

Civil Society Working Document on the Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition

Draft – December, 2011

BACKGROUND

In 2008, the food price crisis again brought the issue of food production and hunger high up on the national and international political agendas. One of the answers promoted by the G8 was the so-called Global Partnership for Agriculture and Food Security. The UN system established the High Level Task Force on the Global Food Security Crisis (HLTF). These initiatives served to further marginalize the Rome-based food agencies and to bring decision making on food and agriculture closer to spaces driven by the G8/G20, the World Bank and, ultimately, the private sector. Civil Society and certain governments mobilized strongly against this, demanding a more democratic process that involved all 193 governments of the UN and Civil Society. This ignited existing momentum for the reform of the UN Committee on World Food Security (CFS), the only legitimate forum where everyone has a voice and decisions can be made with the participation of poor countries and peoples' movements around the table. The coordinated work of civil society organizations was one of the reasons that this reform was successful and established, among others, the Civil Society Mechanism of the CFS. It was an important step towards appropriately limiting the influence of the donor countries, the World Bank and the private sector.

The reform of the CFS is an important achievement for civil society and social movements, particularly the organizations of small-scale food producers and supporters of food sovereignty, human rights and democratization, who actively engaged in the year-long process of negotiations over the CFS reform, influencing its character and rules in important ways. One of our central demands throughout the reform process was that support be given to the development of a Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition (GSF) to act as a much-needed global reference for policy-makers as the central body for coordination and decision making on food and agricultural issues, and to define the role and responsibilities of the reformed CFS.

The existing model of global food governance is perpetuating injustice. It is based notably on the financialization of natural resources and unfair trade rules. Existing governance is one of the major causes of ongoing food crises and, if not dramatically changed, it will not end hunger and malnutrition. New global governance for food, agriculture and nutrition in which all States take responsibility for their governance role and are held accountable by their constituencies is necessary. Power imbalances need to be addressed by giving equal voting weights to all countries. Civil society and social movements, particularly food producers, the majority of whom are women, and those affected by food and nutrition insecurity, must be able to interact and influence processes and policies with their proposals, experience and alternatives.

Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) have consistently maintained that the Global Strategic Framework is at the heart of the CFS reform. We have fought hard with like-minded governments to keep it in the CFS reform process despite the attempts by some governments to weaken global coordination and accountability. Above all, the GSF is about coherence: we want to see coherence with human rights instruments, with human dignity, solidarity and peoples' sovereignty. We want to shift away from the existing coherence that certain governments promote with market liberalization and the plundering of our territories and mother nature.

VISION

We envision a world where those who produce, distribute and need food are at the heart of food, agricultural, livestock, forestry and fisheries systems and policies: a world where food production is rooted in environmentally sustainable production, under local control and honoring traditional knowledge, whilst guaranteeing the possibility of a diversified and healthy diet and nutritional well-being; a world where trade policies and practices will serve the rights of peoples to safe, healthy and ecologically sustainable production and consumption; a world where the interests of the next generation will be included, and a world where new social relations are free from oppression and from the inequalities of class, ethnicity, caste, gender, religion.

We envision a world where the role of the State is reaffirmed and where States uphold their responsibility to protect and promote democracy, as well as respect and strengthen food and peoples' sovereignty.

Land, oceans, rivers, forests and all of nature are much more than a means of production; they are the very basis of life, culture and identity, and fulfil crucial social, cultural, spiritual and environmental functions. We envision genuine agrarian, fisheries, pastoralist and forest reforms that guarantee access to, and the sharing of, productive territories and other resources free from the threat of large scale land and other natural resources privatisation,¹ loss and eviction. The right of self-determination of Indigenous Peoples must also be upheld.

Our vision is deeply rooted in the human rights framework and seeks to seamlessly integrate the concepts of food sovereignty, the right to food and food and nutrition security. The indivisibility of rights is a core principle that is fundamental to the human rights approach. Accountability is another core principle that must be respected and protected by all actors (State and non-State); impunity of violations against these rights must be overcome.

We recognize the need to re-emphasize the centrality of nutrition in the GSF, including its upstream social determinants such as universal access to potable drinking water, sanitation, maternal and child care and quality primary health care and education.

¹ Privatization is the process of transferring ownership of a business, enterprise, agency, public service or property from the public sector (the state or government) to the private sector (businesses that operate for a private profit) or to a private non-profit organization. In this context, we understand privatisation as a key element of neo liberal processes, which has allowed large scale acquisition of natural resources, bringing them into the hands of (usually big) private enterprises or investors. The HLPE has recently made visible that the way land investments affect women's rights and access shares strong similarities with previous examples of resource privatization; affections include loss and eviction of their resources.

ANALYSIS OF THE CAUSES OF HUNGER AND MALNUTRITION

Hunger is a product of policy failures to meet States' human rights obligations. Increasingly, global decisions on food, nutrition and agricultural policy are being taken by powerful private interests, supported by local elites, and with States abdicating their responsibility to guarantee food sovereignty and the autonomy of food producers. This is leading to a situation where unsustainable models of industrial agriculture are taking precedence over agro-ecological systems of agriculture. Through mechanisms such as investment contracts, bilateral and regional free trade agreements, and the World Trade Organization (WTO), Transnational Corporations (TNCs) are establishing, controlling and benefiting from global markets for food and agricultural commodities. While the number of hungry people has increased in the last few years, corporate profits for the traders and primary processors are at record levels. This increasing financialization of the food, nutrition and agricultural sectors is leading to the continued perpetration of injustice, not just for farmers, especially small holder agriculturists, but also for workers and consumers who end up paying more for increasingly unhealthy foods. Lack of purchasing power of waged workers, rural and urban poor is the source of hunger in the world today. Wages of agricultural and food workers and the prices for small scale farmers worldwide remain low, while food prices reach record highs and push millions of waged workers and rural communities into malnutrition and hunger. There are clear ILO statistics on the low wages in agriculture – in some countries under one dollar per day. The destruction of livelihoods which is linked to the continuation of non-sustainable agriculture jeopardizes livelihood security and local economies and prevents all people from having sufficient, safe and healthy food produced in ecologically sustainable ways and equitably consumed.

Industrial production models are capturing and dominating markets, and in this way, are further undermining the local markets of small food producers and disrupting the livelihoods of small-scale food providers and the diverse ecosystems upon which sustainable, low energy production depends. This industrial model promotes monocultures, as well as the use of food crops and land for agrofuel production rather than to feed people. This industrial model of production can have dramatic impacts on workers, on communities, on social relations, on local knowledge systems, on technologies and on the environment, and has led to exploitation of people and ecosystems, etc. It actively leads to the concentration of market power of transnational corporations throughout the entire food chain from production to distribution. It leads also to unsafe, unhealthy, centrally processed foods, unethical marketing practices and destruction of genuine diverse food options for consumers, compromising nutritional status, on the other hand.

Current processes of privatization of land, water and other natural resources are contributing to violations of the right to food and other related human rights because they hinder the access, use and control over those resources needed for the livelihood of millions of people. In certain areas, factors such as demographic growth, desertification, climate change, neoliberal policies, investment in mining and forestry and the liberalization of land markets all contribute to aggravating existing tensions, including the loss of biodiversity. This often affects women in developing countries disproportionately as they play a significant role in traditional agricultural production (feminization of the agricultural labor force) but remain invisible and are very often even further marginalized in systems based on large scale industrial agriculture.

About 30% of global emissions leading to climate change are attributed to agricultural activities; mainly a result of agroindustrial models of production. Climate change is likely to lead to an increase in the frequency and severity of sudden disasters and physical water scarcity, triggering an increase in short-term, internal and regional displacements, particularly in Asia and in Africa. It is estimated that one billion people could be forced to migrate because of climate change by 2050, a situation that will most likely lead to more conflicts over land and water.

Governance of food security has until now been dominated by markets and privatization interests. Government and public sector institutions have abdicated their governance role to trade and financial institutions and, as a result, policies are incompatible with the right to food and other obligations of States.

Another cause of food insecurity is the inadequate use of emergency food aid. Many cases have shown that this was used to dump surplus production, including GMOs, from some rich countries and to pressure aid recipients to accept the food aid. This undermines local production, local markets and biodiversity. The failure to make resources available for effective and adequate post-emergency rehabilitation, as well as insufficient attention to how this undermines or reinforces local agriculture resilience and local initiative, and continuing use of donor sourced food aid, including the uses of GMO commodities may also jeopardize people's livelihood after an emergency. This approach often leaves countries more vulnerable and people more exposed to the risks of becoming chronically food insecure.

WHAT DO WE WANT THE GLOBAL STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK (GSF) TO DO?

The GSF should set criteria, standards of good practice and clear policies, along with clear roles outlined for policy makers, for civil society, for financial institutions, for UN agencies and all other actors. It should aim to improve food and nutrition security and work towards the realization of the right to food and food sovereignty. The GSF must create and enable an environment for States to take up their responsibilities for the realization of the right to food. The focus of all policies developed within the GSF must be the people, especially those most affected by hunger and malnutrition.

More specifically, the GSF should:

1. Develop a strategy on how to operationalize and make the GSF visible in national contexts.
2. Provide clarity on what kind of policies must be adopted to strengthen small food producers in the production of diversified varieties of nutritious crops in a sustainable manner, with particular consideration for the role of women, and their respective areas of concern, including cooperation with the private sector to ensure mutual and community benefit.
3. Stress the universality and indivisibility of human rights and the centrality of non-discrimination and consider marginalized communities irrespective of whether they are producers or not, through environmentally sound systems of production that protect future

generations. The GSF will thus set the strategy for the realization of the right to adequate and affordable food

4. Develop critical analysis on the issues related to current unsustainable and unjust models of consumption, production, transformation and distribution of food and develop concrete action and policies to fix the broken food system, for example through adequate incentives and public investments in small scale food producers.
5. Revitalize the role of the public sector and of the State in really addressing the causes of hunger and malnutrition.
6. Promote fair trade relations as a contribution towards tackling malnutrition and highlight the difference between free and fair trade
7. Clearly define the new governance of food security and nutrition along the lines of the new principles that the GSF will be adopting.
8. Explicitly address the rights for women, including their right to breastfeed, and related labor rights if employed and women's land tenure and inheritance rights. Equally, address the rights of the child related to their nutritional security, focusing particularly on children under two years of age, recognizing the importance of adequate nutrition within this window of opportunity of the first 1,000 days of a child's life for determining their physical and cognitive development.

WHAT ARE THE CHALLENGES TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GSF?

Civil society is committed to work with national governments to overcome the following challenges:

- The GSF will have no significance if it remains at global level; hence the process of implementing of the GSF at national level is crucial. The ultimate goal is to achieve national ownership (understood as democratic ownership).
- Since governments have failed to pay sufficient attention to the International Assessment of Agricultural Knowledge, Science and Technology for Development (IAASTD), we consider it key that the GSF builds upon the findings and recommendations of this ground-breaking report.
- Overcoming the inconsistencies between existing analytical documents that are inhibiting real progress towards the fulfillment of the right to food (e.g., the inconsistencies between the findings and recommendations of the High Level Panel of Experts on food security and nutrition (HLPE) and those of the report produced for the G20 by a number of multilateral agencies must be reconciled).
- Making sure that the GSF, reflecting well substantiated CFS decisions, is adhered to by agencies like FAO, IFAD, WFP and the CGIAR group.
- The HLPE does and will consider recommendations coming from other bodies, such as nutrition related resolutions by the World Health Assembly, but the former

must supersede any other external recommendations if they are counter to the principles espoused by the GSF.

- There is a lack of knowledge of the GSF process (even by related ministers) and thus a lack of coordination with key ministries at country level.
- Human rights learning is --and for a long time to come will be-- an overarching, key element to be clearly called for by the GSF so as to increase the human rights knowledge of claim holders and duty bearers at all levels.
- Last but not least, funding of the process to implement the GSF for its application at national and sub-national levels must be secured as part of the approval of the final GSF.

THE ROLE OF ACTORS

Social actors in the CFS including social/people's movements and representatives of small holder food producers from the fisher-folk, farmer, pastoralist and other communities, through the coordination of the Civil Society Mechanism, have important roles to play in the realisation of the GSF as a tool for the progressive realisation of the right to food. The role of social actors in the GSF is particularly critical in the face of negative interferences from both existing and potential violations, and from abuses of people's rights, as well as from other intergovernmental bodies, States, IFIs, the private sector and TNCs.

The roles of the duty bearers in the CFS in relation to the Global Strategic Framework are:

1. **Role of Governments**

- i. Governments are to utilise the CFS as the most important intergovernmental and international platform for the promotion of food and nutritional security, in line with their human rights obligations.
- ii. They are to respect, protect and fulfill the progressive realization of the Right to Adequate Food and related rights, within the principle of the indivisibility of human rights, following already established standards as the Voluntary Guidelines on the Right to Food and General Comment 12.
- iii. They are to regulate the private sector at national and international level, to stop the violation of people's rights.
- iv. Governments are to strongly support and increasingly invest in agroecological, small holder based models of production that create decent employment, help mitigate climate change, build resilience and maintain and enhance ecosystem functions and biodiversity.
- v. Governments from rich countries and international institutions must provide appropriate and adequate responses in emergency situations to fulfill the right to adequate nutritious food, the right to shelter, sanitation and basic health services, allowing the transition from short term emergency food assistance into longer term food and peoples

sovereignty.

2. **Role of intergovernmental organizations**

The obligations of intergovernmental organizations such as FAO, WFP, IFAD, World Bank and WTO in the CFS in relation to the Global Strategic Framework are:

- i. To respect, protect and fulfill the progressive realization of the right to adequate food and related rights, within the principle of indivisibility of human rights.
- ii. To regulate the private sector at national and international level and to stop the violation of people's rights.

3. **Role of civil society:**

- i. Civil society will increase its empowerment activities, its level of organization and mobilization, including the task of increasing the number of rights holders that become de- facto claim holders.
- ii. Civil society will increase pressure on governments and TNCs to stop violations and abuses of the human right to adequate food and related rights.
- iii. Civil society will work towards strengthening participation of the Civil Society Mechanism in the CFS, especially with regard to the Global Strategic Framework.
- iv. Civil society will actively participate in the elaboration, implementation and monitoring of public policies.
- v. Civil society will struggle for greater democratization and greater people's sovereignty, particularly at national level.
- vi. Civil society will work on monitoring the implementation of the GSF and on holding governments accountable.
- vii. Civil society will engage in documenting progress in the implementation of the GSF, the dissemination of ad-hoc information on good/bad practices.

4. **Role of transnational corporations, private sector and agribusiness**

- i. It is the extra-territorial obligation of the host and domestic countries of transnational companies, the private sector and of agribusiness to regulate their activities through enforceable public policies.
- ii. The transnational corporations, the private sector and agribusiness have, therefore, the obligations not to violate human rights of any kind, and must be held accountable for their activities when they interfere with the enjoyment of any human rights, e.g.: access to land, to water, adequate, healthy food and safe working conditions. They are to be

liable for restitution in cases of proven violations.

POLICY PROPOSALS

Civil society, through the Civil Society Mechanism, calls upon the GSF to ensure that the IAASTD Report is used as the basis for all future discussions on agriculture. Food sovereignty for all people, as defined in the Nyeleni Declaration, should be a guiding principle of the GSF.

A comprehensive set of proposals is described in the declaration and synthesis document (Nyeleni) and has been signed by more than 500 civil society organisations. Many of these policies were further elaborated in the document on “Policies and Actions to Eradicate Hunger.”² The specific issues that civil society would like to highlight for the GSF are the following:

Human rights accountability: The human rights framework must be the basis for all future accountability mechanisms. Governments must reclaim their role in governing the food, nutrition and agricultural sectors from the private sector and recognize the universality, indivisibility, inalienability, interrelation and interdependency of all human rights.

Support and protection of small-holder food production: Policies and support schemes should be focused on supporting small holder based, diverse and sustainable models of production for small holders including fisher-folk, indigenous producers, and pastoralists, particularly women, protecting these from conflicting interests, especially those of large corporations.

Access to and control over productive resources: This includes land, seeds and water. In many countries agrarian reform is needed. The rights of specific constituencies such as fisher-folk, indigenous people, pastoralists and women have to be taken into account.

Stop land grabbing: Under no circumstance can land be treated as an investment only. There must be urgent regulation at the global and national levels to ensure that land is not taken away from producers and handed over to “investors.”

Security of land tenure and link to Voluntary Guidelines: There is an urgent need to ensure security of land tenure in coherence with the Voluntary Guidelines on land under discussion.

Agricultural markets, prices and food-reserves: Producers and consumers should be enabled to strengthen local and domestic food markets. Markets should arrive at fair prices to ensure decent revenue for food producers. Domestic markets have to be protected against dumping, speculation and low price imports. Decentralised models of community and public food reserves should be supported. Markets should also enable consumers to obtain food at fair prices. Markets should be sufficiently regulated to protect interests of small food producers as well as consumers and should not be controlled or dominated by intermediaries, processors or other corporate interests.

² http://www.eradicatehunger.org/pdf/Anti_Hunger_EN.pdf

Investment in agriculture: Fair prices and stable markets should allow small holders enough income to invest sufficiently in their production. Small holders, particularly women, who produce up to 80% of the world's food, have to be recognized as the most important investors in farming. Public investment has to be focused on small holder production, particularly supporting agroecological models of production, including appropriate infrastructure for food processing and preservation. The role of donors and governments in investment is fundamental. Private corporate investment has to be regulated and should in no way negatively affect small holder production. Investment in agriculture should lead to food security and decent jobs.

Climate change and energy: Policies should support people to improve the resilience of their food production systems against climate change. Appropriate, community managed technologies to provide energy have to be supported and scaled up. Mandates and subsidies to promote large scale, industrial agro-fuel production has to be eliminated

Farmer-led research: Research needs to be reorganised for greater democracy. The preference for food sovereignty research requires public funding. Research should be participatory where farmers are recognised as researchers. Indigenous and traditional knowledge must be recognized, protected and applied.

Position of women: Equality has to be ensured, in particular the recognition of women as heads of households, and their role in decision-making at production level. Women must be protected against all forms of discrimination, including violence and the right to maternity leave for women waged workers must be ensured. Women must have equal rights regarding access to and control over land and productive resources, as well as basic services (education, health). Women have to be recognized as producers and in their role as gate keepers of nutritional security through reorientation of research, extension, credit banks, academic, etc. Women's rights to equal access, control and ownership of the entire agriculture chain from production to consumption, including an equitable food distribution at household level, must be ensured.

Infants and children: Specific policies are needed to guarantee access to adequate food and to the further basic needs of all children. In the case of infants, care needs to be taken that provisions exist to enable women to exclusively breastfeed their infants for the first six months. These provisions include maternity entitlements (including facilities for crèches, income support to compensate for loss of wages and supplementary nutrition).

Social protection/security: Security of jobs, livelihoods, provisioning of decent wages and adequate conditions for wage workers and agricultural workers, as well as workplace safety, are needed. Adequate responses in emergency and post emergency situations have to be guaranteed to vulnerable people and those people who are at risk of becoming vulnerable after an emergency. Universal social security nets and food safety and nutrition without commercial sponsorship or influence are vital elements in helping vulnerable people to cope with emergencies.

Basic public services: Active public support for basic public services such as quality education, sanitation, community-led infrastructure, health and water is crucial.

Conflict and protracted crises: Raise accountability of countries and other actors in conflict. In conflict situations, priority must be accorded to saving lives and the protection and restoration of livelihoods that are at risk to ensure an adequate transition from emergency to development. Coordination between funding for emergency food assistance and long term

food sovereignty policies and actions will help build resilience and avoid future shocks and protracted crises.

Emergencies: Much greater attention and resources should be given to ensuring effective post-emergency rehabilitation to strengthen local agricultural resilience and local initiative. There is a continued need to transition from emergency responses to more resilient food systems. Not doing so leads to protracted “chronic crises.” All emergency responses must lay the basis for longer-term solutions to food security and sustainable livelihoods.

Urban poor: Support for urban food production is crucial, as well as ensuring access and purchasing power for non-food producers. Development of stronger links between producers and urban dwellers (i.e. Community Supported Agriculture) is to be encouraged.

Migration: The right to mobility must be recognised. Forced migration must be avoided, if people must move, migrant rights must be respected.

Implementation of human rights: This means the right to food and other human rights, which are universal, inalienable, indivisible, interdependent and interrelated. It also includes the obligation of States to respect, protect and fulfil these rights, including awareness creation and access of rights claimants to justice or the recognition of the right to food in national constituencies and relevant policies and institutions that coordinate food and nutrition matters.

Urbanisation encroaching on farmlands: This relates to the drastic reduction of land available for agriculture due to the growing pressures of urbanisation. Urbanization plans must consider the drastic reduction of land available for agriculture and the impact it can have on food production, food producers and on nutritional outcomes.

Bringing nutrition back into focus: Nutritional security must be based on the production of diverse foods, and ensuring that all people have access to these diverse foods to meet their nutritional needs adequately. Nutrition security needs to be re-emphasised with greater focus on the key social determinants of malnutrition, including universal access to potable drinking water, maternal and child care, sanitation and quality health care. The linkages between these interconnected sectors need to be further explored, with a nutrition sensitive perspective, and nutrition objectives and indicators becoming part of the planning, implementation and monitoring of such programs.

Regulating the financial speculation on agricultural markets. To be effective, agricultural commodity markets need to be transparent, regulated and supervised: transparency ensured by required registration and clearing of contracts and actors; roles of different actors should be clearly delineated with strict limits on financial institutions and funds not active in agricultural supply and demand; strict price and position limits to minimize speculative market influence; national and international regulation and supervision across commodity exchanges and across countries.

Participation: Strengthening the capacities of vulnerable groups creating spaces for them to participate in policy making and implementation processes.

IMMEDIATE PRIORITIES FOR THE GSF

Price volatility: Take direct measures to stabilize markets (local and international)

Land grabbing: Need to stop land grabbing immediately

Investment in agriculture: Set the vision of investment in agriculture that addresses the structural causes of hunger and work for small-holder production

Social security: Sufficient purchasing power has to be guaranteed for those that have not (yet) access to food production

Right to food accountability: Human rights based accountability and monitoring mechanisms are a must component of GSF

MONITORING AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Accountability and monitoring must be listed as priority issue in the GSF and not relegated to a separate chapter. Both outcomes and processes need to be monitored and special emphasis must be put on examining the coherence of all policies that impact food security, rather than those that are specific to food security, agriculture and nutrition. Monitoring also includes economic, trade and investment policies. GSF must monitor international policies on key issues including agro-fuels, speculation, IFIs, FTAs, land grabbing, as well as CFA, CAADP, G-8, GPAFSN, Food Facility and Extra Territorial Obligations. The Food Aid Convention, the only existing treaty framing global food assistance, has to be coherent to the GSF to ensure that food or food-related transfers strengthen long-term strategies for food security and food sovereignty, not undermine them.

Accountability and monitoring must be enforced at international and national level and beyond a rights-based approach must include other mechanisms of control such as effective communication in the media and the effective use of democratic institutions. The actions and struggles of social organizations and NGOs constitute a key element in the monitoring and accountability system. Strengthening social organizations and protecting their actions against repression and criminalization should be a key component of a strategy to increase accountability and monitoring of governments, institutions and the private sector.

The rights-based approach is a central part of the accountability and monitoring mechanism and a clear identification is to be insisted upon of the roles and obligations of the duty bearers (including both State and non-State actors) and rights/claims holders. The GSF must refer to human rights principles and standards, as well as already established standards, including the Voluntary Guidelines on the Right to Food and General Comment 12. Strengthening justiciability mechanisms at national and regional levels and including processes which “name and shame” violating duty-bearers have to be put in place.

With regards to adherence to the GSF, an independent body appointed by the CFS (e.g., something similar to the HLPE) should be entrusted with the task of holding to account and monitoring both State and non-State actors, including TNCs and IFIs. Through this mechanism, positive and best experiences regarding public policies and those of CSOs will be exchanged to allow for shared learning. The participation of civil society in such mechanisms has to be ensured.

Current mapping exercises in the CFS could play a role in setting up a monitoring system. The International Code Documentation Center (ICDC) on monitoring the code for marketing of breastfeeding substitutes could be an example. The role of the UN Special Rapporteur on

the Right to Food must be strengthened. Also, the independent monitoring body proposed above can build on and coordinate with existing mechanisms such as reporting to the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. All member States of the CFS should file a regular compliance report and civil society organizations should be provided the opportunity to file parallel reports that challenge or support official claims on the fulfillment of State obligations and GSF implementation.

At the national level, the GSF must have clear accountability mechanisms which enable rights holders to claim their rights. National level bodies and structures that are set up for monitoring must necessarily have the participation of local communities with clearly defined methods to measure outcomes, benchmarks of progressive realization and targets. Also, mechanisms have to be put in place where communities and organizations can complain if obligations are not met. This will empower communities thereby pushing the frontiers of accountability. In the long run, at both national and international levels, effective complaint mechanisms need to be developed and established to prevent the repetition and the impunity of violations of the right to adequate food and other rights. Finally, best practices in monitoring and accountability at national level (eg. Conselho Nacional de Seguranca Alimentar e Nutricional, CONSEA in Brazil) need to be examined to guide the respective section of the upcoming GSF.