

# Practical Methods to Monitor the Human Right to Adequate Food

## Volume I

### Making the Case for Monitoring the Human Right to Adequate Food

#### 7. STRENGTHENING THE INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY TO MONITOR THE RIGHT TO ADEQUATE FOOD.....31

#### 1. PREFACE

The realisation of the right to adequate food is to benefit over time all members of society. This requires that the impact of actions towards achieving food security for all, and the processes by which these actions are implemented, are closely monitored and assessed. Not only should such actions be effective, efficient and sustainable, but they should be targeted at the most food insecure and most vulnerable. The ultimate aim is to reduce, and eventually eliminate, food insecurity, and vulnerability to food insecurity, for all, and to protect from any effects that adversely impact on the food security and nutrition status of anyone. Rights-based monitoring (RBM) aims to monitor and assess progress with the realisation of the human right to adequate food. It is an approach to monitor the formulation, funding and implementation of policies, programmes and activities that should contribute to that aim. RBM information should provide guidance with the implementation processes in directions fully consistent with human rights principles and approaches, i.e. they should be equitable and non-discriminatory, and should fully reflect the fact that all human rights are inter-related and inter-dependent. Finally, RBM information should be instrumental in fully informing the food insecure and vulnerable about their right to adequate food, and should contribute to their capacity to claim those rights.

*The Voluntary Guidelines to Support the Progressive Realization of the Right to Adequate Food in the Context of National Food Security* are intended to provide practical guidance to States with establishing priorities and with implementing ways to realise the right to adequate food. To expect that the Voluntary Guidelines will actually be used at country level requires an intermediate step: transforming the Voluntary Guidelines into

practical tools for action development and planning, implementation and monitoring. This should be coupled with right to food advocacy, and with providing duty bearers and rights-holders with a clear understanding of what the right to adequate food means. The two volumes of the Practical Methods to Monitor the Human Right to Adequate Food -- PMM for short -- represent this intermediate step with respect to monitoring the human right to adequate food. They are thus directed at countries that are committed to implementing right-based monitoring (RBM) of all economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to adequate food.

The most relevant parts of the Voluntary Guidelines are *Guideline 17* (“Monitoring, Indicators and Benchmarks”), and the Guidelines that relate to institutional aspects of RBM (*Guideline 5.2*), to stakeholder participation in RBM (*Guidelines 10.3 and 18.1*), and to disaggregated vulnerability analysis for different population groups (*Guideline 13.2*). Related Guidelines that deal more with monitoring in post-emergency situations (*Guidelines 15.1, 15.3, 15.5 and 16.8*) are less relevant here, although assessments and monitoring of international food aid often generate useful information for monitoring structural situations and impact, particularly as these relate to vulnerable groups.

Volume I presents a broad framework for implementing rights-based monitoring of the right to adequate food, within the broader context of rights-based development and within the principle that all human rights are inter-dependent and inter-related. The volume attempts to contribute to a common understanding of what rights-based monitoring means. It discusses a number of methodological issues related to rights-based monitoring, which then link up with relevant sections in Volume II. Volume I also deals with issues that will undoubtedly be involved in country-level implementation of RBM of the right to adequate food. These include: targeting RBM information outputs at different users and stakeholders, and institutional capacity strengthening needs. By understanding the opportunities and constraints that may exist at country level, strategic approaches can be put in place that contribute to RBM mainstreaming.

Volume II represents a methodological toolkit. The methods that are presented and discussed are expected to be applied by technical staff at public sector institutions and civil society organisations with mandates and responsibilities for:

1. food security, nutrition and poverty reduction policy and programme monitoring,
2. monitoring progress towards the achievement of national (and sub-national) food security, nutrition and poverty related goals and targets,
3. monitoring the realisation of human rights in the country at national, sub-national and community levels, and
4. analysing monitoring information as part of the preparation of reports targeted at different audiences, including national and international human rights monitoring bodies and reporting in follow-up to various international conferences and summits on economic, social and cultural rights.

The PMM attempt to be practical, and to provide the most relevant methodological and operational information. No recipes are presented, but instead methodological options are explained and discussed. Detailed information regarding specific methods are summarised in Volume II, which also includes references of easily accessed sources of technical and methodological documentation. In most cases, the methods that are included are methods that are already applied. These methods were selected because they are the most relevant to rights-based monitoring, and because the monitoring information outputs can potentially reflect human rights principles, while the implementation process can be made to be human rights compliant.

The process, by which the PMM were developed, included validation by two types of in-country users: monitoring practitioners (who are expected to become actual users of the PMM in applying specific methods), and users of monitoring information outputs that can be generated by the various methods. Early on, the structure and content of both volumes were presented and intensively discussed at an international workshop held in Norway in September 2005.<sup>1</sup> The formulation of the PMM includes the conclusions obtained at this workshop. Subsequent drafts of both volumes were reviewed by many different professionals whose work relates to monitoring food security and vulnerability, and indeed the realisation of human rights. Both volumes attempt to draw on actual in-country experiences. The next step involves the in-country application of the PMM, so that the need for further modifications can be assessed through continuous inter-action with actual users. This is the best way of ensuring over time that the PMM will indeed become a tool that is effectively and usefully applied.

## 2. INTRODUCTION

International commitment to the eradication of hunger was clearly stated at the 1996 World Food Summit, where Heads of State and Government reaffirmed:

*“...the right of everyone to have access to safe and nutritious food, consistent with the right to adequate food and the fundamental right of everyone to be free from hunger”.*<sup>2</sup>

The 2002 World Food Summit: *five years later* invited the FAO Council to establish an Intergovernmental Working Group (IGWG), with a mandate to elaborate, in a period of two years, a set of voluntary guidelines to support member Nations’ efforts to achieve the progressive realisation of the right to adequate food in the context of national food security.<sup>3</sup> The resulting Voluntary Guidelines, a human rights-based practical tool addressed to all States, were adopted by the 127<sup>th</sup> Session of the FAO Council in November, 2004. Their stated objective is to:

---

<sup>1</sup> A detailed report of the workshop can be found.....

<sup>2</sup> Rome Declaration on World Food Security. The right to adequate food was also expressed in Article 11 of the 1966 International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR).

<sup>3</sup> Paragraph 10 of the Declaration adopted at the 2002 World Food Summit: *five years later*.

*“...provide practical guidance to States in their implementation of the progressive realisation of the right to adequate food in the context of national food security, in order to achieve the goals of the Plan of Action of the World Food Summit...”*

The Voluntary Guidelines address a range of activities that States should undertake in order to realise the right to adequate food. The Voluntary Guidelines are divided into three sections. The first section explains the objective of the Guidelines, refers to relevant international instruments, and explains what the right to adequate food and the achievement of food security mean.<sup>4</sup> A human rights-based approach to food security emphasises universal, inter-dependent, indivisible and inter-related human rights, the obligations of States and the roles of relevant stakeholders. In this approach, people hold their governments accountable and are participants in the process of human development. The approach addresses the final outcome of abolishing hunger, as well as proposes ways and processes with which that goal is achieved. States have obligations to respect and protect the right of adequate food of all, and to take appropriate steps to achieve progressively the full realisation of the right to adequate food.

Section II of the Voluntary Guidelines deals with creating an enabling environment for the implementation of the right to adequate food, assistance and accountability mechanisms and contains nineteen Guidelines, which identify a wide range of components integral to realising the right to adequate food.<sup>5</sup>

The third section of the Voluntary Guidelines refers to a range of actions that States, relevant international organisations and other stakeholders may take, measures they may implement or commitments they may make to realise the right to adequate food. States are recognised as having the primary responsibility for their countries’ economic and social development, and thus are the primary duty-bearers in implementing the right to adequate food.

## **2.1 Guideline 17: Monitoring, Indicators and Benchmarks**

Monitoring of the realisation of the right to adequate food is specifically included in the Voluntary Guidelines. Monitoring of the realisation of the right to adequate food cuts across the content of all other Guidelines. Implementation of these Guidelines means addressing root and immediate causes of food insecurity and vulnerability, particularly among the resource-poor who are food insecure or are vulnerable to food insecurity.

### BOX

|                                                            |
|------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>GUIDELINE 17: Monitoring, Indicators and Benchmarks</b> |
|------------------------------------------------------------|

<sup>4</sup> See Appendix 1.

<sup>5</sup> The Voluntary Guidelines are: 1 Democracy, good governance, human rights and the rule of law; 2 Economic development policies; 3 Strategies; 4 Market systems; 5 Institutions; 6 Stakeholders; 7 Legal framework; 8 Access to resources and assets; 9 Food safety and consumer protection; 10 Nutrition; 11 Education and awareness raising; 12 National financial resources; 13 Support for vulnerable groups; 14 Safety nets; 15 International food aid; 16 Natural and human-made disasters; 17 Monitoring, indicators and benchmarks; 18 National human rights institutions; 19 International dimension.

17.1 States may wish to establish mechanisms to monitor and evaluate the implementation of these Guidelines towards the progressive realization of the right to adequate food in the context of national food security, in accordance with their capacity and by building on existing information systems and addressing information gaps.

17.2 States may wish to consider conducting “Right to Food Impact Assessments” in order to identify the impact of domestic policies, programmes and projects on the progressive realization of the right to adequate food of the population at large and vulnerable groups in particular, and as a basis for the adoption of the necessary corrective measures.

17.3 States may also wish to develop a set of process, impact and outcome indicators, relying on indicators already in use and monitoring systems such as FIVIMS, so as to assess the implementation of the progressive realization of the right to adequate food. They may wish to establish appropriate benchmarks to be achieved in the short, medium and long term, which relate directly to meeting poverty and hunger reduction targets as a minimum, as well as other national and international goals including those adopted at the World Food Summit and the Millennium Summit.

17.4 In this evaluation process, process indicators could be so identified or designed that they explicitly relate and reflect the use of specific policy instruments and interventions with outcomes consistent with the progressive realization of the right to adequate food in the context of national food security. Such indicators could enable States to implement legal, policy and administrative measures, detect discriminatory practices and outcomes, and ascertain the extent of political and social participation in the process of realizing that right.

17.5 States should, in particular, monitor the food-security situation of vulnerable groups, especially women, children and the elderly, and their nutritional status, including the prevalence of micronutrient deficiencies.

17.6 In this evaluation process, States should ensure a participatory approach to information gathering, management, analysis, interpretation and dissemination.

## 2.2 Right to Adequate Food and Rights-Based Development

*“Human rights add significance to the agenda of development. They draw attention to accountability for the delivery of development benefits to all people, and lend legal and moral legitimacy, and a sense of social justice to the objectives of human development”<sup>6</sup>*

The process of realisation of human rights for all and the development process are intricably related, and both processes reinforce each other. Human rights turn development into a people-centred process aimed at the complete realisation with dignity of the full capacities of all human beings. A rights-based approach to development involves the integration of human rights norms, standards and principles in national plans, policies and development process<sup>7</sup>. The human rights principles to be integrated are: equality and equity, accountability, empowerment and participation. This translates into:

- equitable distribution of development benefits,
- transparency in governance and in the use of public resources,
- non-discrimination in development processes,

---

<sup>6</sup> UNDP. Human Rights in UNDP. A Practice Note. New York, April 2005.

<sup>7</sup> OHCHR

- effective mechanisms to hold those responsible accountable for meeting development, poverty reduction and human rights goals and targets, and
- informed participation by rights-holders (and/or their representatives) in development planning and policy and programme formulation, implementation and monitoring.

At the same time, the development process should aim at strengthening the capacity to implement human rights principles and practices, and ultimately to realise all human rights.

When concrete evidence points to the fact that all human rights, including the right to adequate food, are progressively being realised, it indicates that progress is being made with addressing fundamental and structural causes of non-realisation of economic, social and cultural rights, such as poverty and of low levels of human development. It also points to the fact that the development process itself is consistent with human rights principles and values. Quite simply, the actual realisation of the right to adequate food indicates that human development is taking place and that other human rights are also being realised. Food insecurity and vulnerability among specific population groups means that their human rights, in addition to the right to adequate food, are not being realised. Such rights are the right to health, to education, to stable and dignified employment, to land and water, and to an adequate standard of living. All human rights are equally important, but some are more closely linked to the realisation of the right to adequate food than others.

The interrelatedness of human rights has definite implications for monitoring the right to adequate food, and for capacity strengthening in RBM. Some methodological tools are specific to monitoring the realisation of the right to adequate food, while others may be applied to monitor broadly ESCR and rights that condition the enjoyment of the right to adequate food. This can easily become an overwhelming monitoring agenda, and care should be taken that the right to adequate food monitoring framework clearly delineates the realisation of which other rights are to be included. For example, rights to water, to work, to land, and to an adequate standard of living may be included as being essential for the enjoyment of the right to adequate food. Monitoring the realisation of the rights to health and education may not. However, there is no set rule as each country develops its own RBM framework.

What, then, makes the development process in practice rights based? Some essential elements are:

- the development process has built in mechanisms to hold duty bearers accountable for delivery of the benefits of development to all in equitable ways
- the goals of development aim at fulfilling the biological, social, economic and cultural needs of all humans, with particular focus on the most vulnerable and marginalised population groups (as laid down in international human rights instruments)

- the development process entails the provision of information to all rights-holders to claim their rights and to act upon that information to further their interests, and directly or indirectly participate in political decision making.

How should development contribute to the realisation of the right to adequate food? *Guideline 2* of the Voluntary Guidelines outlines a comprehensive development policy agenda designed to create an enabling environment for the realisation of the right to adequate food. These development strategies and policies should address the more immediate problems of unstable food supplies, inadequate access to food, and of unsafe and culturally unacceptable foods, but also the underlying causes of food insecurity and vulnerability. The latter may include: low levels of investment in human capital (health, education), poor conservation and management of natural resources, non-functioning markets, little investment in infrastructure, little participation of the poor in policy decisions, lack of access to affordable technologies and financial resources by the poor, and lack of policy and regulatory environment conducive to more equitable sharing of development benefits between different population groups. Needless to say that each country, after a thorough assessment of the food insecurity, development and human rights situation, should establish its own policy priorities to address the most pressing problems.

### **2.3 Questions that are addressed here**

Volumes I and II of these PMM are structured to provide a methodological platform from which to assist countries with the implementation of RBM of the right to adequate food, by finding answers to the following guiding and inter-related questions. No recipes are provided. Volumes I and II provide methodological and practical insights for those responsible in the country for monitoring the realisation of the right to adequate food.

*What do we understand by rights-based monitoring, and what does it mean in practice?*

It is important to have a common understanding of what we mean by rights-based monitoring, and of what additional dimensions it introduces in conventional and ongoing monitoring activities at country level.

*Who are the users of RBM information and for what purposes do users require RBM information?*

Intermediate and end users of RBM information (government, civil society, groups representing rights-holders, private sector) should be identified, and their information needs understood by information providers. This is to ensure that the RBM information that is produced and disseminated is timely, relevant, technically and socially accessible and appropriately targeted at different users groups. Presentational tools for dissemination of RBM information targeted at different user groups are described in Section 7 of Volume II.

*What to monitor from a rights perspective?*

A RBM framework needs to be mapped out that guides what to monitor from a rights' perspective, what methods to apply, what information and indicators to include, and what institutional arrangements and capacities should be in place.

*Which types of institutions are likely to undertake RBM of the right to food at national, sub-national and community levels?*

The right to adequate food is a multi-faceted right that is inter-linked with other economic, social and cultural rights. Monitoring the right to adequate food requires information from different sources at both national and sub-national levels. Thus, there is a need to develop an institutional framework that details:

- which institutions/organisations will participate in the main components of the RBM process, which institution will have primary responsibility for monitoring the realisation of the right to adequate food
- how RBM information will flow horizontally among institutions/organisations, and vertically between national, sub-national and community levels,
- what are existing institutional capacities, and gaps in those capacities, for the implementation of RBM of the right to adequate food, and
- how to ensure that RBM information is directly linked to follow-up decision making and action.

The institutional framework will have to be country-specific, and its implementation may require specific legislation. Or it may be defined as part of a food and nutrition policy or strategy. Institutional issues are further discussed below.

*What is needed for the RBM process itself to be rights based?*

In order to ensure that the RBM process is rights based, simple monitoring methods are required that allow maximum participation by rights holders and duty bearers in all parts of the process. In describing methods in Volume II, particular emphasis will be placed on indicating how the monitoring process can be made rights based.

## **2.4 Basic concepts relevant to RBM of the right to adequate food**

In order to ensure that the users of these PMM have a common understanding of the terms most often used in relation to RBM of the right to adequate food, a glossary of terms is included in **Appendix 1**. It is not intended that this glossary contains the definitive word: multiple definitions may exist to describe the phenomenon represented by a given term. The glossary is included to facilitate the communication of ideas and knowledge contained in this document, as it is hoped and expected that the actual users of these PMM will represent many different backgrounds and professions.



Two fundamental concepts that are highly specific to the field of human rights law, are *rights-holders* and *duty-bearers*. It is essential to understand these concepts in relation to rights-based monitoring of the right to adequate food, and they are described in generic terms in the Box below. The ultimate beneficiaries of RBM are the rights-holders in having their right to adequate food realised, when measures to that effect are made more effective, efficient, equitable and sustainable through the use of RBM information. RBM information outputs are targeted at duty-bearers with responsibility for developing, implementing and monitoring right to adequate food measures. Thus, it is important to identify the various duty-bearers, and understand the RBM information needs in relation to their respective responsibilities for the realisation of the right to adequate food. The description in Box .. clarifies the relationship between international human rights law, and responsibilities/duties of in-country state and non-state duty-bearers.

#### BOX

##### **Rights-holders and Duty-bearers**

The concept of human rights implies a relationship between right-holders and duty-bearers. The human rights system is based on the principle that individual human beings are the primary right-holders and that states are the primary duty-bearers. Under human rights law, the main purpose is to establish duties of the state towards its own inhabitants. Rights-holders face the state in the form of state agents of various kinds, ranging from presidents, or cabinet members to local police agents, lower-level functionaries, teachers in public schools or doctors and nurses in public hospitals, and any other person who exercises public authority, however limited. All of these acquire some degree of duty on behalf of the state. The state can be held responsible for acts or omissions of such persons when these are made in their official capacity. Individual duty-bearers have only such legal duties as are set out in relevant domestic laws and regulations, complemented by their official job descriptions where such exist.

State obligations are couched in very general terms in international human rights law. Details had to be developed over time, increasingly through a normative process which involves state practice, facilitated and strengthened by the dialogue of the State parties with the treaty monitoring bodies. It has also been influenced by normative developments within intergovernmental bodies, in particular the United Nations, the specialised agencies and a few others. To fulfil their evolving human rights obligations, states should adopt national law and administrative regulations reflecting international normative developments, and update these as the international normative development proceeds.

Can non-state actors be considered duty-bearers under international human rights law? Since that law is addressed to states, it binds only states. Part of the obligations undertaken by states, however, is to impose duties on private persons under national law. Example 1: The right to adequate food involves the right to safe food. This implies a state obligation to adopt legislation imposing duties on private food producers to ensure that only safe food is marketed. Example 2: The Convention on the Rights of the Child imposes obligations on states to adopt legislation to ensure that parents respect and fulfil the rights of the child. Although legal responsibility of non-state actors only arises as a consequence of domestic law, they will be considered as duty-bearers responsible for human rights compliance, even when domestic law has failed to establish the corresponding legal duties. It can be said that they are morally responsible even when not legally responsible.

### **3. THE MEANING AND APPLICATION OF RIGHTS-BASED MONITORING**

### 3.1 What do we understand by rights-based monitoring?

Rights-based monitoring (RBM) can be understood in different ways. Four different ways of considering rights-based monitoring are specified here. One or more may be involved in a rights-based monitoring system. Two meanings relate to outcomes and thus to the question of what to monitor, and two focus on process.

#### *Monitoring outcomes*

1. RBM means monitoring the progressive realisation of rights, or whether given human rights have been respected. Concretely, it asks whether rights have been fulfilled, or the degree to which they have been fulfilled, such as, for instance, the right to adequate access to food.
2. RBM means monitoring the impact of measures that are expected to contribute to the progressive realisation of human rights. These measures include policies, programmes and projects and other actions at national, local and community levels. Within the context of the right to adequate food, examples may include a national food and nutrition policy or strategy, a poverty alleviation programme, a community-based project to increase food production, or programmes to improve access to rural markets or to rural health services.

#### *Monitoring processes*

3. RBM can mean monitoring the political, economic, social and institutional processes that are involved in implementing measures that are expected to contribute to the realisation of rights. For example, monitoring of state budgets from a rights' perspective: have certain economic, social and cultural rights been given the priority they should have in accordance with the principle that states should take measures 'to the maximum of their available resources' for the implementation of such rights<sup>8</sup>.
4. RBM requires that the monitoring process itself is rights compliant, i.e. that the monitoring process is conducted in ways that are consistent with human rights principles. Here the focus is on the process of monitoring itself. It implies that the monitoring process needs to be transparent, that stakeholders have equal opportunity to participate in the process of monitoring, that their participation empowers them, and that rights-holders and duty-bearers are fully informed at all stages about the monitoring process and about the outcomes and results.

The most common understanding of RBM probably refers to the first meaning above. The fourth meaning cuts across the other three meanings. The application in the field of participatory assessments methods also shows a concern for the fourth meaning. When rights-holders define the assessment agenda in line with their priorities and

---

<sup>8</sup> Article 2, CESCR

perceptions, participation takes on a more genuine meaning. The RBM concept should not be understood too rigidly, making it otherwise too difficult to apply in practice.

As will become clear, RBM is understood here to cover all four meanings which are considered to be complementary. This means that a complete monitoring framework should include indicators that cover all four meanings. Which meaning applies depends on the specific purpose for which monitoring is undertaken, and on the mandate of the in-country institutions that undertake rights-based monitoring tasks. For this reason, Volume II includes methods that are relevant to one or more of these four RBM meanings, as is explained in the Introduction to that volume.

### 3.2 What does RBM add over and above conventional monitoring?

Monitoring is a broad and extensive topic. Many definitions of monitoring can be found in the development literature. Conventional monitoring takes place at national, local and community levels, and of policies, programmes or projects. We highlight here some main elements of conventional monitoring, as identified by the World Bank (Box)<sup>9</sup>. This is a useful point to start, since RBM of the right to adequate food should build on existing monitoring information systems and activities. It is assumed that the reader is either a monitoring practitioner, or has some knowledge of, and possibly some experience in, monitoring policies, programmes and/or projects related to food security and nutrition, or other economic, social or cultural rights.

#### BOX

##### **Monitoring:**

- Is a continuous activity that systematically uses information
- Measures achievement of defined targets and objectives within a specified timeframe
- Provides feedback on implementation processes, and implementation problems
- Tracks resource acquisition, allocation and expenditures, and the production and delivery of services

Monitoring and evaluation are often mentioned together, and are often seen as closely integrated functions or sets of activities. Others may argue that monitoring and evaluation are separate functions, in part because the information is generated for different uses and different users. One way may be to see these sets of activities as complementary parts of an integrated information-producing and –disseminating system. For example, *Guideline 17.2* encourages countries to undertake “right to food impact assessments”. i.e. to analyse or evaluate how policies, programmes or projects impact on the food insecurity of vulnerable groups. If these assessments are repeated regularly, they become part of impact monitoring activities. Monitoring results can also indicate the need for more in-depth assessment or evaluation, when progress is not as anticipated, and there is a need to understand why, so that corrective measures can be implemented that are

---

<sup>9</sup> Valadez, Joseph and Bamberger, Michael (Eds.). Monitoring and Evaluating Social Programs in Developing Countries. A Handbook for Policymakers, Managers and Researchers. EDI Development Studies. The World Bank. Washington, D.C., 1994.

designed to speed up progress. Thus, monitoring needs to be complemented by more detailed analysis or evaluation to help understand why progress is or is not achieved as projected or anticipated. Both monitoring and evaluation activities can either focus on outcomes and results, or on the processes involved in producing those results. For the remainder of this report we will mostly refer to “monitoring”, but it will become apparent throughout how evaluation activities feed into a monitoring process.

Once a monitoring framework has been established, the actual monitoring process generally consists of at least five sets of activities. These are:

- information organisation (including constructing indicators)
- information (data) gathering from primary and secondary sources;
- processing and transformation of information
- information analysis and interpretation; and
- information sharing and dissemination (reporting).

RBM has these components in common with conventional monitoring, but each component needs to be examined to see whether the monitoring process is rights compliant and whether the monitoring information outputs are indeed rights-oriented. Of particular importance, within a human rights context, is that the monitoring information is tied to follow-up action, or what is sometimes referred to as “evidence-based decision making”, by both duty-bearers and rights-holders.

In summary then, what are the additional elements that are introduced by adopting human rights principles and approaches in monitoring? These additional elements are derived from the nature of rights-based development which provides the broader context for the right to adequate food, as was described above. Thus, RBM focuses on outcomes and implementation processes of policies and programmes, and links these for the purpose of designing and implementing remedial actions to strengthen outcomes. Specifically, RBM reflects the following.

- Rights-based development provides a comprehensive economic, social, cultural and political framework that should be reflected in the design of the monitoring system.
- A rights-based approach to development integrates the norms, standards and principles of the international human rights system as contained in international treaties and instruments, and translates these into national plans, policies and processes of development.
- By definition, rights-based approaches should address gaps between norms and reality, pointing to development policies, programmes or activities that may violate the enjoyment of human rights by all, as trade-offs between the aims of development and the realisation of human rights are in principle not permitted.
- Information should be provided in an open and transparent way, allowing rights-holders to hold duty-bearers accountable for the delivery of public

services. It should strengthen rights-holders' capacity to claim their rights and plan actions in line with their own priorities.

- Information should be gathered that assesses the legal and institutional framework for the realisation of the right to adequate food, and that specifically monitors whether steps have been taken to incorporate in national law the human rights provisions of international treaties and conventions that the country has endorsed and ratified, and whether adequate institutional arrangements are in place to implement those provisions.
- A variety of policy measures should be monitored and assessed as to their impact over time compared to established targets and benchmarks related to the progressive realisation of the right to adequate food.
- Special emphasis should be placed on monitoring food insecure and vulnerable groups. These groups should be well identified and well characterised as to the reasons why they are food insecure or vulnerable to food insecurity, as they should be targeted for right to food measures.

#### **4. PUTTING RBM OF THE RIGHT TO ADEQUATE FOOD INTO PRACTICE**

What needs to be done to get from the normative statements contained in the Voluntary Guidelines to implementing RBM of the right to adequate food at country level? Opportunities and constraints will be found at country level, and will differ among countries. These should be assessed. It is also useful to learn from available country level experiences, even if these are limited as is the case here.

##### **4.1 Understanding opportunities and constraints to implementing RBM<sup>10</sup>**

The development and implementation of a RBM process at country level are likely to encounter constraints that need to be overcome. At the same time, there may be opportunities that help to facilitate the RBM implementation process. Opportunities and constraints are likely to be found at national and at local levels, and a RBM implementation strategy will need to take account of both.

##### Political and Social Opportunities

- The human right to adequate food is explicitly or implicitly enshrined in the constitutions of a number of countries. This opens up in those countries political space that can be capitalised on by ensuring that the relevant constitutional provisions translate into national legislation, policies, strategies and programmes.
- Democratisation processes, facilitated by increasing decentralisation of government actions towards sub-national levels, make possible in a number of countries more

---

<sup>10</sup> This section draws on conclusions reached at the Oslo Workshop on the Implementation and Monitoring of Rights-based Development in the Context of the Voluntary Guidelines on the Realisation of the Right to Adequate Food, September 2005

effective participation by rights holders and duty bearers at local level in policy dialogues, and programme formulation and monitoring. At the same time, the local diversity in underlying causes of food insecurity and vulnerability can be better understood, so that locally developed actions will be more effective and monitoring systems more relevant to information needs of local decision makers and stakeholders.

- Food security and poverty reduction are increasingly becoming policy priorities as a result of large scale mobilisation in some countries. International efforts to mobilise, e.g. to achieve the MDGs, have also contributed to this. Coupled with this is the recognition for the need to monitor in-place policies, laws and programmes relevant to the right to adequate food.
- There is a body of accumulated experience with advocacy work, for example, for gender mainstreaming. This offers opportunities for learning, relevant to advocating the right to adequate food and the need for RBM of the right to adequate food.
- Popular movements in some countries are growing in terms of influence, opening up new potential spaces at grass roots levels for self-determination and claiming of rights. To turn these new social spaces into effective areas of grass roots action requires, among other things, monitoring information, targeted at rights holders or generated by them, of how policies and programmes affect them.

### Constraints

One or more of the following constraints may be encountered at country level. Some of these apply more generally to the realisation of the human right to adequate food, but will have implications for RBM of the right to adequate food. Others constitute more specific constraints to the implementation of RBM at country level. As usual, the list of constraints is longer than the one of opportunities.

#### a. Conceptual Constraints

- The real meaning of, and the State obligations related to, the realisation of the right to adequate food are poorly understood by government officials and others. They are often equated with the direct provision of food to all who do not have adequate access to food. This in turn is seen then as threatening to the achievement of government priorities, or even leading to civil unrest by people demanding food from the government. It makes a big difference how authorities understand compliance with the right to adequate food, and how they act upon their understanding of compliance.
- Thinking in governmental institutions, donor agencies, and even in academia is often fragmented and along sectoral lines, usually reflecting a specific discipline or field of interest. This constitutes a barrier to the development of an integrated monitoring framework that needs to be implemented by various stakeholders. Yet, RBM of the right to adequate food requires an integrated monitoring framework as the causes of food

insecurity and vulnerability are multiple, and the development and implementation of remedial actions involve various sectors and persons from different disciplines.

- There is often no clear understanding or consensus of the meaning of relevant right to adequate food and food security terms, which hinders effective communication among multiple stakeholders, and diverts time away from real action to realise the right to adequate food, due to endless debates.

#### b. Institutional Constraints

- Public officials are often unaware of what their obligations and duties are. This may be due to the fact that obligations are not directly tied to specific positions. Consequently, the interpretations of what the obligations are depends on the occupant of the position, and thus change with different occupants. This makes it difficult to hold public officials accountable by monitoring their performance.
- While decentralised decision making aids the democratisation process, it means that RBM information also needs to be generated at local and community levels. This is where capacity is weakest, thus requiring capacity strengthening efforts for which resources are usually limited, reflecting higher priorities being afforded to capacity strengthening at national level.
- The development, implementation and maintenance of solid information systems require considerable human and financial resources, which often are not available in developing countries. This is why so often this work heavily depends on donor funding and international technical assistance. This in turn brings into question the sustainability of information systems and the long-term monitoring of the realisation of the right to adequate food.
- Even when national public resources are budgeted to support information systems, these resources are often not timely released or do not become available at all, thus causing serious interruptions in information systems development, implementation and capacity strengthening.
- In many countries there is a lack of an institutional culture of monitoring and evaluation. One explanation may be that this is one way to avoid being held accountable, when no monitoring information is available to indicate levels of performance and compliance.
- Fragmented institutional responsibility for food security often leads to fragmented monitoring responsibility. This may be due to the lack of incentives to think and act to open up to other fields and institutions, when the institutional commitment is there to promote one own field. The result of fragmented and uncoordinated monitoring activities is that it places undue burden on inter-institutional information sharing, and impedes more comprehensive monitoring of the realisation of the right to adequate food.

### c. Political Constraints

- Discontinuity of governments and of government policies and programmes is a fact of life. It means that what is to be monitored with respect to policies and programmes for the realisation of the right to adequate food changes over time, thus information systems will need to be flexible as to what to measure and to analyse.
- Political commitment (or rhetoric to that effect) is often not followed by implementation. This can negatively affect political support for RBM of the right to adequate food. Monitoring information can of course reveal lack of implementation of food security and nutrition measures, and thus to holding government officials accountable for non-performance.
- Political considerations may enter the selection of indicators to be applied in monitoring information systems. This may mean that aspects most relevant to rights-based monitoring and the right to adequate food are not included because they cover politically sensitive issues, or may measure lack of progress.

### d. Technical Constraints

- Rights-based monitoring needs to combine technical knowledge and experience in monitoring and evaluation with expertise in human rights principles and approaches. Capacity in both may be lacking at country level. High staff turnover constitutes a constraint to capacity strengthening in many countries.
- Availability of data will often be an important constraint. This is particularly important, as RBM systems are to build on existing information systems. Some of the problems that are encountered are: (i) gaps in geographic coverage, (ii) low validity, (iii) data do not become available until a long time after they have been generated, and (iv) incompatibility among different data sets with respect to geographic or household-level identification, thereby limiting linking of data sets. In addition, the construction of process indicators may require data that are not found in existing data sets.
- Technical material to guide the development and implementation of information systems that is available at country level, such as handbooks and manuals, are often not user-friendly, and thus are not used.

## **4.2 Lessons learned from selected in-country experiences**

The lessons learned with respect to implementation of RBM of the right to adequate food that are summarised here, have been distilled from five country studies that were conducted in Uganda, Brazil, South Africa, India and Canada<sup>11</sup>. The case studies were conducted to examine the degree to which the right to adequate food has been realised in each country, and were not conducted to examine in detail food security and

---

<sup>11</sup> FAO. Implementing the Right to Adequate Food: The Outcome of Six Case Studies. IGWG RTFG Information Paper No. 4. Rome, June 2004.



vulnerability monitoring systems in each country. As systematic rights-based monitoring of the right to adequate food is not commonly implemented in many countries, there is still little in the way of empirical evidence from which to learn. But the lessons learned with respect to operationalising the right to adequate food at country level, also apply to implementing rights-based monitoring.

### *Awareness building*

Awareness building among rights-holders and duty-bearers is essential to operationalise the right to adequate food at country level. This conclusion can also be extended to the implementation of rights-based monitoring. The information providers (duty bearers) should clearly understand how to incorporate rights-based approaches in their monitoring activities. Rights-holders and duty-bearers as end-users of RBM information should understand how monitoring information can be used and interpreted in relation to their action spheres and respective responsibilities.

Human rights institutions, such as the South African Human Rights Commission and the Uganda Human Rights Commission, as well as NGO right-to-food networks, such as in India, Brazil and Uganda, undertake awareness building activities targeted at both rights-holders and duty-bearers. Potentially, human rights education can be promoted through the formal school system, professional and in-service training, and at community level in poor areas. The challenge is to find ways to de-technify the monitoring information field. This links up with understanding the information needs of end-users and finding effective ways to disseminate such information from rights-based monitoring.

### *Identifying the food insecure and vulnerable*

In spite of poverty reduction strategies and policies in many countries, the food-insecure and vulnerable are often poorly identified and the reasons for being food insecure are not reflected in policy and programme designs. Pro-poor policies and strategies often lack well-defined target groups reflecting the absence of people-centred development paradigms. Thus, with a RBM approach, the identification and characterisation of food-insecure and vulnerable groups needs to take centre stage, and so contribute to improved designs and better targeting of pro-poor policies and programmes.

### *Rights-based monitoring indicators*

Particularly rights-related process indicators still need to be identified. Process indicators to monitor the effectiveness of policy, legal and institutional frameworks related to the realisation of the right to adequate food still need to be developed and agreed upon. Other process indicators that can be used to monitor budgetary practices, public participation, public service delivery and the implementation of food security, nutrition and poverty reduction programmes are also needed. Indicator development should directly involve stakeholders such as programme managers, legislators, as well as representatives of food-insecure and vulnerable groups.

### *Capacity strengthening*

There is a critical need for capacity strengthening so that policies are well implemented and programmes are well targeted in line with policy priorities to address food and nutrition problems in food insecure and vulnerable groups. Capacity strengthening within a human rights framework should target both rights-holders and duty bearers in both public and private sectors. This directly involves strengthening capacity for rights-based monitoring, joining both technical and human rights expertise, and strengthen capacity at grass-roots levels to be participants in monitoring processes.

### *Role of civil society in monitoring the right to adequate food*

Partnerships between government and civil society are increasingly taking on importance in the development and implementation of food and nutrition programmes. Evidence tends to show that community-based and non-governmental organisations are more successful in reaching the poor than government agencies, as they operate more effectively at sub-national and community levels. In some countries, civil society organisations play a significant role in monitoring the realisation of the right to adequate food, particularly among the food insecure and vulnerable, such as in Brazil. These organisations also develop and apply assessment and monitoring methodologies that are more participatory and more adapted to measure underlying causes of food insecurity at local levels. Rights-based monitoring should take full advantage of government-civil society partnerships, appropriately incorporate relevant methodologies that are applied by non-governmental organisations as well as the monitoring-relevant information that these organisations may possess.

## **4.3 Implementing at Country Level RBM of the Right to Adequate Food**

When dissecting the relevant Guidelines, a number of action domains can be discerned that should be part of a country level implementation strategy and work plan. These PMM contain several methods for the implementation of these action domains. These action domains may become part of an implementation agenda. They cover: (i) creating an enabling institutional, political and social environment for RBM (mainstreaming through institutionalisation, capacity strengthening, and advocacy and social communication), (ii) high priority analysis to contribute to the development of a RBM framework, and (iii) development of methods to ensure that monitoring is rights-based. Implementation priorities for RBM should be established in each given country setting, after a thorough assessment of the political, social and institutional environment for rights-based monitoring, and of existing and relevant information systems.

### *An enabling institutional, political and social environment*

The goal is for RBM to become a routine activity in which institutions and organisations participate that have a clear mandate, adequate human and financial resource, and adequate capacity to undertake RBM of the right to adequate food. This

may well require a specific policy directive which outlines specific institutional mandates for RBM of the right to adequate food. To provide inputs for the formulation of the strategy and work plan, the following should be undertaken:

- an assessment of the existing food security related information systems and ongoing monitoring activities,
- an assessment of existing institutional roles and capacities (human, technical and financial) in relation to the needs of a RBM system,
- establishing reporting procedures, ensuring openness and transparency in the monitoring process, and
- identification of RBM information users and gaining a clear understanding of their information needs as rights holders and duty bearers with respect to the right to adequate food.

More details are provided below. However, Sections 2, 8 and 11 in Volume II describe methods that can be applied in this process. The implementation strategy and work plan address gaps by identifying high priority and specific activities and assigning resources to implement these within a given time frame. RBM builds on ongoing monitoring activities, but introduces rights-based approaches in line with a RBM framework. One strategic way may be to implement RBM approaches as part of ongoing monitoring of major policy initiatives or national planning exercises, relevant to food security and poverty reduction. For example, this is happening with the development and implementation of the monitoring module of the National Food and Nutrition Strategy in Uganda, which explicitly includes rights-based approaches, in line with the human rights underpinnings of the National Food and Nutrition Policy.<sup>12</sup>

#### *Advocacy and communication*

Human rights principles and approaches with respect to policies and programmes for the fulfilment of the right to adequate food are still new and are often little understood at country level. Specific efforts will therefore need to be undertaken to make institutional decision makers and technical staffs fully aware of RBM approaches, and link these clearly to ongoing food security and nutrition monitoring activities. Thus, a well-articulated advocacy and communications strategy needs to be formulated that:

- targets normative and operational staffs with responsibilities for monitoring food security, nutrition and the incidence of poverty,
- clearly lays out how rights-based approaches can be incorporated in ongoing monitoring activities, possibly in incremental ways, and
- helps rights holders (or their representatives) understand how they can become active partners in RBM.

#### *Capacity strengthening*

---

<sup>12</sup> Government of Uganda. National Food and Nutrition Policy. Kampala, 2003. National Food and Nutrition Strategy. Kampala, 2005.

This is relevant for individuals, groups, households, communities, civil society organizations and governmental institutions. Duty-bearers in charge of, or involved in, RBM of the right to adequate food, need to have the *capacity* to undertake those duties. The essential components of capacity, within a human rights framework, are: (a) responsibility, motivation and leadership, (b) authority, (c) access and control of human, financial and organisational resources, (d) capacity to communicate and build partnerships, and (e) capacity to make rational decisions. Section 8 of Volume II describes the concepts that form the basis for roles and capacity analysis, as well as the methods to apply this analysis. Duty-bearers should have technical and managerial skills and appropriate knowledge and insights that are adequate and commensurate with the duties they are being asked to undertake. Duty-bearers need to be motivated, and clearly understand the relevance and importance of what they have to do. They must have a degree of autonomy based on delegated authority, they must be empowered and have adequate access to resources, while possessing the needed skills to undertake the tasks for which they are held responsible.

#### **4.3.1 An analytical agenda**

Following the relevant Guidelines, several lines of analysis may be prioritised early on as they provide necessary inputs for the development and implementation of the RBM framework and process, and these include:

- Food security and vulnerability analysis that includes the identification and characterisation of food insecure and vulnerable population groups, and that provides baseline information that allow planners and other decision makers to establish targets and benchmarks, against which to monitor progress in achieving the realisation of the right to adequate food
- Establish an inventory of policies, programmes and projects relevant to the realisation of the right to adequate food, and analyse their impacts and distributional effects, particularly on food insecure and vulnerable groups
- Analyse budget allocations and expenditures to assess and monitor the implementation of political commitments (or the lack thereof) towards the realisation of the right to adequate food.

*Who are the food insecure and vulnerable?*

Section 4 of Volume II describes methods to identify and characterise food insecure and vulnerable groups. An integral part of the right-based approach to reducing food insecurity and vulnerability is specifically targeting measures to the most needy. To effectively do so, requires that those groups are identified and are located. The reasons for these groups suffering from food insecurity and being vulnerable must clearly be understood by those who formulate pro-poor policies and implement targeted programmes. In the same way, monitoring should focus on assessing over time the degree

in which the right to adequate food is being realised among the food insecure and vulnerable.

#### *Food security and vulnerability assessments, targets and benchmarks*

Establishing targets and benchmarks, and monitoring progress towards their achievement, provide information with which duty bearers can be held accountable for any lack of progress, and this in turn should contribute to finding ways to accelerate progress. Targets and benchmarks, against which to measure progress, are usually established after a food security and vulnerability assessment has been conducted. Methods for food security and vulnerability situation assessments and baseline analysis are described in Section 10 of Volume II.

#### *Policy and programme inventories and impacts*

Policy and programme formulation and implementation processes are part of rights-based analysis. These rights-based lines of analysis should be directly linked to corrective measures to improve policy and programme targeting of the most needy, reduce or mitigate negative effects, and strengthen positive effects, on the realisation of the right to adequate food, as well as to provide inputs in the formulation of new policies, programmes and projects that are human rights based in their intended impact. Analytical methods to assess policy and programme impact from a rights' perspective are described in Section 5 of Volume II.

#### *Budget analysis to monitor implementation of political commitments*

One way to monitor the implementation of political commitments to the right to adequate food, as expressed in domestic policies, laws and regulations, is to monitor the allocation and expenditures of public funds. The results of public budget analysis enable rights-holders to hold duty bearers accountable for the lack of progress when public budget allocations and actual expenditures are not in line with expressed political commitment to the right to adequate food. Budget analysis methods are described in Section 6 of Volume II.

### **4.3.2 A methodological agenda**

Two cross-cutting methodological issues are identification and development of indicators, and participatory monitoring approaches. Indicators are discussed in more detail below and in Section 3 of Volume II. Much of the technical discussions related to rights-based monitoring centre on indicators. It is good to bear in mind that the identification of indicators and the development of indicator lists may be necessary conditions, but are not sufficient, for the implementation of a RBM system.

#### *Identification and development of indicators*

Indicator sets relevant to food insecurity, vulnerability and poverty can be found in many countries, and should be drawn upon for RBM, when appropriate. These indicators are often more likely to cover impact or outcomes, rather than implementation processes, of policy measures and programmes. As indicated above, once a RBM framework has been established, available indicators and their actual use should be assessed. Many outcome indicators generated by conventional food security monitoring systems are applicable in monitoring the actual progress in the realisation of the right to adequate food. Not all may be suitable to assess, at individual levels, the enjoyment or denial of the right to food. RBM would be more concerned with the distributional effects of policy measures and programmes, and thus outcomes: i.e. whose right to adequate food is not being respected, protected or fulfilled?

### *Participatory monitoring approaches*

The Voluntary Guidelines suggest that the monitoring process itself be participatory, i.e. that it be owned by duty-bearers and rights-holders. This is often not the case, as both participation in the monitoring process and access to the monitoring information are limited to small technical groups. This is not to say that rights-holders (or their representatives) should necessarily participate in all parts of the monitoring process. Organisations that represent rights-holders' interests, such as consumer protection and advocacy agencies, ombudswomen, human rights commissions, community-based organisations may undertake some monitoring, and should have full access to available and relevant monitoring information. Participatory monitoring approaches, either through direct participation and/or through full access to monitoring information outputs, should contribute to: (a) the empowerment of rights-holders, (b) to rights-holders' capacity for self determination, establishing their own priorities, and for action planning, (c) holding duty-bearers accountable, and to rights-holders' capacity to claim rights.

## **5. IDENTIFYING INDICATORS FOR RIGHTS-BASED MONITORING**

The process of identifying and developing indicators to monitor the right to adequate food requires several specific inputs. These are:

- a conceptual-analytical framework that specifies what is to be monitored<sup>13</sup>
- a set of guiding human rights principles and methodological considerations that help in the selection of indicators
- an inventory of candidate indicators that are already being produced as part of ongoing monitoring activities, and an assessment of these indicators as to their relevance in relation to the monitoring framework and the possibility of consistently being constructed and analysed in accordance with human rights principles
- a gap analysis to assess what additional indicators need to be identified and constructed to complete the monitoring framework.

---

<sup>13</sup> Volume II provides guidance on the development of conceptual-analytical frameworks

The identification and application of indicators should start from what already exists. This should consistently be the approach in RBM of the right to adequate food: to build upon what already is in place. Modifications in line with the monitoring framework of indicators already being constructed, and the application of additional indicators, should take place in incremental ways so as not to overburden ongoing monitoring activities. Section 2 of Volume II deals with methodological issues related to assessing typical sources of available information with respect to constructing indicators. Section 3 of Volume II details RBM frameworks and their applications, and how to derive indicators from these. It also provides specific country examples of monitoring frameworks that are being applied, some reflecting human rights approaches. As was argued above, key to RBM of the right to adequate food is the actual use of RBM information outputs by rights-holders and duty-bearers in making decisions and taking action. Thus, the RBM indicator list should similarly reflect inputs provided by targeted users of RBM information. Section 11 of Volume II is again relevant here.

We shall briefly discuss here the question of *what to monitor* as well as some guiding human rights principles for the selection of indicators. The question of what to monitor brings us back to the different meanings of rights-based monitoring of the right to adequate food, which were briefly discussed above. As was indicated there, three of the four RBM meanings are complementary. In a monitoring framework this means that implementation processes need to be related to outcomes of right-to-food measures, because the former help explain the specific outcomes that are being observed. And the latter in turn help explain the positive progress (or lack thereof) with the realisation of the right to adequate food.

Three types of indicators are usually distinguished related to the question of what to monitor: *structural* or *contextual* indicators, *process* indicators and *outcome* indicators. These are discussed in greater detail in Section 3 of Volume II. Structural indicators are involved, for instance, in baseline assessments (Section 10, Volume II). These indicators are meant to measure different dimensions of legal, regulatory, and institutional frameworks and socio-economic development priorities and poverty reduction strategies and policies that bear on the implementation of right-to-food measures and condition the outcomes of those measures. Prime examples are: legal access to land by women, food safety laws, existence and effectiveness of consumer protection agencies, mandate of human rights institutions, employment, domestic trade and taxation policies, priorities afforded to the most needy in development strategies.

*Structural indicators* may not be specific to any one human right. Some aspects of legal, institutional and development policy frameworks may equally be relevant to the realisation of all economic, social and cultural rights.

*Outcome indicators*, in conjunction with targets and benchmarks, monitor progress with respect to the realisation of the right to adequate food, and help to raise red flags when that progress is less than expected. This is particularly relevant to international reporting. However, if the reporting is limited to presenting outcome

indicators, without linking these to process and structural indicators, little can be said about what remedial actions to take to speed up the realisation of the right to adequate food.

*Outcome indicators* can also measure the results of right-to-food measures that are thought to contribute to the realisation of the right to adequate food. These are usually in line with the stated objectives of a policy, programme or project. Relevant examples of such outcomes may be: number of households with access to safe water, productivity in basic food production, off-farm employment by women, number of under-five children with vitamin A deficiency, etc.

*Process indicators* are meant to capture different dimensions of the implementation processes of right-to-food measures that are designed to protect the right to adequate food or to fulfil that right. Right-to-food measures may include: land reform and micro-credit programmes, provision of safe water, transfer of agricultural technology for small farmers, income generation programmes for the urban poor, food-for-work for displaced populations, community-based health care, targeted food price subsidies, etc. Process indicators can be constructed that measure answers to such questions as:

- How well are specific population groups (the food insecure and vulnerable) targeted by these measures?
- are there mechanisms that effectively hold duty-bearers accountable for non-delivery or inadequate delivery of public services?
- Are eligibility criteria for programme benefits discriminatory, or are they applied in non-equitable ways?
- How do rights-holders participate in decision-making regarding programme design and implementation?
- How are public resources allocated to social investment programmes that are to benefit the poor? And are those resources spent efficiently?
- Does the programme implementing agency have adequate capacity?

Process indicators should be designed to provide information that points to the need for corrective policy, legal and/or administrative measures to improve the implementation process and bring it in line with human rights principles and approaches.

An illustrative example of a monitoring framework that covers outcomes and processes is presented in Box... In this framework, a distinction is made between final outcomes (“realisation of the right to adequate food”) and intermediate outcomes that contribute to the realisation of the right to adequate food. Process indicators would cover both inputs and processes by which inputs are transformed into outputs.

BOX

|           |                                                                                                                                                           |
|-----------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| INPUTS    | Availability and allocation of human, financial and other resources.<br>Conditions under which resources are made available to implementing institutions. |
| PROCESSES |                                                                                                                                                           |



|                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                       | Procedures and operational mechanisms being applied in right to food measures, including resource management procedures, institutional linkages, stakeholder participation in decision making, mechanisms for accountability, capacity to implement right-to-food measures. |
| OUTPUTS               | Immediate results of right to food measures, e.g. higher skill levels, increased food production, greater access to markets, more awareness of economic, social and cultural rights (ESCRs).                                                                                |
| INTERMEDIATE OUTCOMES | Changes in income levels, better social and governance conditions, better access to quality public services, higher levels of educational attainment, improved health and nutritional status, and other outcomes that directly impact on the right to adequate food.        |
| FINAL OUTCOMES        | Improvements in peoples' well being.<br>Fewer right to adequate food violations, or change in the number of people whose right to adequate food has been realised.                                                                                                          |

Other monitoring frameworks are presented in Section 3 of Volume II. For example, one framework relates the levels of state obligations (*respect, protect, facilitate and provide*) to the core content or attributes of the right to adequate food (Food that is adequate: in dietary terms, safe to eat and culturally acceptable; environmentally and economically sustainable supply of adequate food; physically and economically stable access to adequate food). Structural, process and outcome indicators can be developed and applied to coherently measure and monitor how state obligations are implemented, with what right-to-food measures, and what the outcomes are of those measures. The right to adequate food is realised when all dimensions of the core content have been achieved.

## 5.1 Criteria for indicator selection

Two types of criteria can be distinguished to guide indicator development work: (i) criteria that reflect human rights principles and related approaches, and (ii) technical or statistical criteria. Both are important.

### *Human rights principles and related approaches*

- **Action follow-up:** The information provided by the indicator should contribute to the formulation of action and to better informed decision-making by either duty-bearers or rights-holders.
- **User friendly:** The indicator should provide clear and transparent information that the intended users can understand and that allows the users to draw their own conclusions

- **State obligations:** The monitoring framework should include some process and outcome indicators that capture the state obligations of *respect, protect, facilitate* and *provide*
- **Capable of being decomposed:** Both process and outcome indicators should be capable of being decomposed across specific population groups and/or by geographic areas. This is essential from a human rights' perspective. It serves to detect discriminatory practices in the implementation process of right-to-food measures, examine how the outcomes of policy or programme measures impact on the realisation of the right to adequate food in different population groups, or whether intended beneficiaries are indeed receiving the benefits of specific food security and nutrition programmes.
- **General application:** The indicator should be relevant in general, but “sensitive” to different social and cultural interpretations.

#### *Statistical considerations*

- **Measurement of change:** Monitoring is about measuring change over time. The indicator should be capable of measuring inter-temporal differences with a minimum of random measurement errors.
- **Disaggregation:** The indicator has to be equally valid for all categories or classes involved in a disaggregated analysis. This is important for making valid comparisons across different population groups, or for spatial comparisons.
- **Ease of construction:** The data needed to construct the indicator should be generated, to the extent possible, by simple measurement techniques, and require a minimum of data transformations. Simple measurement techniques open up more opportunities for participation in monitoring activities, and lower costs.
- **Specificity and Validity:** The indicator should be specific to a given phenomenon, thus avoiding different interpretations. The indicator should also be a valid or true representation of a given phenomenon.

## **6. USERS AND USES OF RBM INFORMATION OUTPUTS**

Who are the end users of RBM information and for what purposes do these users require RBM information? Which stakeholders constitute the target groups for RBM information, and what can be done to assist the different stakeholder groups to transform that information into better and more effective decisions and actions. In this section we focus on the duty-bearers with respect to the realisation of the right to adequate food. Specifically, we outline what type of RBM information may be relevant to the responsibility spheres of different duty-bearers. The aim then is to contribute to “evidence-based decision making”, realising fully well that decisions and actions are usually based on more than just available information. Structured and continuous dialogue between information users and providers can contribute to ensuring that the RBM information is timely, relevant to duty-bearers' responsibilities, technically and socially accessible to targeted users, and is appropriately disseminated to different users

groups. Simple methods to ascertain user information needs, and the actual utilisation of RBM information outputs, are discussed in Section 11 of Volume II.

Rights-holders and their representatives constitute an important RBM information users group. The right to information is essential to the right of self-determination, and to the right to claim rights. Access to information serves to empower, and to give real meaning to participation. Specifically then, the uses to which rights-holders may put RBM information, appropriately disseminated, include the following:

- Reaffirmation of their rights, and claiming non-realised rights
- Participation in public policy debates and in action planning to represent their priorities and perceptions
- Participation in social control mechanisms to hold duty-bearers accountable
- Planning self-reliant actions to address prioritised problems
- Political and social mobilisation efforts
- Acquire greater awareness and understanding of their economic, social and cultural rights within the context of rights-based development.

A monitoring system is thus rights-compliant when information outputs are specifically targeted at rights-holder groups, and when the contents and dissemination methods fully take into account the capacities and information access constraints (for example, language capacity) faced by these groups. Direct participation by rights-holder groups in the preparation of information outputs should be helpful. An interesting example from Uganda is presented in Box...

#### BOX

In Uganda each year the national budget preparation phase ends with so called Budget Day in June. On that day, the national budget is officially launched. Two days later, a newspaper insert comes out in two prominent newspapers (*The Monitor* and *New Vision*), called Budget Highlights, which attempts to explain in lay terms what is contained in this year's budget. The insert is also translated in four local languages (paid for by the newspapers), and appropriately inserted on a regional basis. A second publication called The Uganda Budget 200x/200x – A Citizen's Guide comes out annually and targets citizens at national, local and community levels. The publication is prepared in English and eight local languages. The contents and translations are validated at community level. The publication is distributed through local government. Both publications are prepared by the Office of Information and Communication of the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development in Kampala.

Right-to-food duty-bearers can be identified by the areas of responsibilities they execute at national, local and community levels. This may be a useful point to start in identifying types of monitoring information that is needed by different user groups (Table 1). This approach also assists with identifying the most relevant methods to be used in rights-based monitoring of the right to adequate food (Table 2). In Section 11 of Volume II we expand on simple methods for identifying RBM information needs of different duty bearers. A brief summary of a possible approach is provided here. Section 8 of Volume II on role and capacity analysis is helpful here as well.

Twelve areas of responsibilities have been distinguished in Table 1, that relate to the realisation of the right to adequate food. Corresponding duty-bearers (government, non-government and international donor and technical cooperation agencies) that operate at national, local and community levels have been indicated in relation to the various areas of responsibility. In most cases, institutions and organisations have been listed. Planners and other technical staff employed by government (or non-government) institutions are intermediaries, in the sense of being responsible for the preparation of technical documentation based on which policy, programme and project decisions are made. Excluded here as an area of responsibility is the provision of monitoring information with respect to the right to adequate food. Of course, often information-using institutions or organisations also generate information, such as statistical departments in line ministries, or when NGO networks conduct their own surveys.

The areas of responsibility in Table 1 can also be distinguished in relation to the various meanings of rights-based monitoring discussed above. The result is as follows.

The progressive realisation of the right to adequate food:

- International reporting on rights-based development, realisation of economic, social and cultural rights
- Establishing and monitoring access to judicial remedies

Impact of right to adequate food measures:

- Public policy formulation and monitoring
- Programme development, implementation and monitoring
- Project development, implementation and monitoring

Implementation processes of right to adequate food measures:

- Legislative bills/laws
- Establishing norms, standards and regulations
- Programme and project implementation and monitoring
- Budgeting and public resource allocation and utilisation
- Public service delivery
- Providing public information
- Political and social mobilisation/human rights advocacy
- Generation of knowledge and capacity strengthening.

**Table 1**  
**Right to Adequate Food Duty-Bearers at National, Local and Community Levels**

| Levels of Action<br>Responsibilities     | National                                                   | Local                                            | Community |
|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Public Policy Formulation and Monitoring | Ministers – line ministries<br>Planners<br>Technical staff | District/municipal executives<br>Technical staff |           |

|                                                                                                   |                                                                                     |                                                           |                                                      |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|
| Legislative Bills/Laws                                                                            | Legislators<br>Technical staff                                                      | District/municipal<br>councils<br>Technical staff         |                                                      |
| Establishing & Monitoring<br>Access to Judicial Remedies                                          | Human rights<br>institutions/commissions<br>Right-to-food NGO<br>networks<br>Courts | NGO networks<br>Courts                                    |                                                      |
| Establishing Norms,<br>Standards & Regulations                                                    | Legislators<br>Consumer protection<br>agencies                                      | District/municipal<br>councils                            |                                                      |
| Programme Development,<br>Implementation and<br>Monitoring                                        | Planners<br>Programme managers<br>International donors                              | Planners<br>Programme<br>managers                         |                                                      |
| Project Formulation,<br>Implementation and<br>Monitoring                                          | International donors<br>NGOs                                                        | Planners<br>Project managers                              | Village councils<br>Community-based<br>organisations |
| Budgeting and Allocation of<br>Public Resources                                                   | Legislators<br>NGO networks<br>International donors                                 | District/municipal<br>councils<br>NGOs                    | Village councils                                     |
| Public Service Delivery                                                                           | Planners-line ministries                                                            | District/municipal<br>planners                            | Village councils<br>Community-based<br>organisations |
| Providing Public Information                                                                      | Mass media (newspaper,<br>radio, TV)<br>NGO networks                                | Mass media<br>(newspaper, radio,<br>TV)<br>NGO networks   |                                                      |
| Political and Social<br>Mobilisation/Human Rights<br>Advocacy                                     | Right-to-food NGO<br>networks                                                       | Right-to-food<br>NGOs                                     | Community-based<br>organisations                     |
| Generation of Knowledge<br>related to Right to Adequate<br>Food/Capacity Strengthening            | Academic institutions<br>Professional<br>organisations<br>Training institutions     | Professional<br>organisations<br>Training<br>institutions |                                                      |
| International Reporting on<br>Rights-Based<br>Development/Economic,<br>Social and Cultural Rights | Human rights<br>institutions/commissions<br>Right-to-food NGOs<br>networks          |                                                           |                                                      |

The identification of various duty-bearer groups linked to areas of responsibility allows us to identify likely RBM information needs of these duty-bearer groups, as in Table 2. This is important for the purpose at hand in deciding which methods are most relevant for RBM of the right to adequate food.

In Tables 1 and 2 then we have attempted to provide a summarised overview of who are the principal duty-bearers at different levels with respect to various areas of responsibility, and what type of RBM information these users may need to execute their responsibilities. As information can be expressed in the form of indicators, this is a cross-cutting methodological issue that applies to all types of RBM information. The presentation is generic and needs to be operationalised in each country setting. But the approach links information needs to duties with respect to the right to adequate food and differentiates between duty bearers. Section 11 of Volume II provides additional methodological information with respect to determining the RBM information needs of different duty-bearers. Key is to understand the roles of different duty-bearers. By way of illustration, we provide two examples.

The implementation process at national level of right-to-food measures involves decision makers in line ministries, legislators and NGO right-to-food networks. These three groups need to know: (i) what the principal food security and nutrition problems are, which population groups are food insecure or are vulnerable to food insecurity, and what the reasons are, (ii) what likely policy or programme impact are, particularly on the food insecure and vulnerable, and (iii) what budgetary allocations are possible, and whether these are in line with national priorities. The role of each of the three groups in this process is somewhat different, however. The decision makers in line ministries need the information to ensure that the design of the policy/programme measure addresses a cause or causes of food insecurity or vulnerability, presumably in the most needy population groups, and is likely to impact positively on food security, while making the case for appropriate budgetary allocations. Legislators (budget committees of Parliament or Congress) who must approve the national budget need to know and understand the food insecurity problems and their broader context as a basis for having established national targets and priorities, must know that the proposed policy/programme measure is in line with those targets and priorities and must find the budgetary resources for the

**Table 2**

**RBM Information Needs of Different Duty-Bearers with Respect to the Right to Adequate Food**

| <b>User Groups</b>      | Baseline Assessment/Food Insecurity & Vulnerability<br>Institutional Roles and Capacities<br>Policy and Programme Impact<br>Budget Allocations & Expenditures<br>Community Level Monitoring |     |     |     |
|-------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|
|                         | RBM Indicators                                                                                                                                                                              |     |     |     |
| <b>National</b>         |                                                                                                                                                                                             |     |     |     |
| 1. Line Ministries      | XXX                                                                                                                                                                                         | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| 2. Legislators          | XXX                                                                                                                                                                                         |     | XXX | XXX |
| 3. NGO Networks         | XXX                                                                                                                                                                                         | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| 4. Mass media           | XXX                                                                                                                                                                                         | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| 5. International Donors | XXX                                                                                                                                                                                         |     | XXX | XXX |

|                                      |     |     |     |     |     |
|--------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 6. HR Institutions                   | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |     |
| 7. Courts                            | XXX |     | XXX | XXX |     |
| 8. Professional.<br>Associations     | XXX | XXX |     |     |     |
| 9. Academic/Training<br>Institutions | XXX | XXX |     |     |     |
| <b>Local</b>                         |     |     |     |     |     |
| 1. District/Municipal<br>Executives  | XXX |     | XXX | XXX |     |
| 2. District/Municipal<br>Councils    | XXX |     | XXX | XXX |     |
| 3. NGO Networks                      | XXX |     | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| 4. Planners                          | XXX |     | XXX |     |     |
| 5. Project managers                  | XXX |     | XXX |     | XXX |
| 6. Mass Media                        | XXX |     | XXX | XXX |     |
| 7. Professional<br>associations      | XXX | XXX |     |     |     |
| 8. Training<br>Institutions          | XXX | XXX |     |     |     |
| 9. Courts                            | XXX |     | XXX | XXX |     |
| <b>Community</b>                     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 1. Village Councils                  | XXX |     |     |     | XXX |
| 2. Community-<br>Based Organisations | XXX |     |     | XXX | XXX |

implementation of the measure. The NGO right-to-food efforts may either consist of advocating or lobbying for or against the measure, depending on their analysis of the food insecurity and vulnerability problems, and of how the proposed policy/programme measure is likely to impact on the food insecure and vulnerable. Their budget analysis and monitoring will aim at showing that budgetary allocations (and expenditures) for the measure are: (i) too large because the measure does not support a national priority or may adversely affect the right to adequate food of food-insecure or vulnerable groups, or (ii) too low because although the measure is in line with national priorities, it does not maximise the positive effect on the most needy.

## **7. STRENGTHENING THE INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY TO MONITOR THE RIGHT TO ADEQUATE FOOD**

### **7.1 Assessment of institutional and legal frameworks**

The establishment and functioning of monitoring systems at the national level requires an adequate legal and administrative basis. In order to undertake a meaningful assessment of the legal and institutional arrangements for the implementation of RBM of the right to adequate food, it is necessary to have a set of criteria against which to

examine the actual institutional and legal conditions, and identify gaps that need to be addressed to create adequate conditions. Important criteria that can serve as an assessment checklist of institutional attributes and responsibilities, may include the following<sup>14</sup>.

- (a) The institution/organisation should have a clear mandate for monitoring the right to adequate food. This mandate should be endorsed at high level (for instance, by Parliament) or explicitly stated in the Constitution (cf. in South Africa), or enshrined in specific legislation. The institutional mandate should be widely known and understood by key stakeholders.
- (b) The institution/organisation with the mandate to monitor the right to adequate food should have adequate and identifiable human and financial resources to undertake the monitoring tasks. There should be a well-defined work plan, on the basis of which the institution/organisation can be held accountable for the production and dissemination of RBM information outputs.
- (c) The institution/organisation should be situated in such a way that the monitoring information outputs easily reach key stakeholders at all levels in both the government and in non-government sectors. It is important that such monitoring information outputs effectively impact on decision making and action planning.
- (d) The institution/organisation should have a high level of credibility *vis-à-vis* duty-bearers and rights-holders. It should be seen as objective and independent, free from political influence. Realisation of human rights should be its institutional agenda.
- (e) Related to the above, the institution/organisation should have effective access to all relevant RBM information, relying on existing information networks in both the government and non-government sectors. It should have both the mandate and the capacity to verify the validity of the information from all sources.
- (f) The institution/organisation should, as part of its mandate, establish advisory committees that represent specific expertise in both technical and human rights aspects needed to monitor the right to adequate food.
- (g) The institution/organisation should have a good communications and advocacy strategy in place when its mandate calls for pro-actively promoting the realisation of the right to adequate food. RBM information should be designed to input into the communications and advocacy strategy.

An analysis to determine the adequacy of the existing legal and administrative framework for RBM may therefore be a priority. Sections 2 and 8 of Volume II contain useful methods for such an analysis. Considerations would include whether the law provides an institutional mandate and authority to gather information and undertake analysis and assessment, and spells out what the reporting requirements are. Access to information and information sharing among different agencies should also be mandated by law. It is likely to be difficult that one institution (or unit within an institution) or

---

<sup>14</sup> These approximately follow the so-called Paris Principles of 1991 which provide reference points for establishing and operating human rights institutions.



organisation could be found that meets all of the above criteria. For example, in Brazil, it appears that the *Ministerio Publico* has a clear mandate to monitor the realisation of economic, social and cultural rights. However it seems to lack adequate human and financial resources to undertake necessary monitoring tasks. The Office of the National Rapporteur for the Right to Food, Water and Rural Land monitors rights violations, and reports these to the *Ministerio Publico*. The South African Human Rights Commission is constitutionally mandated to monitor the realisation of all human rights. It is autonomous and has unlimited access to information from all government departments. The Commission directly reports to Parliament, and can make legislative proposals to Parliament. The role in RBM of the right to adequate food of a human rights commission, or another human rights monitoring body, should carefully be examined, even when its technical monitoring capacity may have to be strengthened.

A distinction can be made between institutions or organisations that have a responsibility to generate monitoring information as well as to monitor the right to adequate food, and institutions or organisations that represent independent monitoring bodies. The South African Human Rights Commission (SAHRC) obtains information from line ministries and other duty bearers, analyses the information and issues a public report to Parliament. Government statistical offices generate and provide information but have usually not a direct responsibility to monitor the realisation of human rights. Civil society organisations do often rely on government statistics to monitor the realisation of human rights, though they may have means to generate additional information and/or to verify government statistics.

Another model is to think of an institutional network to monitor the right to adequate food, with members that are distinguishable as primary or leading institutions or organisations, and as associated institutions that may undertake specialised and highly technical tasks, the results of which feed into the overall monitoring function. In many countries academic institutions conduct food security related research, and research on right to adequate food, and primary monitoring institutions partially rely on these research results. A network of NGOs, social associations and institutions in Brazil, called *Fórum Brasileiro de Segurança Alimentar e Nutricional*, undertakes research and field work to generate and analyse information related to food and nutrition. The outputs produced by the network and individual members are used for policy and programme formulation and monitoring.

## **7.2 Strengthening the sustainability and capacity in monitoring the right to adequate food**

The lack of sustainability and of capacity have been signalled above as important constraints faced by information systems at country level. Sustainability has political, social, institutional, technical and financial dimensions, which, in turn, are inter-related. An information system that is seen by many stakeholders as producing important and relevant information outputs that have a real impact and fill a real need for information is more likely to be supported politically and socially. Capacity strengthening can contribute to strengthening the institutional and technical sustainability. An information

system that is politically and socially supported, that has a strong institutional base or network, and that produces technically sound information products that are relevant and timely, will most likely have adequate financial resources, including from national sources on a long-term basis. Crucial is how the information system development and initial implementation processes are executed, requiring:

- an inclusive participatory process, involving key stakeholders (monitoring information providers and users)
- a good communication process, which articulates well the value added of the information system (in this case, particular the value added of integrating human rights principles and approaches in existing monitoring activities)
- an early demonstration of what the information system is capable of producing in response to felt information needs on the part of users
- a realistic and transparent assessment of the information system's capacity, and a clear definition of what is needed to improve the system's effectiveness and efficiency

In the real world there are no guarantees. Applying these ideas may help. But information work is often seen as academic or even a luxury when needs to act are so pressing. The emphasis on producing "accurate" data leads to use of complex and time-consuming methods, when to provide a basis for informed decision making requires only indicative information that can be generated by simple methods.

A programme of capacity strengthening for RBM should start off with an assessment to ascertain existing capacity strengthening needs. The assessment should cover not only human resource factors, but also institutional and financial factors, in institutions and organisations that have clear duties to generate, synthesise, manage, analyse and disseminate information for monitoring the right to adequate food. The assessment results should provide the basis for the formulation of a strategic work plan for capacity strengthening. This plan may cover skills-building, knowledge acquisition, technological or methodological development, improved communications, internal reorganisation to establish clear job responsibilities and lines of authority, and more effective ways of information sharing among institutions and organisations.

## **8. CONCLUSIONS**

Volume I is meant to set the stage for a methodological toolkit for rights-based monitoring of the right to adequate food at country level. This methodological toolkit is presented in Volume II. This volume explores the various dimensions of rights-based monitoring, making the case that it builds on existing monitoring systems and activities, but adds some new dimensions. Stakeholders in the realisation of the right to adequate food are many, and consequently the users of RBM information with different information needs are many as well, and are found at national and local levels. Their monitoring information needs should be well understood by monitoring information providers, to ensure that monitoring information products are relevant and timely, and

thus enable rights holders to hold duty bearers accountable and plan effective self-help food security actions. At the same time, the monitoring information should serve for duty bearers to perform better.

Monitoring the realisation of the right to adequate food also involves institutional issues. Inter-institutional information sharing and government-civil society partnerships are essential as the RBM information will need to draw on multiple sources of information. Data are to be complemented by so-called qualitative information. Direct and meaningful participation at grass roots levels in information gathering, analysis and interpretation is essential in RBM, particularly when the RBM information is to serve decision making and planning at grass roots levels. A RBM implementation strategy needs to be based on an assessment of existing and relevant information systems, and should address issues such as, ways of institutional capacity strengthening and making institutional information systems self-sustaining, decreasing over time their dependence on external funding. Lastly, it needs to be decided which institution will have primary responsibility for monitoring the realisation of the right to adequate food, in line with the Paris 21 Principles.

To expect effective application of the Voluntary Guidelines and operationalisation at country level of the right to adequate food will require the development of an implementation strategy that covers awareness raising, advocacy, education and communication, capacity strengthening, the role of civil society, as well as monitoring. Awareness raising, education and promotion of human rights, including the right to adequate food, and the development and implementation of RBM will need to go hand in hand. RBM requires an enabling human rights environment if the monitoring process is to become rights compliant, and the monitoring information to be useful to further the realisation of human rights, including the right to adequate food. These two parallel processes involve different stakeholders, and the creation of an enabling human rights environment is not the primary responsibility of monitoring practitioners. However, RBM information can in turn contribute to creating an enabling human rights environment if the information outputs are well targeted, are relevant and timely.

How to get started? Clearly there is no set way, as conditions to operationalise human rights and to develop food security information systems will differ from country to country. One model is where a small inter-institutional working group is convened to develop a rights-based monitoring system, as was done in Uganda (see Box...). For such a working group to function well requires: (i) a clear specification of the outputs to be produced by the group within a given time line, (ii) creation of awareness at high management levels of the importance and relevance of those outputs, (iii) participation by individual staff members from different institutions is mandated at high management levels. It is also helpful that there is a specific context within which the RBM module is to be developed, i.e. there is a clear and identified need for the development of a RBM information system. This should guide, among other things, the specification of outputs to be produced by the working group. The working group should be convened by an institution with strong ties to key institutions and organisations, and should continuously consult (at national, and if possible, at sub-national levels) and provide feedback on progress on its work to those institutions and organisations. This will facilitate the

eventual implementation of the RBM system, which will involve those same institutions and organisations, both as providers of monitoring information and/or as users.

### **Box**

To develop and operationalise the monitoring module of the Uganda Food and Nutrition Strategy (UFNS), an inter-institutional working group was convened by the Secretariat of the Plan for Modernisation of Agriculture (PMA). The group consists of a representative of the following institutions: Uganda Human Rights Commission, Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development (Poverty Monitoring and Analysis Unit), Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries, Ministry of Health, Uganda Bureau of Statistics, and the Food Rights Alliance Network (a NGO network). In order to ensure continuous participation in the group's work, the assignment of staff to the working group was mandated from high management levels in the respective institutions. The work of the group is assisted by a national consultant hired by FAO. The final output to be produced is a practical methodological toolkit to monitor UFNS implementation, applying rights-based approaches. The first task that the group completed is a work plan that outlined specific tasks to complete and outputs to produce within a given timeline, and assigned specific responsibilities to members of the group. The group periodically reports to the PMA Sub-Committee on Food and Nutrition Security, and consults its members when needed.

This volume outlines an analytical and methodological agenda, while Volume II synthesises a number of tools that may be used in RBM of the right to adequate food. What is relevant will depend on the situation in each country, and specifically, what needs to be monitored and for what purpose. It is hoped that the contents of these two volumes provide enough guidance for country teams or other stakeholders to decide what is relevant and useful to imbue existing information systems with human rights principles and approaches, and to provide RBM information outputs to contribute to the realisation of the right to adequate food in the country.

## **Appendix 1**

### **Glossary of Basic Terms Related to Rights-Based Monitoring of the Right to Adequate Food**

#### Human Rights

|                                       |                                                                                                                                                                       |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Political rights                      | Rights related to government or the conduct of government (e.g. the right to vote and to participate in governmental decision-making [1])                             |
| Civil rights                          | Rights an individual has in his/her role as a citizen or in his/her relation to the State [1]                                                                         |
| Economic rights                       |                                                                                                                                                                       |
| Social rights                         | Rights relating to the person in society, such as the right to education, social security, health [1]                                                                 |
| Cultural rights                       | Rights that protect a person's enjoyment of his/her own culture [1]                                                                                                   |
| Right to adequate food                |                                                                                                                                                                       |
| Progressive realisation of ESC rights | Key provision of Article 2 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights related to a government's obligation with respect to ESC rights. ESC |

rights must be achieved progressively; no backward steps may be taken [1]

Duty bearers

Rights holders/claimants

Human Rights Attributes

Equity

Transparency

Accountability

Participation

Empowerment

Social responsibility

Non-discrimination

Fundamental human rights principle, meaning that all rights are guaranteed to all without discrimination, which is an act or practice of discriminating against someone on the basis of his/her membership in a category (e.g. race, ethnicity, gender) [1]

Realisation of ESC Rights

State obligations

Government obligations with respect to ESC rights. These obligations are comprised of: (a) Respect: government must not act counter to the relevant human rights standards, (b) Protect: government must act to stop others from violating human rights standards, and (c) Fulfil: government has an affirmative duty to take appropriate measures to ensure that the human right standard is attained [1]

Rights-based targeting

Comprises transparent and non-discriminatory eligibility criteria to include all those in need, and exclude all those not in need, and effective accountability and administrative systems [2]

Legal and regulatory environment

Sustainable development

Human rights-based strategies

Social safety nets

Stakeholders

### Food Security

Food security

Food security exists when all people, at all times, have physical and economic access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food to meet their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life. The four pillars of food security are: availability, stability of supply, access and utilization [2]

Vulnerability to food insecurity

Vulnerability refers to the full range of factors that place people at risk of becoming food insecure. This is determined by the exposure to the risk factors and people's ability to cope with or withstand stressful situations. Vulnerability can be transitory, temporary, seasonal or structural (permanent) [3]

Vulnerable groups

People who are faced with a high probability of becoming food insecure at any time [3]

### Measurement

Human rights monitoring bodies

Rights-based monitoring of the right to adequate food

Rights based analysis and assessment

Benchmarks

Baselines

Process indicators

Impact indicators

Outcome indicators

References

[1] Dignity Counts: A Guide to Using Budget Analysis to Advance Human Rights.

[2] Voluntary Guidelines

[3] FAO-FIVIMS. Tools and Tips.