil society organizations, States and human rights institutions.
3. Improved policy coherence with the right to food and human rights in specific global standard setting processes
4. All three specific objectives include the aim of promoting gender equality in realizing the right to food.

---

<sup>1</sup> SDC Credit proposal (7F-09181.01), Annex 2. Concept note by FIAN.

<sup>2</sup> Idem.

## 2. Conceptual approach

The project focuses on the relevance of international human rights standards and mechanisms for generating **social changes**. The human rights-based approach to food security focuses on **sustainable access to food** by those who suffer from hunger. The project aims at strengthening national implementation, accountability and policy coherence of the right to adequate food and nutrition.

The impact hypothesis is that **effective participation** of rights-holders in national and international processes are crucial to achieve these objectives, and thereby, contribute to sustainable access to nutritious food for all. The underlying assumption recognizes that the United Nations and regional Organizations offer political space for influencing national policies.<sup>3</sup>

Accordingly, the project supports and develops **advocacy work**. In this regards, “advocacy is a contributing strategy, aimed at amplifying effects of service delivery programmes or other interventions. It is likely to be one part of a much bigger picture. Advocacy campaigns can be both a catalyst for other efforts - boosting public support for a broad policy direction, or building civil society capacity in ways that help shift future power dynamics - and a way to break ground for ambitious and **long-term change agendas**.”<sup>4</sup>

Also, “in advocacy, everything can ultimately be, and invariably is, contested and so proof is generally elusive. The picture can really only be built from aggregated intelligence, much of which will be subjective and open to different interpretations. It is proposed that social change organizations embrace this truism rather than being coy about it. Build a **subjective evidence** base but make sure it is as robust as it can be by asking the right questions; asking the right people and filtering responses based on a wider understanding of motivations at play.”<sup>5</sup>

Advocacy and campaigning carry the potential of leading to **structural changes and exponential results**. However, such results are less quickly achieved and less easily assessed or measured. Causality or correlation appears to be evasive, “given that advocacy and campaigning typically takes place in – and further fosters – unpredictable and sometimes volatile social and political contexts”<sup>6</sup>. Nevertheless, advocacy organizations need to anchor their strategic plans in a **theory of change**. In the case of FIAN International, the overall impact hypothesis is based on effective participation, as mentioned above.

Thus, given the challenges in **assessing advocacy impact**, in particular in terms of tangible results, process-based results should nonetheless be identified: “how issues are framed, whose agendas are recognized (...), who gets a seat at the table, and whose voices are heard and whose are excluded. (...) building profile and rallying public support (...), building the `demand

---

<sup>3</sup> This is a reference to the theory of social movement studies and the structure of political opportunities as applied to transnational protest. See Donatella della Porta, Hanspeter Kriesi and Dieter Rucht, 1999, *Social Movements in a Globalizing World*, Macmillan press.

<sup>4</sup> BetterEvaluation. *The value iceberg: weighing the benefits of advocacy and campaigning* Discussion Paper 1. 2014. Page 7.

<sup>5</sup> Idem. Page 10.

<sup>6</sup> BetterEvaluation. *The value iceberg: weighing the benefits of advocacy and campaigning* Discussion Paper 1. 2014. Page 6.

side’, by supporting and empowering disadvantaged communities to become involved in political processes, or by helping to create political space for civil society organizations to have their voices heard”<sup>7</sup>.

### 3. Evaluation approach and methodology

The internal evaluation follows an approach covering context analysis, research and review of documentation, interview and participative observation, as well as SWOT analysis. The **qualitative and participative approach** has been used to gather and analyze the views and experiences of the implementing partner (FIAN International) and members of the Global Network on the Right to Food and Nutrition (Global Network hereafter), but also of SDC and UN representatives. Contexts analysis covers opportunities and challenges arising from the **fields of interventions of the projects**: national States, regional and international institutions.

**Face-to-Face and on the phone semi-structured interviews** have been conducted to capture specific information while being open to new elements, in particular related to unintended effects and results, following the proposed questions in the ToRs (see Annex 1).<sup>8</sup> Around 20 Interviews have been conducted with representatives of SDC, FIAN, UN staff as well as NGOs and social movements, members or allies of the Global Network (see Annex 2). A matrix of analysis has been used to gather and organize the relevant information pertaining to the contexts of intervention (international, regional and national) (see Annex 3).

Interviews have been informed and guided by the results of a **SWOT analysis** conducted with FIAN International at the outset of the internal evaluation, as an instrument for collective evaluation capturing both retrospective and prospective dimensions<sup>9</sup>. The SWOT analysis offered a general picture of self-perceived achievements and prospective thinking.

Besides, **participatory observations** have been undertaken at a meeting of the UN Committee on Food Security (CFS) and at FIAN activities in Colombia: a civil society consultation with the UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights on land issues, Academic Forum on Nutrition and the opening of the annual meeting of the Global Network on the Right to Food and Nutrition.

FIAN International and members of the Global Network and SDC representatives have been remarkably cooperative and genuinely engaged in sharing their views and experiences with the evaluation team. The availability and openness of UN representatives have been highly beneficial to the evaluation and, certainly, manifests their excellent collaboration with FIAN International.

---

<sup>7</sup> Idem, page 4 and 5.

<sup>8</sup> EuropeAid Co-operation Office. *Evaluation Methods for the European Union’s External Assistance. Evaluation tools.* Volume 4. 2006. Page 47.

<sup>9</sup> Walter Egli, *Analyse de situation avec SEPO ou SWOT.* Outil. Nadel.

## 4. Achievements and lessons learned

This section highlights the achievements reported regarding the three outcomes of the project, namely a) national implementation, b) monitoring and accountability and c) policy coherence. The sub-sections present the main achievements, challenges and future implications.

### FIAN International project's objectives

**Overall goal:** Enhanced right to food policy coherence, implementation and accountability, in particular towards small-scale food producers and women, lead to more sustainable access to diversified and nutritious diets for all

### Outcomes (Objective of the phase 2015-2017)

1. National implementation: Increased knowledge, use and application of right to food-based global framework in 60 countries.
2. Accountability: Strengthened right to food accountability through human rights monitoring.
3. Improved **policy coherence** with the right to food and human rights in global standards settings (CFS, UN standards settings, ICN2).

## A) National Implementation

### Main achievements

- Increased knowledge on the RTFN by local communities, FIAN national sections, members of the Global Network for the Right to Food and Nutrition<sup>10</sup> (Global Network), government representatives and local media whose demand for support on the application of the RTFN has consequently increased
- Increased ownership by local communities, FIAN national sections, members of the Global Network, government representatives and local media of the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security (Tenure Guidelines),
- Increased knowledge by local communities, FIAN national sections, members of the Global Network, government representatives and local media on the Right to Food
- Progress in national legislation and jurisprudence
- Opened national and local political space
- Facilitated mobilization and networking
- Developed tailored education material

---

<sup>10</sup> The Global Network for the Right to Food and Nutrition is an initiative of public interest CSOs and social movements peasants, fisherfolk, pastoralists, landless people, consumers, urban people living in poverty, agricultural and food workers, women, youth, and indigenous peoples - that recognize the need to act jointly for the realization of the right to adequate food and nutrition. See: <http://www.righttofoodandnutrition.org/network>.

FIAN has directly contributed to **national legislation and jurisprudence** on the RTFN, such as in Burkina Faso, Mali and Nepal. In that regard, FIAN Colombia is actively engaged with the Constitutional Court of Colombia. The national section provides legal advice to the Court directly contributing to the resolving of cases and to jurisprudential development, such as the recognition of environmental rights.

Further, FIAN International has demonstrated a capacity to **open political space and foster dialogue with public authorities**, even in adverse contexts. For instance, FIAN Brazil participates in the National Council on Food Security and Nutrition, despite the fact that the current government is moving away from a right-based approach to food security.

There is a clear recognition of FIAN's capacity of facilitating **mobilization** respecting **ownership** of and **empowering rights-holders**. As a case in point, the Global Network is an achievement in itself, perceived by social movement as a vehicle for bringing together and working with a variety of movements and organizations around the right to food and nutrition.

The Global Network offers a unique space for strategic discussion and framing issues and priorities. One notable achievement is the inclusion of and increased visibility given to the issue of nutrition. Another salient achievement in supporting national implementation refers to the production of **educational material tailored to local communities**, such as the People's Manual on the Guidelines on Governance of Land, Fisheries and Forests, prepared in collaboration with FAO, launched in 2016.

### Challenges in achieving national implementation

At the outset of the project, FIAN **expected results per countries** have been far too ambitious (60 countries) and referred to results beyond the sphere of influence of an advocacy project. In the future, FIAN could identify a limited number of clusters of countries with similar characteristics requiring similar strategies to foster the implementation of the RTFN framework.

In the context of the SWOT analysis, FIAN highlighted the challenge on finding the most **effective and appropriate manner to support national implementation**, considering that methods and strategies need to be tailored to each situation and country.

For instance, the letter campaigns seem to have an impact regarding cases rather than national framework. In Ecuador, the letter campaign regarding the national law on land (Ley de Tierras) generated rejection by the government, due to the configuration of power: the government of Ecuador was maintaining close ties with the sector of agricultural production<sup>11</sup>.

Another challenge relates to the **holistic approach** promoted by FIAN International and the Global Network. It is difficult to bring all members to engage on a common global issue, such as seeds, as it is not equally important to each member and each context. Also, there is a shared perception that **the role of the Global Network** needs further clarification, regarding other regional networks, such as the Convergence in West Africa.

---

<sup>11</sup> [http://www.fian.org/es/noticias/articulo/nueva\\_ley\\_de\\_tierras\\_en\\_ecuador\\_excluye\\_participacion\\_ciudadana/](http://www.fian.org/es/noticias/articulo/nueva_ley_de_tierras_en_ecuador_excluye_participacion_ciudadana/).

## Implications for FIAN's project

- FIAN International support should strengthen its **communication** work for simplifying complex notions without losing the key contents of the RTFN, which would be otherwise an obstacle, and should strengthen the production of information designed for shaping public opinion, such as the case of the campaign against of "[Carne Fraca](#)" in Brazil.
- FIAN should carry on with the **development of educational material for local communities** and develop user-friendly continuing and distance training modalities on recent international and regional developments, such as short video or video conference with space for exchanges.
- FIAN should consider developing and supporting long-term **strategic litigation** at national level aiming at the effective implementation of the RTFN global framework.
- FIAN should maintain its approach respecting and fostering **local communities' leadership and ownership**.
- The Global Network could develop **regional advocacy work** by supporting regional actions with potential direct impact on national level. In that perspective, the Global Network could increase the **exchange of experience** and build its capacity to mobilize the existing diversity and experience among its members.

## B) Monitoring and accountability

### Main achievements

#### *Accountability through international and regional mechanisms*

- Strategic **use of international and regional mechanisms** by a) preparing parallel report; b) participating in UN sessions and use of regional human rights protection system, such as the African and the Inter.-American human rights protection systems (case filing and participation in hearings).
- The adoption of **country recommendations by UN treaty bodies**, as a useful tool for promoting the RTFN at the national level.<sup>12</sup>
- Progress in supporting a holistic approach to the RTFN through the **use of UN human rights mechanisms not specialized on the RTFN**, such as the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child and the UN Special Rapporteur on Toxic Wastes.
- The adoption of **CFS monitoring terms of reference** in October 2016, to which FIAN International and the Global Network advocacy work have contributed to.
- Consolidation of the **bridges between CFS, UN bodies and regional mechanisms**, such as the organization of the meeting between the African and Inter.-American human rights protection systems.

---

<sup>12</sup> For instance, a parallel report led to concluding observations from the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights recommending the State of Burkina Faso to ensure that the new mining law is enforced and that users of land who consider their rights to have been violated have access to remedies.

- FIAN's capacity to facilitate social movements' **access to intergovernmental standards-setting processes** (e.g. Declaration on the Rights of the Peasants or ICN2) and translate social claims into legal arguments adapted to the format of international process.
- The “**Watch**” has proved to be very useful as an opportunity to give visibility to the claims of social movement and their situation in regional and international settings.

#### **Highlights: Bridges between the regional human rights protection systems:**

The African Commission on Human and Peoples Rights (ACHPR) has not been fully explored and utilized for monitoring or standard setting, despite the progressive interpretations on priority issues related to RTFN and food sovereignty, in particular on issues of land. To better utilize this system, and explore linking together regional systems, a high level meeting was held between FIAN, the ACHPR Working Group on ESCR, the IACHR, and social movements from Africa. Such an activity allowed FIAN to facilitate and create political space for the first-ever exchange among both commissions around the RTFN and human rights defenders, with participation of social movements from Africa, namely the Convergence for land and water.

#### *Accountability at the national level*

- Use of the **Tenure Guidelines** for national monitoring by social movements, such as in Burkina Faso, Mali and Colombia.
- Establishment of **national monitoring platforms on the right to adequate food**, like in Uganda<sup>13</sup>.
- The development of the “**people's monitoring**”<sup>14</sup> which has the capacity to a) denounce violations; b) review the progress in standards-setting session and b) result in a systematized global overview of the Right to Food<sup>15</sup>.
- FIAN national sections have established working collaboration with **FAO country offices** in several countries (e.g. Colombia and Nepal).
- **Fact-finding missions** are an important tool for national, regional and international monitoring, as reported in Burkina Faso on the issue of seeds and in India, on agricultural workers in tea plantations, primarily women workers.

---

<sup>13</sup> <https://ccafs.cgiar.org/blog/meeting-platform-better-climate-policy-creation-kicked-gear-uganda#.WVLhket971U>.

<sup>14</sup> People's monitoring is an assessment of food insecurity and malnutrition that is centered on the knowledge and direct participation of people, particularly those most affected by these challenges. See also, <http://www.righttofoodandnutrition.org/legal-recognition-rtfn>.

<sup>15</sup> Molly D. Anderson, *Moving Toward People-Centered Monitoring of the Right to Food and Nutrition*, in the Right to Food and Nutrition “Watch Keeping Seeds in Peoples' Hands”. 2016/Issue 08.

### Challenges in achieving accountability

- FIAN recognizes the challenges in monitoring the **use and impact of the Watch**.
- The **Watch** is presented as the main product of the Global Network, whereas it is still perceived as a FIAN activity.
- The challenges of bringing all members of the Global Network equally involved in **addressing global issues**.
- FIAN national sections still need, from the International Secretariat of FIAN International, **more training** on the UN mechanisms and recommendations, as a means to strengthen their understanding on how best to use them in national strategies and advocacy.
- **Follow-up of fact-finding missions** needs to be strengthened.

### Implications for FIAN's project

- FIAN should develop a stronger capacity to elaborate **strategic approaches to promote accountability** at the national level.
- The Global Network should provide support in undertaking **country and local assessments** as a basis for further action.
- The Global Network should also develop **monitoring activities of public policies** through regional and international mechanisms with the support of FIAN.
- FIAN should further expand its **monitoring work with local communities** - beyond FIAN National sections - to mobilize the local potential for enforceability to bring about **structural change** by giving priority to “**paradigmatic**” cases<sup>16</sup>.
- FIAN should ensure **follow-up of fact-finding mission** and consider reinforcing the tool with **participatory research** work.
- Strengthen **monitoring through regional and sub-regional processes**<sup>17</sup> given that they are more directly articulated with national governments and easy to access for bringing people's voice, monitor commitment and strengthen accountability.
- In this light, FIAN could explore further work in the context of ECOWAS and MERCOSUR while **linking regional and international processes**, such as the CFS and Geneva-based human rights monitoring framework.
- **Regional work** should be strengthened in region where there is limited political space, such as in Asia and the MENA regions. In the latter, more material in Arabic is needed.
- FIAN International should maintain the use of **international human rights monitoring mechanisms**, such as treaty bodies, special procedures and the Universal Periodic Review, while assessing the possibility to request the Human Rights Council to establish **special investigation** for specific situation, such as occupied territories.

---

<sup>16</sup> A paradigmatic case focuses a particular situation that, when brought to court, has the potential of bringing structural changes, such as changes in legislation or policies that have a national impact, which legal reasoning may be used in other domestic or regional courts in other countries as well. While one of FIAN's programs is specifically dedicated to casework – the documentation and analysis of violations of the RTFN and the implementation of strategies to reclaim communities' RTFN – the review of this work was beyond the scope of the internal evaluation.

<sup>17</sup> Regional and sub-regional processes include ECOWAS elaboration of policies and land and water, the establishment of human rights mechanisms within the ALBA or MERCOSUR.

## C) Policy coherence

### Main achievements

- FIAN has consolidated a **holistic approach of the RTFN**, in particular by systematically engaging on the issue of **nutrition** with a rights-based approach in international processes (ICN2 – International Conference on Nutrition), moving away from the medical approach to nutrition still dominant at the World Health Organization (WHO) and the CRC (UN Committee on the Rights of the Child), for instance.
- FIAN has contributed to ensure coherence and highest standards in **new standards-setting process**, notably by promoting the Tenure Guidelines, resulting in the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) General Comment No. 34 on the rights of rural women and country recommendations adopted by the UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (CESCR).
- FIAN has contributed to the relevance of standards-settings processes by facilitating the **participation of social movements** active in the CFS in the intergovernmental process elaborating the Declaration on the Rights of Peasants.

### Highlights: Value of social movements' participation in standards-setting

According to the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) representative servicing the Open-Ended Working Group on the Declaration on the Rights of Peasants highlighted the contribution of social movements: 1) It brings legitimacy to the process and outcome, 2) the voice of the rights-holders, the peasants, and their knowledge of the issues and solutions are factored in the outcome, 3) social movements are drivers putting pressure for results on all actors involved (Members States, including the Chair of the group, other civil society actors and the OHCHR) 4) ensure the focus remains on concrete and urgent issues to be solved and 5) they bring applicable and acceptable solutions in contrast with legal discussions (e.g. Member States have been very concerned with the issue of seeds and its legal definition and scope. Social movements clarified that the concern is about the use and exchange of seeds “not standardized” by and between small farmers.

### Challenges in achieving policy coherence

- FIAN is too much absorbed by “damage controlling” against technical approaches to nutrition preventing a **proactive strategy** to promote rights-based approach to nutrition.
- The implication of the holistic approach<sup>18</sup> is the widening of relevant human rights and other international policy and normative processes for advancing the RTFN, such as the

---

<sup>18</sup> The holistic approach of the Right to Adequate Food and Nutrition (RTFN) departs from an understanding that the struggles for the RTFN are manifold and interlinked and thus this approach seeks to contribute to the convergence

SDGs framework, creating a need for strategic decision regarding **priorities and allocations of resources** with the scope of the project.

- There is no UN institutional framework, such as voluntary funds, for supporting the participation of civil society and social movements in the negotiations of new instruments (in particular, Treaty on TNC and Declaration on the Rights of Peasants). Participation is, therefore, self-funded laying out uncertainties about sustained **civil society participation**. Furthermore, these standard-setting processes do not have webcast, due to lack of funding at OHCHR, limiting thus their outreach and inclusiveness.

### Implications for FIAN's project

- FIAN has identified the need for a **strategic meeting with partners and other organizations involved in human rights work** on prioritizing and defining strategies on how to engage in increasing international processes.
- FIAN and the Global Network should assess whether and, if yes, how **the Global Network** could gain visibility and leadership in international processes.
- Maintain and increase the **participation** of social movements and representatives of local communities, with the view that their knowledge and experience are fundamental in defining the policies and standards in opposition to “corporate capture” or technical solutions to hunger and malnutrition.

### Highlight: Consultation on the right to land with the CESCR in Colombia

FIAN International and FIAN Colombia facilitated a consultation on the elaboration of a General Comment on Land Issues by the UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (CESCR). The consultation follows FIAN practice to facilitate the participation of social movements in standard-setting processes. On that occasion, the consultation was held in Bogotá with two members of the UN CESCR and representatives of the Global Network and Colombian civil society representatives. The issue is whether the Committee would recognize the right to land as part of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, even though it is not explicitly (textually) recognized in the Covenant, or limit the General Comment to clarify the link between land issues and the Covenant. The Consultation offers the opportunity for the Global Network to express their views on various aspects of the substantive content of the General Comment such as a) the most important land issues faced by communities; b) the justifications for recognizing the right to land; c) Definition and scope of a right to land, including whether it has a collective dimension; d) the application of the principle of free, prior and informed consent to other groups than indigenous peoples and d) whether special protection should be granted to groups (peasants, women, etc.).

---

and interlinkages of these different struggles (which span all along the food system, including seeds, land tenure, and nutrition).

## D) Gender equality

### Main achievements

- In the course of the project, FIAN International has contributed to gender equality. FIAN International contributed to the **increased knowledge of women's rights to food** in social movements as a result of dissemination of information.
- The adoption of the **CEDAW General Recommendation** on rural women which is greatly based on FIAN proposals and expertise represents a significant success.
- FIAN International organized with the Global Network, an event on women rights and the right to adequate food at the UN on the **international women day**.

### Challenges in achieving gender equality

- There is a common perception that FIAN International work would benefit by generating and applying a **deeper understanding of gender equality** in FIAN International, the Global Network and the existing 19 FIAN national sections.
- In FIAN national sections, there is knowledge about the gender equality theory while there is a need for specific support on how to apply it in practice

### Implications for FIAN's project

- **In-depth understanding of gender equality** should be at the core of FIAN strategies and work. Such understanding would help FIAN International to clarify its contribution and the impact of FIAN International regarding gender equality.
- The **Global Network** could establish a working group on gender equality with a clear mandate that goes beyond the transversal approach, with for instance support to the members of the Network to further contribute to gender equality.
- FIAN International should build on its experience working on women's rights around the world and **build further alliances with women's rights organizations and networks**, including small farmers' organizations, and further their capacities to claim for affirmative actions and policies.

## 5. Relevant changes in the context and possible implications

At all levels, there is a social erosion of the centrality of human rights and the rule of law in the building of peaceful and democratic societies. The change of US policies in the multilateral system on key issues, such as climate change, is certainly a weakening factor of the multilateral system with direct implications for the UN human rights machinery. In the CFS, today's opposition of the US to human rights is significantly stronger in comparison with past contribution such as the facilitation of the adoption of Tenure Guidelines. At the same time, there is a process of popularization of existing and binding international human rights standards as social movements and local communities increasingly make use of them for addressing hunger and malnutrition nationally, regionally and internationally.

### a) International context

According to all interviews, the United Nations, in particular the **international human rights system**, remain relevant political spaces for social movements and local communities. This is the case for all national contexts, particularly where national political space is shrinking or inexistent. For instance, in the context of occupied territories such as the Western Sahara, FIAN could explore how the UN human rights machinery could support an official investigation on the human rights situation in particular regarding the RTFN.

The **holistic approach** of the RTFN promoted by FIAN and its partners opens the opportunity to make use of a wide range of human rights mechanisms beyond those specialized on the RTFN, namely the UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food and UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and (e.g. CEDAW and CRC).

Furthermore, in the framework of its monitoring activities in 2018, the CFS will review and take stock of the **national implementation** of the guidelines on the right to food, opening a window of opportunity for FIAN and the Global Network to further national implementation. In this line, the **CFS inclusiveness** offers an opportunity of participation and thereby ensures policy coherence. A challenge is also that CFS becoming a "fair" for all food and agriculture issues, losing the focus on food insecurity.

According to the interviewee, there are several challenges in the international context to consider for future work on the RTFN. The **social erosion of the centrality of human rights** and the rule of law internationally manifest itself through the rising trend preferring voluntary standards over binding instruments, the decrease of funding for the international system of human rights protection or the persistent lack of enforcement capacity of the multilateral system. In this context, the impact and the power of transnational companies in agriculture and food production is perceived as a threat for food security and national realization of the RTFN, in particular for local communities.

### **Highlights: 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda: Opportunities and Challenges**

The SDG framework offers both opportunities and challenges. It can serve as a catalyst for national implementation of global policies and standards of the RTFN through national monitoring and accountability. The SDGs, however, may drive significant challenges for the RTFN, as it may “capture” the agenda on food security, side-lining to existing frameworks and standards. In this regard, “Goal 2 includes nothing about the right to food and nutrition, thus missing alignment with the CFS and ignoring substantial evidence that implementation of this right has resulted in significant improvements in food security”<sup>19</sup>.

Furthermore, like the MDGs, the SDGs risk to be technocratic setting goals and targets orienting policies, ignoring people’s realities and experiences. Moreover, the private sector - considered essential for financing the SDGs – might seek to control the agenda without participation of the people concerned and without accountability. Participation of civil society in the elaboration phase of the SDGs has been praised by the international community. A people-centered approach to the SDGs, as they relate to food security, requires civil society participation in the implementation phase too.

Despite the shortcomings of **the international human rights protection system**, its different mechanisms, in particular the reporting process of treaty bodies, offer a unique accountability mechanism whereby States have to demonstrate their efforts to implement the RTFN. In the context of the **FAO**, the closing the Right to Food Unit raises concern about the capacity of the FAO to effectively ensure national monitoring and implementation of the right to food guidelines. From another perspective, the recent CFS decision to monitor the implementation of the Guidelines on the right to food and numerous other guidelines developed over the last decade, such as the Tenure Guidelines and Global Strategic Framework, offer significant opportunities.

Regarding policy coherence, the **CFS** represents a unique space for generating policies and standards on the RTFN, due to the inclusiveness of the mechanism. The 2018 CFS Global Thematic Event in CFS on the Voluntary Guidelines on right to food will provide a unique opportunity for assessing to what extent and how they have been used worldwide. CFS is universally recognized to be the place where evidence – based policy recommendations are generated to combat hunger , providing a space for developing guidelines for the private sector and governments to be more accountable.

Within the UN context, the **inter-governmental standard-setting** negotiations for a human rights treaty on transnational corporation face uncertainty given a weak political support, while the standard-setting process on a Declaration on the Rights of Peasants faces a different challenge: the process is driven by conflicting approaches. On the one side, there is an expectation to adopt quickly the instrument, with the risk of limited consensus and political support for implementation, and, on the other hand, there is a will of building broad support before its adoption.

---

<sup>19</sup> Idem, page 15.

All standards-setting processes carry the **risk of retrogression of the political and normative framework** of the RTFN. This is also the case for the CESCR General Comment on land issues of significant relevance for the RTFN. This illustrates that “the dimensions of change are typically multi-faceted” and include prevention. In that perspective, the project design needs to address the challenge of “How to measure the results when efforts have been aimed at preventing from getting worse?”<sup>20</sup>.

#### **Highlights: the Open-Ended Group on the Declaration on the rights of peasants**

As opposed to other UN processes, the Open-Ended Group has made significant progress, having completed a procedural phase and entering now in the negotiation of the content. This is largely the result of the participation of civil society. In this context, FIAN plays a significant role by a) providing legal expertise and arguments providing the basis for the smooth adoption of provisions b) acting according to a sound understanding of roles and procedures c) mobilizing support from States, such as the EU d) engaging discussion on the Declaration in Asia and Africa, with little governmental participation in Geneva e) ability to translate social claims into legal arguments.

#### **b) Regional contexts**

The regional contexts encompass the **main regional human rights protection systems**, such as the African and the Inter.-American human rights protection systems, as well as sub-regional economic and political multilateral institutions, such as Mercosur and ECOWAS. The emergence and consolidation of these institutions and their accessibility represents new opportunities to advance the RTFN and food security.

Moreover, the regional human rights protection systems still represent essential avenues for national implementation, accountability and policy coherence, despite funding uncertainties. In addition to be more **embedded with national contexts** than multilateral institutions, these institutions are headed by regional courts adopting binding decisions, an absent feature at the international level. Furthermore, there is **increasingly regional and coordinated mobilization of social movements** on the RTFN and related issues, such as the Convergence in Africa.

Even though the decrease of **funding** for the Inter.-American Human Rights Protection Systems at the Organization of the American States have been a serious concern over the past years, the recent decision (June 2017) of OEA Member States to double their financial contributions represent a positive signal and guarantee of efficiency, autonomy and independence<sup>21</sup>.

Likewise, in Latin America, **FIAN national sections** are developing specific regional work with the Inter-American human rights system, in a complementary manner with the International

---

<sup>20</sup> Better Evaluation, page 6.

<sup>21</sup> [http://www.fian.org/en/news/article/se\\_duplica\\_el\\_presupuesto\\_del\\_sistema\\_interamericano\\_y\\_hace\\_historia/](http://www.fian.org/en/news/article/se_duplica_el_presupuesto_del_sistema_interamericano_y_hace_historia/).

Secretariat of FIAN. For instance, FIAN Brazil and FIAN Colombia participated in hearings held by the Inter-America Human Rights Commission as part of their national work plans.

There is a need to use more the regional level, as the Africa Union, to frame policies inspired from the RTFN framework to foster its application in national level. Likewise FIAN International and the Global Network could advocate for CFS decisions and policies to be put into practice also in Europe, through the European Parliament as it has been the case with the access to land report of the Agri CoMM of the European parliament.

### c) National contexts

In most countries, the policies related to natural resources, including land and water, offer an entry points for the promotion of the RTFN as the impact of the climate change and the exhaustion of natural resources and soils is increasingly negative. In Western Sahara, for instance, the situation of illegal exploitation of natural resources removing the means of subsistence through land and water grabbing lead to a single claim for restoring access of the local population to natural resources. Globally, these issues have prompted further reflection and mobilization regarding rural-urban dynamics and the potential of agroecology. The wider understanding of issues affecting the RTFN broadened the scope of opportunities to promote the RTFN. The debate around nutrition is case in point.

#### **Highlight: Academic Forum on Adequate Food and Nutrition in Bogotá, Colombia**

FIAN Colombia organized a one-day academic forum to discuss nutrition issues and strategies to ensure adequate nutrition. The forum gathered national universities, public health institutions and civil society organizations favoring networking and learnings including from Brazil. The forum addressed issues such as the health impact of nutrition, marketing and publicity, in particular oriented to children. Interestingly, the forum has been an opportunity to bring together organizations focusing on different issues and proposals (baby and children, peasant and agroecology models, consumers' rights in urban areas), offering the basis for establishing a wide platform to promote adequate nutrition in Colombia.

However, the **political space and opportunities** depends on every particular country. For instance, FIAN Brazil participates in the national body on food security, along with States' representatives, despite the change in government. Similarly, the Peace Accords offer a framework to promote the RTFN in which FIAN Colombia plays a unique role due to its expertise on the RTFN.

With regard to the challenges emerging from changes in national contexts, there are systemic and long-term trends such as **shrinking political space**, affecting directly the promotion of the RTFN and human rights work generally, but it also weakens the SDG agenda. On the one side, the principle of people-centered, participation and inclusiveness would remain on paper and, on the other hand, development cooperation agencies would have to justify their efforts to alleviate poverty in those contexts.

Furthermore, an increasing number of countries undergo **political instabilities** which render sustainable development policies subject to volatile governance, like in Brazil and Philippines. For instance, in Brazil, the current government has radically changed policies in the agriculture sector from a model of social programs to a model exclusively oriented by the market and producers. Even though the previous government fell short in addressing root causes of hunger and malnutrition, (access to food, fiscal injustice, agrarian reforms and demarcation of indigenous territories), the current government's policies represent a significant setback regarding the RTFN in Brazil. Likewise, FIAN Colombia observes that government policies regarding land tenure, agriculture and access to food are contrary to the Peace Accord, which is likely to fuel the drivers for a new armed conflict.

In this connection, there is an increase of repressive policies and **criminalization of human rights defenders** working on land, water and food issues. Presumably, these negative trends are corollary to **economic and social policies** implementing false solutions to food security (technological solutions), often promoted by corporations, which interfere with the principles of inclusiveness, democracy and food sovereignty at the core of the promotion of the RTFN.

In the same token, the promotion of national **multi-stakeholders approach** creates an artificial equality between actors detrimental to a human rights-based approach based on the notion of States' international legal obligations under international human rights law.

#### **Highlights: Nepal: Enabling environment for the Right to Food**

FIAN Nepal has directly contributed to the national legislation on national parks using the Tenure Guidelines. This has been possible due to the political space for civil society to dialogue with local and national authorities. In addition to the recognition of the right to food in the 2015 constitution, FIAN Nepal participates in a civil society coalition supporting the draft law on the right to food.

## 6. Conclusions and recommendations

### Overall achievements

The project contributes to the **international governance** and development of international standards and policies on food security. The project facilitates the participation of civil society and social movements' representatives, in particular small farmers, fisherwomen and fisherman, indigenous peoples and coastal communities among others, in food security related international institutions and processes. In this manner, the project contributes to ensuring a people –centered international response to food security challenges.

A salient achievement of FIAN project is the consolidation of the **Global Network** resulting from FIAN's ability to shape global strategies for the RTFN. The Global Network is still in its starting phase and, consequently, has focused more on internal development than on its outreach. The Global Network is a unique platform for framing strategic issues and coordinating the work on the RTFN. In this early phase, the Global Network greatly depends on FIAN. As a result, the open question is about its future role in national, regional and international settings, in particular where FIAN and social movements already have their own presence. In this regard, the Global Network may have a strong impact on national and local processes by developing regional advocacy work in regional institutions and with regional civil society networks.

### a) Recommendations for the end of the first phase

#### *Project management*

- In the planning of the second phase, FIAN should clearly identify **expected outcomes** and **process-oriented results** to which FIAN can directly contribute to.

#### *Gender equality*

- Hold an international meeting or consultation aiming at **capacity building and exchange of experiences** to inform the next phase of the project on gender equality.

#### *National implementation, accountability and policy coherence*

- Carry out a preliminary assessment on the format and the use of the **Watch** to identify strategies and actions required to increase ownership by the Global Network.
- Clarify strategy and objectives regarding the **SDGs** for the next three years.

## **b) Recommendations for the second phase**

### *Project design and management*

- The design of the project should keep the existing **three outcomes**; national implementation; b) monitoring and accountability and c) policy coherence and **multi-level fields of intervention** (national, regional and international)
- FIAN should further reflect on **the theory of change** underlying the project while keeping at its core the impact hypothesis based on the participation of social movements and local communities in national, regional and international processes.
- FIAN should further conceptualize its advocacy work in order to break down the elements and phases of the processes in which FIAN intervene with the view of more precisely identifying **expected results** of FIAN project.
- FIAN should reinforce the **monitoring of outcomes** to improve learning and reporting as well as to be used as a navigation tool for the project.

### *Gender equality*

- **In-depth understanding** of gender equality and its application in the context of FIAN work
- The Global Network could establish a **working group** on gender equality
- Build further **alliances** with women organizations and networks

### *National implementation*

- National implementation strategies should seek **change at the local level**, rather than national, in the context of shrinking political space.
- The choice of and the number of **priority countries** should be realistic, flexible and made according to a systematic, robust and regular context analysis.
- The more **recent normative and policy frameworks**, such as the Voluntary Guidelines on Land Tenure, the SDGs framework, Human Rights recommendations, and CFS policy decisions can be used as additional tools to implement the RTFN at the national level.
- Where there is no national monitoring system of the RTFN, FIAN and the Global Network could explore how to engage with **national human rights system**.
- **Communication strategy and tools** should be enhanced for ensuring stronger impact of the work varied out by FIAN and the Global Network.

### *Accountability*

- Project should expand its activities of **capacity-building, trainings and exchange of experience** on international mechanisms for national sections and partners, notably at local level and through South-South cooperation.
- Further trainings and support for **strategic litigation**, supported by an international network of lawyers and human rights experts.
- Further produce **educational material** designed for social movements.
- The format of the **Watch** merits to be assessed in order to improve its effectiveness according to the audience that is given priority
- FIAN and the Global Network could hold regional meetings that would have a stronger effect in reinforcing **regional monitoring**, participation, coordination and synergies.

### *Policy coherence*

- FIAN International and the Global Network should reflect on how to facilitate processes leading to **collective mobilization on all aspects of the RTFN**.
- In order to counter the threat of the exclusion of civil society from international processes, FIAN International and the Global Network should continue to **make full use of existing participatory mechanisms** as a way to “keep doors open”.
- FIAN International should continue to ensure and provide **technical support for the participation** of those most affected by hunger and malnutrition in international fora as a means to ensure that the global framework reflects their realities and their solutions.

### *Open questions*

- There are **global issues** having an immediate and significant negative impact on access to food, such as climate change and trade agreements. FIAN International and the Global Network could assess whether these issues should be more present on their agenda and how best to address them within the scope of the project. In the same line, FIAN could seek to strengthen its research capacities on global strategic issues, such as the financialization of food systems and land with complementary to the project.
- The strengthening of the work on **gender equality** might require to be inserted in the project as a separate and additional outcome (objective) with its own activities and funding. The open question is whether other activities should be given less priority and less funding, or whether a reasonable increase of funding is foreseeable for the second phase to specifically work on gender equality, along the lines of in-depth research and advocacy, specific training for national section and local communities, support to partners (e.g. Via Campesina) and strengthened work with women organizations.
- After a decade of approval of relevant normative instruments on the RTFN, implementation remains very poor. FIAN International, the Global Network, in collaboration with human rights and CFS mechanisms should assess the reasons of such **implementation gap**, as a basis for reflecting on the medium and long-term strategies and priorities to ensure implementation. Would such an assessment be useful and, if yes, how it should be conducted and what actors should be involved? What would be the role of FIAN and the Global Network?

## Annex 1. ToRs Questions

Regarding **Outcome 1**: Increased knowledge, use and application of right to food-based global frameworks in 60 countries, including approved right to food policies or legislative documents in at least 20 countries:

- How have FIAN International and the members of the Global Network for the Right to Food and Nutrition (GNRTFN) supported the application and implementation of global Right to Food and Nutrition (RTFN) policy frameworks at the national level?
- How have FIAN International and the members of the GNRTFN enhanced participation in RTFN policy spaces at the national level?
- What has the support of FIAN International and the GNRTFN achieved at national level?
- What have been the challenges and obstacles in supporting RTFN at the national level?

Regarding **Outcome 2**: Strengthened right to food accountability through human rights based monitoring by civil society organisations, States and human rights institutions:

- How are current monitoring mechanisms and spaces in the UN HRC and the CFS being utilized to increase RTFN accountability?
- How are regional spaces and mechanisms being utilized to increase RTFN accountability?
- How is the RTFN Watch being used in different settings and by different CSO actors?
- What has the support of FIAN International and the GNRTFN achieved to strengthen right to food accountability?
- What have been the challenges and obstacles in supporting right to food accountability?

Regarding **Outcome 3**: Improved policy coherence with the right to food and human rights in specific global standard setting processes:

- How are the current global standards setting processes being used to progress RTFN interpretation and new standard setting for RTFN?
- How has FIAN International in collaboration with networks, in particular GNRTFN, CSM, and the International Planning Committee for Food Sovereignty (IPC), facilitated participation in international policy processes related towards the RTFN?

For b)

- For the prospective part, the evaluation intends to throw light particularly on the extent to which the current project design takes into account the changing context of the RTFN globally and in the specific national contexts.

Key questions for a) and b) regarding gender equality and women's empowerment are:

- Does the project reach men and women equally?
- What are the benefits of the project for women?
- What implications can be drawn in terms of gender analysis for the future of the project?

## Annex 2. List of participants

	Name	Organization	Sector
<b>Axis 1: national frameworks / capacity building</b>			
1	Mrs. Chantal Jacovetti	CNOP Mali	Social movement
2	Mrs. Isa Alvarez	Urgenci	Social movement
3	Mr. Valentin Hategumana	FIAN International	Implementing partner
4	Mrs. Sabine Pabst	FIAN International	Implementing partner
5	Mrs. Angelica Castaneda	FIAN International	Implementing partner
6	Mr. Juan Carlos Morales	FIAN Colombia	NGO
7	Mr. Massa Kone	CMAT	Social movement
8	Mr. Milton Yulán	FIAN Ecuador	NGO
9	Mrs. Valeria Burity	FIAN Brazil	
<b>Axis 2: Monitoring (linked to 3 as well)</b>			
9	Mrs Ana – Maria Suarez	FIAN International - Geneva	Implementing partner
11	Mrs Gisela Dutting (TNI) NGO	(WFFP)	NGO
12	Mr. Thierry Kesteloot	(OXFAM Solidere, CSM CC)	NGO
<b>Axis 3: Standards-setting</b>			
13	Mr. Martin Wopold-Bosien	CSM secretariat	NGO
14	Mr. Joseph Schechla	(HIC-HLRN)	Social movement
	Mr. Taleb Brahim	(HIC-HLRN)	Social movement
15	Mrs Alberta Guerra	(Action Aid)	NGO
16	Mrs Taina Hedemann	(CITI)	Social movement
17	Mrs Sandra Moreno	LVC	Social movement
18	Mr. Biraj Patnaik	(Right to Food Campaign, India)	NGO
19	Mrs Svetlana Boincean	IUF	Social movement
<b>Academia and research:</b>			
20	Mrs Molly Anderson	Middlebury College	Accademia and research
21	Mrs Shalmali Guttal	Focus on the global south	Accademia and research

	<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Sector</b>
<b>UN Institutions</b>			
22	Mr. Guilherme Brady	FAO	UN
23	Mr. Bahram Ghazi	OHCHR	UN
<b>FIAN International Global vision</b>			
24	Mrs Sofia Monsalve	FIAN International	Implementing partner
25	Mrs Emily Mattheisen	FIAN International	Implementing partner
26	Mrs Alejandra Morena	FIAN International	Implementing partner
27	Mrs Alejandra Del Rey	FIAN International	Implementing partner
<b>SDC representatives</b>			
28	Mrs Dimka Stantchev Skeie	Global Programme Food Security	SDC
29	Mrs. Liliane Ortega	Permanent Representation of Switzerland to FAO, IFAD and WFP	SDC

### Annex 3. Analytical matrix

