








Report: Reflection Exercise on Global Food Governance Reforms

October 2026










Institute for Agriculture & Trade Policy

CONSEA Conselho Nacional de Segurança Alimentar e Nutricional

SECRETARIA-GERAL

Report: Reflection Exercise on Global Food Governance Reforms

The publishing institutions CONSEA and IATP are responsible for the final content of this publication and wish to acknowledge and thank all participants to the reflection exercise for their valuable contributions. The drafting team was composed by Elaine Martins Pasquim, Elisabetta Recine, Sophia Murphy, Martin Wolpold-Bosien, Shiney Varghese, Marina Andrade and Giselle Silva Garcia.
The publishers also express their gratitude to the Ministry for Foreign Affairs and the Ministry for Social Development of Brazil, the Civil Society and Indigenous Peoples Mechanism for relation to the CFS, and FAO Brazil for their valuable support to this endeavour.

Pulblished October 2026

The Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy (IATP) is a nonprofit research and policy organization, based in Minneapolis (USA) and dedicated to the realization of just and resilient food systems at home and globally. IATP works at the intersection of food systems, climate change, and international trade. IATP upholds the twinned principles of food sovereignty and agroecology. IATP envisions agriculture, trade and food systems that are good for people, farmers and food system workers, ecosystems and social justice globally.

The Institute provides first-class, accurate analysis, informed by research, science and lived experience. Its policy advocacy is shaped in close collaboration with social movements, coalitions and civil society organizations. IATP works to ensure a strong regulatory framework that protects public health, the environment, workers and farmers.

www.iatp.org

The National Council for Food and Nutritional Security (CONSEA) is an advisory body to the Presidency of the Republic of Brazil whose main attribution is to propose and monitor public policies related to food and nutrition sovereignty and security, and the human right to food. The National Council for Food and Nutritional Security (CONSEA) is composed of two-thirds civil society representatives and one-third government representatives.

The Council forms part of the National Food and Nutritional Security System (SISAN), which is responsible for the cross-sectoral management of public policies and coordination between the three levels of government (federal, state and municipal), with the social participation of civil society, for the implementation and execution of Food and Nutritional Security Policies.

https://www.gov.br/secretariageral/pt-br/consea/

Institute for Agriculture & Trade Policy

CONSEA Conselho Nacional de Segurança Alimentar e Nutricional

SECRETARIA-GERAL






Report: Reflection Exercise on Global Food Governance Reforms

Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy
Brazilian National Council for Food and Nutritional Security

Contents

1. Executive summary 1
2. Introduction to the Reflection Exercise 5
3. Gaps and challenges 7
4. Elements of a comprehensive response 9
i. The need for an intersectoral, inclusive and participatory rethinking of global food governance 9
ii. Food is not a weapon, food is a human right 10
iii. Defending and restoring the normative foundations of global governance 11
iv. Public policies with social participation 12
v. Protecting public policies against corporate power 13
vi. Funding gaps and financial architecture reforms 14
vii. Specific steps for FAO 15
viii. Specific steps for CFS 16
ix. Specific steps for the bridge between Rome and Geneva 17
x. Specific steps to bridge Food and the Rio Conventions 18
xi. Right to Food as a topic for ECOSOC, UNGA, UNSC, and UNSG 18
xii. Human Rights and social participation in the post-SDG process 19
5. Conclusion 20
Appendix: Agendas of the International Workshop and the Dialogue 21

Institute for Agriculture & Trade Policy

CONSEA Conselho Nacional de Segurança Alimentar e Nutricional

SECRETARIA-GERAL

1. Executive summary

Introduction

In the global context of geopolitical turmoil and serious questions on the destiny of the multilateral system and the global governance of food systems, the Brazilian National Council for Food and Nutritional Security (CONSEA) and the Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy (IATP) convened a **Reflection exercise,** bringing together 86 actors from civil society, United Nations (U.N.) Member States, U.N. bodies and academia. Together, these participants shared insights and discussed critical challenges, gaps, needs, opportunities, and proposals related to global food governance. The exercise included two moments: an International Workshop on Global Food Governance Reforms held at the Rio Branco Institute of the Brazilian Ministry of Foreign Relations on April 29-30, 2026 in Brasilia, and an Informal Exchange on Needs and Opportunities for Global Food Governance held as an online dialogue on May 15, 2026.

The **reflection exercise started with seven questions** linked to 1) fracturing multilateralism; 2) ongoing U.N. reform processes and opportunities to strengthen social participation, democratization, and representativeness; 3) challenges and opportunities to strengthen the U.N. Committee on World Food Security (CFS) as the main U.N. policy coordination platform on food security and nutrition; 4) the role of U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) in global food governance; 5) challenges and opportunities to achieve more effective collaboration between the three Rome-Based Agencies (FAO, World Food Program, and International Fund for Agriculture Development); 6) proposals to address, limit, and counter corporate power in global food systems governance; and 7) interlinkages between efforts addressing food system transformation and the global finance and climate justice agendas.

These questions were shared in advance with the participants and helped frame the planning of, and interventions during the Brasilia workshop and the subsequent online dialogue. The exchange of perspectives among participants established a broad picture of gaps and challenges, and a vision of critical elements for a comprehensive response. These are set out in this report and summary, based on a shared understanding that global food governance reform is, at its core, a democratic project.

Key Messages:

The exercise identified **nine critical gaps and challenges:**

1. An increasing number of **wars and conflicts** directly generate hunger and exacerbate food insecurity and malnutrition. In several of these conflicts, food has been used as a weapon or as a means for political and economic pressure, and starvation has been used as a method of warfare.

2. **Corporate concentration** in food systems and corporate power in political decision-making continue to expand inexorably, weakening the position of small-scale food producers, processors, and retailers, and undermining the sovereignty and self-reliance of many communities, countries, and regions.

3. Governance processes involve **insufficient social participation**, based on the principles of autonomy, self-organization and representativeness; they also lack respect for the principle of prior, free and informed consent of Indigenous Peoples.

4. The **United Nations is fragmented,** struggling to overcome siloed approaches and a lack of cooperation within and among institutions. This is exacerbated by the open disregard shown by some of the most powerful Member States for the U.N.'s core principles, agreements and proceedings.

5. There is a **need for enhanced global policy coordination;** mechanisms such as the CFS, which was reformed for precisely the purpose of strengthening global policy coordination for achieving food security, lacks effective support.

6. The **available financial resources are inadequate** to address the acute and structural causes of food insecurity, as unprecedented wealth is concentrated in a few hands without just and effective taxation.

7. There has been an **erosion of normative power** in governance institutions; U.N. credibility is severely undermined when countries are allowed to blatantly violate the U.N. Charter, international law, human rights and international humanitarian law with impunity.

8. There is a **lack of consistent global responses to major drivers of food insecurity and malnutrition.** These drivers include: immense wealth inequalities, wars and violent conflicts, climate collapse, biodiversity loss, land degradation, pollution, marginalizing and racist policies, gender discrimination, exploitation, corporate concentration, and other expressions of economic, social and ecological injustices.

9. The **U.N. is threatened** by authoritarian regimes which aim to impose their nationalistic and shortsighted interests against multilateral efforts for peace, development and human rights.

A comprehensive rethinking of global food governance should intend to address the enormous and interlinked gaps and challenges through an interconnected agenda based on an intersectoral approach, the human right to food, and effective social participation.

The exercise identified **12 elements of a comprehensive response:**

1. Efforts to strengthen and reform global food governance need to develop an **intersectoral and inclusive approach**, combined with **effective and meaningful social participation**, to build an **interconnected agenda** with related processes in the areas of finance, corporate accountability and climate justice. For this purpose, a much closer cooperation of Member States and U.N. agencies playing a role in the promotion and protection of the human right to adequate food is critical.

2. **Food is not a weapon; food is a human right.** The use of food as a weapon of war and conflict, as a measure of political and economic pressure, or even the use of starvation as a method of warfare, are clear violations of international law. One conclusion of the reflection process is a call to collectively develop a global campaign against using food as a weapon of war and other conflicts. This campaign would mobilize the public and raise awareness around the human right to adequate food as well as the global responsibility to protect human life and dignity in situations of conflict and war.

3. **Normative foundations must be restored and defended** as effective guidance for global governance. Acting to reverse the erosion of norms requires building new alliances among civil society, academia, and Member States who are committed to defending the basic values of the United Nations while joining hands in protecting, reforming, democratizing, and strengthening the U.N. as an institution. The consistent protection and promotion of the right to food can be a convening point for collaboration across the U.N.

4. **Public policies must be created with social participation**. Social participation is crucial to designing public policies that are responsive to the real needs, rights, and potentials of the concerned communities and societies. Social participation can inform public policy-making and monitor its implementation on all levels of food governance (local, national, regional, and global) through institutionalized social participation mechanisms that respect the autonomy, self-organization, and representativeness of civil society. Democratizing the process of policy formulation gives new direction to food system transformation. Decision-making spaces from local to global should empower social movements to participate by elevating their voices and protecting those spaces from asymmetries of power in food systems.

5. **Public policies must be protected against corporate power.** It is essential to limit and regulate corporate power in order to ensure that public interest prevails in public institutions. Key initiatives to address corporate power in governance include the introduction of robust safeguards against conflicts of interest, as well as transparency rules in national and international institutions. The ongoing negotiations on the U.N. Binding Treaty on Transnational Corporations and Human Rights are of high relevance for the food sector. Experts have proposed to develop a U.N.-wide Corporate Accountability Framework. The UNDP Food and Power Initiative addresses corporate concentration and its relation to local, national, and global governance.

6. **Financial structures must be reformed to eliminate funding gaps.** Countries in the Global South are more vulnerable to economic crises, conflicts, wars, and the impacts of climate emergencies. Three ongoing processes at the United Nations are advancing to increase fiscal space: strengthening the economic justice agenda in the context of Financing for Development (FfD); advancing the negotiations on the U.N. Framework Convention on International Tax Cooperation (UNFCITC); and establishing a Framework Convention on Sovereign Debt at the U.N. to enable countries in the Global South to renegotiate their debts under fairer terms.

7. **Specific steps for FAO:** FAO's work should be guided by the human right to adequate food. The mandate given by the FAO Conference 2025 to mainstream the right to food throughout the organization's program of work needs to be implemented. FAO should prioritize a systemic approach to food security through the just transition of food systems, emphasizing agroecological transformation, support for small-scale food producers, agrarian reform, and the promotion of gender equity, women's rights, racial equity, and labor rights. Specific attention must be paid to the livelihoods, rights, and knowledge systems of Indigenous Peoples, Afrodescendants and other ethnically minoritized populations, including peasants and artisanal fisherfolks. FAO should establish mechanisms for effective and meaningful social participation of the diversity of these constituencies.

8. **Specific steps for CFS:** Member States should, as a matter of high priority, concert collective efforts to strengthen CFS as the U.N. global policy coordination platform on food security and nutrition, using its unique convening power and legitimacy as the foremost inclusive intergovernmental and international platform to advance the progressive realization of the right to food. The Rome-Based Agencies (RBAs) should provide formalized and reliable support to CFS. They should also integrate the promotion, use, and application of CFS policy guidance

instruments into their regular programmatic and country work. The World Food Day, October 16, should again become a regular part of the CFS Plenary week, as a clear sign of support of FAO for CFS.

9. **Specific steps to connect Rome-Geneva agency goals:** The protection and promotion of the right to food is the key connection between the RBAs, CFS and the Geneva-based Human Rights System. The collaboration of the World Health Organization (WHO) with the CFS and the RBAs offers many possibilities to strengthen the human rights perspective, given the intrinsic link between the right to food and the right to health.

10. **Specific steps to connect food system goals with Rio Conventions:** The promotion of agroecological transitions rooted in food sovereignty principles is the main common transformational proposal that connects the global food conversation with the three Rio Conventions (UNFCCC, U.N. CBD, UNCCD). Other common threads dealt with as a priority themes in all four U.N. spaces have been gender equality, regulating the corporate sector, the realization of the right to food, and effective and meaningful social participation.

11. **Specific Steps to enhance the Rome-Geneva-New York U.N. agency collaboration:** In the context of the UN80 Reform initiative, connections and cooperation between Rome, Geneva, and New York on issues related to food security and the right to food need to be improved. This includes particularly the cooperation of the CFS and RBAs with the U.N. Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), the U.N. General Assembly, the U.N. Security Council, and the U.N. Secretary General.

12. **Human Rights and Social Participation in the Post-SDG process:** The right to food is fundamental for human life and dignity, and should therefore be considered as a core element of the post-Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) process, to signal a long-term political commitment on the global level, with effective monitoring and accountability mechanisms included. At the same time, meaningful and effective social participation mechanisms should be applied to the preparations of the post-SDG process, starting with the initial deliberations at the SDG Summit in September 2027.

The identified challenges and gaps point to the need for a **comprehensive and intersectoral approach** that ensures effective social participation and connects the different spaces and levels of food governance, from local to global. The 12 elements listed as part of a comprehensive response are neither complete nor exhaustive, but critical to be considered. The **elements show the potential of an interconnected agenda to restore and improve global food governance.** They illustrate how the **right to food** can serve as a **convening cornerstone for collaboration** across the U.N., and from the territorial to the global level.

2. Introduction to the Reflection Exercise

In the **global context** of geopolitical turmoil, we have seen some powerful governments weakening the United Nations and undermining the principles of international law. Their actions have often supported the destructive strategies of a number of private corporations, some philanthropists, and important media and social media channels. In turn, their actions raise serious questions about the stability of the multilateral system, and the future of global governance structures and processes related to food systems.

In response to these challenges, the Brazilian National Council for Food and Nutritional Security (CONSEA) and the Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy (IATP) facilitated a reflection exercise focused on **critical challenges, gaps, needs, opportunities, and proposals related to global governance structures and processes related to food systems**, as well as the human right to adequate food, food sovereignty, food security, and nutrition. **Seven key questions** were addressed:

- In the context of fracturing multilateralism, what are the major gaps and challenges in global food governance and how can they be addressed?
- What revision and reform processes are under way within the United Nations with relevance to global food governance, and how do they evolve in the current geopolitical context? Where are there opportunities to strengthen social participation, democratization and representativeness in these processes?
- What are the challenges and opportunities to strengthen the U.N. Committee on World Food Security (CFS) as the main U.N. policy coordination platform on food security and nutrition?
- What should be the role of the U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) in global food governance? What are the opportunities to strengthen FAO towards democratization, social participation, and representativeness?
- What are the challenges and opportunities to achieve a more effective collaboration between the three RBAs?
- What are key proposals to address, limit and counter corporate power in global food systems governance? Which are the specific implications of such an approach for the U.N. and different governance spaces such as FAO, CFS, the U.N. Development Program (UNDP), etc?
- What proposals in the global finance and climate justice agendas can connect with efforts to address food system transformation?

In addressing these questions, the **objective of the Reflection exercise** was to:

- Facilitate a space for strategic reflection and dialogue among actors from civil society, social movements, Indigenous Peoples, Member States, U.N. bodies, and academic experts on the gaps in global food governance and the potential for reforms in the current geopolitical context, with a focus on interconnections between food, finance, and climate.
- Promote interrelated collaboration among committed actors to reinforce, advance, and connect specific proposals and ongoing initiatives for global food governance reforms, oriented towards a different script for food system transformation, based on mutual appreciation, shared analysis, and specific commonalities in political agendas.

In this line, the reflection process focused on **four tasks**:

- Analysis of current initiatives and discussion processes with high relevance for global food governance, including U.N. reform, discussions on future FAO reforms, the role of CFS as global policy coordination platform, the UNDP Food and Power Initiative, and initiatives from civil society, social movements, Indigenous Peoples, and academia.
- Analysis of interlinkages between global food governance and related processes in the areas of finance and climate, especially linking to debt, tax justice, corporate accountability, finance, climate negotiations, and links to regional processes.
- Strategy discussion among civil society, social movements, Indigenous Peoples, and allies on governance reform proposals from a transformative perspective to defend and advance human rights, social participation, food sovereignty, gender justice, agroecology, climate justice, economic justice, and social justice.
- Dialogue with committed actors from Member States and U.N. bodies on specific and interconnected proposals and strategies for global food governance reforms, to explore and facilitate advocacy collaboration across levels and different institutions.

Underlying all this was a **shared understanding that global food governance reform is, at its core, a democratic project**. The reflection exercise itself was conceived as a small but meaningful contribution to the democratization and emancipation of global governance spaces. Participants agreed this is not a technical exercise in efficiency, but a political effort to broaden the discussion on who has voice, representation, and decision-making power in shaping the future of food systems.

The **format** of the reflection exercise included two moments: an International Workshop on Global Food Governance reforms held at the Rio Branco Institute of the Brazilian Ministry of Foreign Relations on April 29-30, 2026 in Brasilia, and an Informal Exchange on Needs and Opportunities for Global Food Governance held as an online dialogue on May 15, 2026.

Participants to these two exchanges included delegates from international and Brazilian civil society, social movements, and Indigenous Peoples, including: CONSEA; IATP; the Civil Society and Indigenous Peoples' Mechanism for relations with the CFS (CSIPM); the International Planning Committee for Food Sovereignty (IPC); CSOs engaged in the U.N. reform process; civil society networks working on finance, tax justice, external debt, aquaecology, toxics, and climate justice; delegates from the Brazilian government; diplomats working in global food governance, including the U.N. in Rome; staff and officials from capitals; delegates from U.N. and academia, including the UN Special Rapporteur on the right to food, CFS, FAO, UNDP, U.N. University, the High-Level Panel of Experts of the CFS (HLPE), and others. All together between the two events, 86 individuals participated.



3. Gaps and challenges

The analysis of gaps and challenges started in the conceptualizing phase of the reflection exercise. The organizers formulated seven key questions, which framed the interventions and organization of the Brasilia workshop and the subsequent online dialogue. The diversity of perspectives among participants created a broader picture of gaps and challenges for global food governance. Participants also discussed the need for a comprehensive response, as set out in this and the subsequent section of the report. Key challenges are outlined below.

An increasing number of **wars and conflicts** directly generate hunger and exacerbate food insecurity and malnutrition. At the same time, these conflicts drain enormous amounts of energy and resources, weaken the United Nations, and undermine the principles of international law. We see clear violations of the prohibition against the use of food as a means for political and economic pressure and/or the use of starvation as a method of warfare.

Corporate concentration and power in food systems and corporate influence in food systems governance continue to expand inexorably. This has been a trend for the last three decades of the globalization period, weakening the position of small-scale food producers, processors, and retailers, and undermining the sovereignty and self-reliance of many countries and regions. This development has also increased inequalities and power asymmetries and undermined the public interest mandate of state and international institutions. These institutions are seldom adequately protected against conflicts of interest. Corporate concentration has increased, linked to the financialization of agriculture, food, and natural resources; the unregulated advance of digitalization and linked technologies; the international rules that govern intellectual property rights; and the expansion of the market for ultra-processed foods.

Effective public policies to advance the right to adequate food need effective and meaningful **social participation**. However, institutionalized social participation is more the exemption than the rule in food governance at all levels. The lack of social participation, based on the principles of autonomy, self-organization and representativeness, and the lack of respect to the principle of prior, free and informed consent of Indigenous Peoples are among the main gaps in global governance, including within the United Nations.

The **United Nations has been fragmented** and even incoherent for a long time, struggling to overcome a siloed approach to problems and planning, as well as a lack of cooperation within and among its institutions. New spaces and initiatives addressing similar issues as existing platforms continue to proliferate, and are now competing over mandates and resources. These problems are now exacerbated by an erosion of norms: Member States are failing to comply with their commitments, while some of the most powerful Member States show open disregard for the U.N.'s core principles, agreements, and proceedings. The result is a hostile environment with a weakened ability to foster public trust, cooperation, and the possibility of convergence.

While the **need for enhanced global policy coordination**, collaborative governance, and greater collaboration on food security and nutrition is widely acknowledged, existing mechanisms that were reformed for precisely that purpose lack institutional support. This is particularly true of the CFS, the foremost inclusive intergovernmental and international platform on food security and nutrition. There is a major deficit of political and financial support from the Rome-based U.N. agencies (RBAs) for the CFS as an institution, as well as for the use, application, and monitoring of CFS policy guidance instruments in RBA programmatic and country work. There is a lack of legal clarity regarding

institutional and financial collaboration among the three RBAs with regard to the CFS that urgently needs to be resolved and formalized through binding agreements.

The **lack of financial resources** is a major challenge to address the acute and structural causes of food insecurity, hunger, malnutrition, poverty, and inequalities. On the one hand, many countries are trapped in a neocolonial debt repayment system that leaves little fiscal space for public policies and programs that could ensure social protection and mitigate the effects of climate emergencies. On the other hand, unprecedented levels of wealth concentrated among a very few individuals and corporations are not taxed justly or effectively, while the budgets of Official Development Assistance and humanitarian assistance have seen drastic cuts. The economic justice and tax reform agendas have the potential to generate resources at scale. However, the related U.N. processes face opposition from wealthy countries. At the same time, these countries block reform of international financial institutions and the re-purposing of existing financial resources for policies and programs, including those for the promotion of the right to food and agroecological transformations.

The **erosion of normative power** — the failure to adhere to the principles of the U.N. Charter, international law, human rights and international humanitarian law — undermines the credibility of the United Nations. When obligations are broken without consequences, the rule of might over right prevails. The lack of accountability constitutes a serious threat to the legitimacy of the U.N. system.

The **lack of serious and consistent global responses** to major drivers of food insecurity and malnutrition generates deep doubts about the capacity and effectiveness of the United Nations to fulfill its mandate. Those drivers include extreme wealth inequalities, wars and violent conflicts, climate collapse, biodiversity loss, land degradation, pollution, marginalizing and racist policies, gender discrimination, labor exploitation, and corporate concentration.

The U.N. must also confront the **continued and complex assaults of powerful Member States** in which rising nationalistic, populist, and authoritarian regimes seek to impose their selfish and short-sighted interests on the already weakened and vulnerable international institutions for cooperation on peace, development and human rights.

4. Elements of a comprehensive response

i. The need for an intersectoral, inclusive and participatory rethinking of global food governance

A comprehensive rethinking of global food governance must address these enormous and interlinked gaps and challenges with an intersectoral approach, combined with effective and meaningful social participation, and critical capacities to assess, address, and reduce power asymmetries.

More than 30 years of experience with public policies on food and nutritional security in Brazil have demonstrated the importance of an intersectorial approach, including social participation, for the realization of the right to adequate food. Resilient, sustainable, and fair food systems for all can only be achieved in an environment that both protects nature and upholds human rights as universal and indivisible.

The **Brazilian National Food and Nutritional Security System** (SISAN), established in 2006, is a decentralized public system that structures food and nutritional security actions, and coordinates levels of government to implement public policies in the area. The Food and Nutritional Security Council of Brazil (CONSEA), as the participatory mechanism of SISAN, is an outcome of the collective efforts of Brazilian civil society in the fight for democracy, human rights, and equality.

However, the participatory realization of democracy involves conflicts and contradictions. Civil society must continuously develop its capacities to influence public policies and prevent setbacks. In the experience of Brazil, it is important to highlight that it was precisely when CONSEA was disbanded by the former president in 2019, that civil society strengthened itself and organized autonomously from the government, holding a people's conference.

An independent network of researchers conducted a national study, published in 2022, that revealed 33 million people with severe food insecurity during the time that the government cut funding for research and dismantled countless public policies. The defunded research instruments included national institutional surveys such as the National Census, resulting in data gaps regarding the Brazilian population. In 2022, Brazil returned to the FAO Hunger Map, which tracks countries with high rates of food insecurity. A People's Tribunal was launched by the people's conference initiative in response to the dismantling of public policies and the dissolution of CONSEA. The symbolic verdict, which identified responsibilities of the federal executive branch, was forwarded to institutions as the Supreme Court and served as the basis for a lawsuit alleging the violation of the right to food.

With the restoration of public policies and the re-establishment of CONSEA in 2023, Brazil was able to once again graduate from the hunger map, reinforcing the importance of involving civil society in the co-construction of public policies.

Efforts to strengthen and reform global food governance need an intersectoral approach which includes meaningful social participation and a focus on the right to food. Societies need to connect work on food systems with ongoing work on financial and tax reform, corporate accountability, and climate justice. These other processes go beyond the food, agriculture, and nutrition domains, but their interconnected impacts are highly relevant for the future of food systems. Multilateral reform initiatives such as the UN80 process are opportunities to strengthen democratic multilateralism and global food governance.

Closer cooperation among U.N. agencies playing a role in the promotion and protection of the human right to food is critical. Discussions in this Reflection Exercise did not cover all relevant U.N. bodies in this field but focused on enhanced collaboration between CFS, FAO, the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), the World Food Program (WFP), United Nations Human Rights System, including the Office of the U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), the Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food and other Special Procedures of the Human Rights Council, UNDP, the World Health Organisation (WHO), the U.N. Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), the three Rio-Conventions (U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), U.N. Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), U.N. Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the U.N. "Beyond GDP" Initiative, the U.N. Finance for Development (F4D) Process, the U.N. Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UNOCHA), the U.N. Expert Mechanism on the Right to Development, and, to a certain extent, the U.N. General Assembly and the U.N. Secretary General's office.

This approach also requires a **collective reflection and priority-setting process among Member States.** Participants underlined in this context that the 2025 decision by the FAO Conference — the organization's highest governing body — to mainstream the right to food in FAO's program of work, was approved by consensus. Building consensus requires close coordination among committed Member States from the Global South and the Global North, and their continuous engagement with regional groups.

ii. Food is not a weapon, food is a human right

The **use of food as a weapon of war or as a measure of political and economic pressure is a clear violation of the right to food**. The use of starvation as a method of warfare is a clear breach of international humanitarian law. Yet such violations occur repeatedly, and with impunity for the perpetrators.

The **horrendous "normalization" of food as a weapon** has many dimensions, including unilateral coercive measures, unilateral trade restrictions and tariff wars, blockades of humanitarian assistance, destruction of food production, restrictions to storage and marketing infrastructure, and forced displacement of peasant communities, Indigenous Peoples, and other traditional communities from their territories.

There is a global outcry against the use of food as a weapon, which has also been taken up by many U.N. Member States. One outcome of the Brasilia workshop was the resolution to **collectively develop a global campaign to oppose the use of food and hunger as a weapon in conflicts and to uphold human dignity and compassion.** Participants agreed to mobilize and raise awareness around the human right to adequate food and the need to care for people living in war and conflict areas as a universal responsibility and obligation.

To resonate with the full diversity of lived experiences of affected communities, the campaign should adopt a **broad and inclusive understanding of violence, war and conflict**, which goes beyond formal inter-state or civil armed conflict to include the daily, chronic forms of violence experienced by many communities: forced displacement, land grabbing, criminalization of human rights defenders, territorial dispossession of Indigenous Peoples and traditional communities, gender-based violence, and structural violence against Afro-descendent and other racially, ethnically, and/or religiously minoritized populations.

Framing the campaign around this wider spectrum of conflict would **strengthen solidarity and highlight the connections between the struggles** of populations living in declared conflict zones and those facing daily and systemic violence, deprivation and dispossession in their territories where food and food-related resources are weaponized to evict and erase communities and livelihoods.

The campaign should be explicitly **connected to the broader care agenda**, recognizing food as life itself, and recognizing food producers, fisherfolks, peasants, Indigenous Peoples, and women as caretakers and producers of life. Framing the defense of the right to food through the lens of care and life, rather than only through legal and normative language, can strengthen the emotional and political resonance of the campaign, uniting struggles for human rights, food sovereignty, and the recognition of care work as foundational to food systems.

The campaign could serve as a **guiding thread and common theme to restore values and defend norms**, promote the food-related interconnections between international human rights and humanitarian law, and unite struggles for the effective realization of the right to food worldwide.

iii. Defending and restoring the normative foundations of global governance

In times when **powerful nations demonstrate that they will ignore the basic normative instruments of international law**, such as the U.N. Charter, and do so **with impunity**, it is not easy to credibly defend the normative order or to restore the legitimacy of the U.N. From the perspective of the affected people, communities, and countries, the U.N. has failed in its mission.

Countering this erosion of norms requires **building new alliances** among civil society, Member States, and academics who are committed to **defending the basic values of the United Nations while joining hands in protecting, reforming, democratizing and strengthening the U.N.** as an institution. Building such alliances is challenging in the current context, but it is also necessary.

Challenges such as overcoming hunger and food insecurity are a priority in many countries, which makes the issue a powerful catalyst to unite large coalitions of countries, social movements, and civil society actors. The **consistent protection and promotion of the right to food can be a convening point for collaboration across the U.N.**, with participation of Member States, the relevant institutions, civil society, and academia. Recovering basic norms such as the right to food can be a pathway to restore the credibility of the United Nations

Within the U.N. institutions, FAO, CFS, OHCHR, and the U.N. Special Rapporteur on the right to food can play a catalyzing role in fostering collaboration among relevant U.N. organizations and programs for the progressive realization of the right to food for all.

iv. Public policies with social participation

Effective public policies to advance the right to adequate food need effective and meaningful social participation. The Brazilian experience is a living and successful example of how the impact of public policies depends on how those policies are developed and implemented.

Public policy must be responsive to the needs, rights, and capacities of the affected communities and societies more broadly. Historically and today, the knowledge systems and lived experiences of the full diversity of urban and rural people, including Afro-descendent and other minoritized communities, women and gender diverse persons, Indigenous peoples, fisherfolks, and peasant movements have too often been undermined in public policy for food and agriculture. The alternatives they have developed, practiced, and tested in their territories are largely overlooked. The most effective national policies and programs to overcome hunger and poverty in Brazil have benefited from this knowledge through institutionalized social participation, as established and practiced by CONSEA.

Social participation is key to democratizing and informing public policy making on **all levels of food governance: local, national, regional, and global**. For public decision-making bodies on all levels, including the U.N., it is important to **institutionalize social participation mechanisms that respect the autonomy and self-organization of the diversity of rights-holder groups** and civil society organizations, as well as the **Principle of Free, Prior and Informed Consent of Indigenous Peoples.**

The Civil Society and Indigenous Peoples Mechanism (CSIPM) developed at the U.N. CFS demonstrates the potential of spaces that support social movements and organizations that represent marginalized rights holders by providing inclusive and safe space for their engagement. Crucially, social participation mechanisms need to apply facilitation methodologies that enable participating organizations to collectively develop their contributions, positions, and proposals to bring to the decision-making body.

Once a **diversity of rights-holder constituencies** can participate in deliberations on public policies and measures that concern them, there is a potential shift in public discourse and policy making to be more responsive to their needs, rights and realities. These constituencies include fisherfolks, landless, peasants, farmers, pastoralists, Indigenous peoples, women, youth, workers, consumers, urban food-insecure populations, migrants, refugees, people with disabilities, and elderly people. Their voices, experiences, and proposals are crucial to the creation of effective public policies.

Political inclusion of the marginalized is critical to reduce economic and social exclusion. The High-Level Panel of Experts report on inequalities in food systems identified three core elements of the "engine of equity": 1) recognition of realities and people with their rights; 2) representation in public deliberation and decision-making spaces, as preconditions for 3) more equality and redistributive measures. On many levels, social participation has strengthened an agenda of transformational change. The inclusion of marginalized or rights-holder constituencies **changes the way knowledge is co-created**. Social participation supports **re-balancing power relations** in domains where economic and political elites usually connect public policy with their own interests.

In this context, the ambiguous and expanding use of **"multistakeholderism"** as a governance model for U.N. spaces is a problem. Without clear criteria distinguishing rights-holders, and social movements and civil society organizations that advocate for their rights, from individuals and organizations representing private interests — be it corporate or philanthropic actors — multistakeholderism will dilute institutionalized social participation rather than strengthen it.

Democratizing the process of policy formulation gives a **new direction to food system transformation**, based on a human rights approach that includes more recognition and effective support for historically discriminated-against constituencies. It supports sustainability by creating a mechanism for accountability, evaluation, and the adaptation of policies that are not successfully responding to what people need.

v. Protecting public policies against corporate power

Limiting and regulating corporate power is essential to ensure that public interest prevails in public institutions. The high levels of corporate concentration in most areas of food systems are evident across the board, in global and national seed markets; fertilizer, pesticides, farm machinery, and technology; and food retail, particularly ultra-processed foods and beverage markets. Corporate capture of political space is an immense problem worldwide, not just in the food sector. Undue influence from companies has encouraged policies that favor commodification, financialization, concentration, and the unsustainable extraction of natural resources. This has been to the detriment of small-scale food producers and processors, rural communities, territorial markets, and ecosystems.

An important initiative to address corporate power in governance is the introduction of **robust safeguards against conflict of interest** in national and international institutions. A newer concern has emerged regarding the U.N.'s digital infrastructure, which is increasingly dependent on a small number of private technology corporations. This situation raises concerns about data sovereignty, the use of sensitive data collected through food security programs, and the extension of corporate influence into the digital governance of food systems. U.N. institutions, including FAO, should develop **specific safeguards and transparency rules** for their relationships with private firms, especially where companies and private philanthropies are giving or receiving funding.

The ongoing negotiations for a legally binding international instrument to regulate the activities of transnational corporations and other business entities from a human rights perspective (**U.N. Binding Treaty on Transnational Corporations and Human Rights**) are of high relevance for the food sector. Establishing human rights accountability for companies' behaviour is key to overcoming impunity and preventing abuse.

Experts and civil society advocates have proposed a **U.N.-wide Corporate Accountability Framework** that would guide U.N. institutions in regulating relations with the corporate sector and protecting their public interest against corporate power, including in the food sector. Ongoing negotiations to create a U.N. Tax Convention (see next section) include proposed rules to better discipline unfair practices of transnational corporate actors.

The **UNDP Food and Power Initiative** addresses the role of power asymmetries in the context of food systems transformation, including the role of corporate concentration in relation to local, national, and global governance. The Food and Power Initiative brings together diverse actors from civil society, academia, U.N. agencies, international coalitions, governments and philanthropy. Together these groups identify, highlight, analyze, and challenge power asymmetries in food systems, in support of the realization of the right to food, equity, and ecological integrity.

vi. Funding gaps and financial architecture reforms

A **deep paradox** continues to define a core disparity in global financial infrastructure: there is a lack of funding to address global food and nutrition security, while a small number of elites and multinational companies possess excessive wealth. Neither the elites nor the companies pay their fair share of taxes. However, public policies aimed at the realization of the right to food as part of food sovereignty and agroecological food systems require public resources.

Countries in the Global South are more vulnerable to economic crises, conflicts, wars, and the impacts of climate emergencies. To address these challenges, they need public resources. However, many countries face two obstacles: they lose tax revenue due to unfair national and international tax rules, and a significant number of them spend an increasing portion of their budgets on debt service.

The **failed solutions** they continue to receive from international financial institutions and neoliberal economists are to implement additional austerity measures to pay their debts; allocate their limited public resources to provide legal certainty to the corporate sector; continue to borrow under exploitative terms from the international institutions; and concede tax exemptions for corporations in the name of economic growth. These prescriptions have failed repeatedly.

It is possible to increase fiscal space. Three ongoing processes at the United Nations are advancing in this direction:

- **Financing for Development (FfD)**: Strengthening the economic justice agenda by:
    - Influencing negotiations on reforming the international financial architecture, especially international financial institutions;
    - Rethinking Official Development Assistance (ODA) by increasing resources and decolonizing the approach;
    - Reviewing the role of the private sector, global debt rules, and global tax rules (all of which are also treated in specific measures detailed below).
- **Negotiations on the U.N. Framework Convention on International Tax Cooperation (UNFCITC)** — known as the "Trillion Convention," because if adopted as proposed, it could mobilize significant additional public resources. These would come from measures that include:
    - Taxing the ultra-wealthy and multinational corporations;
    - Eliminating illicit financial flows;
    - Eliminating harmful tax breaks (including for fossil fuels, agribusiness, or mining);
    - A fairer allocation of taxing rights.
- **Establish a U.N. Framework Convention on Sovereign Debt** to enable countries in the Global South to renegotiate their debts under fairer terms.

vii. Specific steps for FAO

FAO's work should be guided by a commitment to human rights, specifically, the human right to adequate food. The mandate given by the FAO Conference in 2025, to **mainstream the right to food** throughout the organization's program of work, needs to be implemented. The principles and dimensions of the right to food and human rights must be transversally applied in FAO.

FAO should give **priority to a systemic approach to the just transition of food systems**, emphasizing agroecological transformation and the fight against food insecurity. This calls for effective public policies that: support small-scale food producers, agrarian reform, the promotion of gender equity, women's rights, racial equity, labor rights, peasants' and artisanal fisherfolks' livelihoods and knowledge systems, and specific attention to Indigenous Peoples', afro-descendants and other ethnically minoritized populations.

The **FAO Strategy for Partnership with Civil Society Organizations**, adopted in 2013 and positively evaluated in 2020, needs to be renewed. For the renewal process to be effective it should ensure the participation of small-scale food producers, Indigenous Peoples, and the broader civil society constituency, so that their perspectives are fully reflected in the new framework. The consultation must protect core principles — such as autonomy and self-organisation of civil society and social movements — as well the free, prior, and informed consent of Indigenous Peoples.

FAO should **promote and ensure social participation**, building on the experiences of the regional conferences or the work regarding the elaboration and application of the Small-Scale Fisheries Guidelines (VGSSF). Small-scale food producer organizations contributed with their knowledge and experiences to the development of the normative guidance and have contributed as well to its use and application, through institutional mechanisms established in FAO.

FAO should establish a mechanism for the FAO Council's **engagement with small-scale food producers, social movements, and Indigenous Peoples**. Building on the consultations with CSOs held prior to FAO regional conferences, a similar process could be developed to bring together small-scale food producer organisations, Indigenous Peoples, civil society, and social movements from the urban and rural areas prior to the FAO Council session and after the technical committee meetings each year.

Building on the positive experience of the U.N. Decade of Family Farming, where governments developed national action plans in consultation with national family farming committees, FAO needs to go beyond what has so far predominantly been policy dialogues to establish ways of social participation focused on policy implementation. This would involve **establishing a structured and permanent consultation mechanism** linking FAO's technical departments with small-scale food producers, food systems workers, and Indigenous Peoples' organisations, ensuring the systematic integration of their knowledge and experience into the design and implementation of initiatives and projects on the ground.

It is therefore proposed that a "family farmers hub" be established to serve as a **permanent platform for dialogue between family farmers and the FAO**, thereby strengthening participation and reinforcing the link between local realities and global policy processes. The family farmers hub should apply the same principles and standards set out in the FAO Strategy for Partnerships with Civil Society Organisations.

The ongoing deliberation process on future FAO reforms should include **social participation and consultation** to hear the voices and proposals of the small-scale food producer organizations, Indigenous peoples, social movements, and civil society groups.

FAO should establish and apply more accountable and consistent regulations in their **collaboration with corporations and the private sector.** FAO needs to ensure that it protects its public interest mandate and democratic decision-making against corporate lobbies, with robust safeguards against conflict of interests and clear transparency mechanisms in place.

FAO governing bodies need to **rethink the organization's funding structure**. FAO is too dependent on voluntary contributions, resulting in what is widely seen as a donor-driven agenda that undermines the organization's mission. The transparency of the budget needs to be increased.

The critical issues listed here regarding FAO and CFS should be brought to the attention of candidates and Member States in the context of the **election process of the next FAO Director General.** The transition period towards a new FAO leadership provides an opportunity to rethink and strengthen the role of the democratic decision-making of Member States and to **establish more effective mechanisms** to hold top management to account.

viii. Specific steps for CFS

Member States should concert their efforts to strengthen CFS as the U.N. **global policy coordination platform on food security and nutrition**, using its unique convening power, responding to emerging food crises, and further developing the function of collaborative governance and global policy coordination in the next Multi-Year Plan of Work (MYPoW) 2028-2031. CFS processes and instruments must be protected from setbacks and regressive efforts which intend to undermine the principles and proceedings that have guided the CFS since its reform in 2009.

The **RBAs should provide formalized and reliable support to CFS** and integrate the promotion, use, and application of CFS policy guidance instruments into their regular programmatic and country work. For that purpose, binding agreements between the three RBAs and CFS regarding institutional and financial collaboration should be established. FAO should work closely with the CFS on the uptake of its policy guidance instruments, in the context of the Right to Food mainstreaming mandate given by the FAO Conference in 2025.

Member States, U.N. agencies, and other relevant actors should engage with the implementation of the **2024-2027 CFS Action Plan on Uptake**. The ongoing cooperation between CFS and the Global Alliance against Hunger and Poverty can support significantly greater use of CFS policy outcomes at the national level.

World Food Day, 16 October, should again become a regular part of the CFS Plenary week, as a clear sign of support of FAO to CFS.

Within the discussion on the next four-year program of work for the CFS (2028-2031), a **new balance between the three main functions of the Committee** could be considered. Participants suggested strengthening the Coordination platform function, continuing to encourage more uptake of the CFS negotiated outcomes in other jurisdictions (national and multilateral), devoting more time and energy to substantive negotiations, developing dissemination and application strategies for CFS policy instruments, and strengthening mechanisms for better monitoring and accountability for their implementation.

Connections between the global level and the national level need to be strengthened. Close collaboration between global and national platforms, such as one that exists between CFS and CONSEA, have been very fruitful for both sides. The regional and country offices of the three Rome-Based Agencies, as well as U.N. Resident Coordinators, could play a pivotal role in supporting and further strengthening these connections.

CFS should implement a strategy of **frequent, coordinated dialogues with different regions** of the world to broaden the scope of its discussions and increase public awareness and uptake of CFS decisions and policy instruments at the national level.

CFS should continue to build its **collaboration with the U.N. system, including the three Rio Conventions** (UNFCCC, UNCBD, UNCCD), the Human Rights System, WHO, UNDP, and other agencies addressing power issues. CFS could also deepen its collaboration with ECOSOC, the High-Level Political Forum (HLPF), the U.N. Secretary General's office (UNSG) and the U.N. Security Council (UNSC). Specifically, CFS should get involved in the ongoing global governance reform discussions in Rome and New York and underline the important role of CFS for both the FAO Reform process and UN80.

CFS should **participate in other global policy and negotiation forums**, including those dealing with international financial systems and climate change. The CFS Secretariat should develop a timeline for the relevant policy and negotiation forums where they can promote CFS policy guidance instruments, and work with the Civil Society and Indigenous Peoples Mechanism (CSIPM) to ensure adequate social participation.

ix. Specific steps for the bridge between Rome and Geneva

The protection and promotion of the right to food is the **central connection between the RBAs, CFS, and the Geneva-based Human Rights bodies**.

In recent years, many activities around this theme were organized among the OHCHR, FAO, CFS, the U.N. Special Rapporteur on the right to food and Permanent Representations of Member States to the U.N. in Rome and Geneva. Most of these activities were side events held during the Human Rights Council, the CFS Plenary, and FAO Council Sessions. The informal group of "Friends of the Right to Food" in Rome has been an important sounding board for these initiatives. OHCHR, FAO and U.N. Special Rapporteur have a long tradition of supporting countries in national implementation processes on the right to food, with specific policy guidance instruments developed by CFS. These collaborations should continue.

The collaboration of WHO in the CFS and with the RBAs, including cooperation in country programs, offers many possibilities to strengthen human rights work and the intrinsic link between the right to food and the right to health. Cooperation could be intensified especially to promote sustainable healthy diets, campaign to prevent non-communicable diseases, and strengthen regulation that protects public health (particularly for children) against aggressive corporate advertising of unhealthy foods and drinks.

A practical but often overlooked barrier to social participation in these bridging efforts is the increasing difficulty of physical access for civil society and Indigenous Peoples' representatives to U.N. venues such as Geneva, Rome, and particularly New York, due to rising costs and visa restrictions. Addressing this logistical barrier is a concrete, practical priority for improving the inclusiveness of Rome-Geneva-New York coordination.

x. Specific steps to bridge Food and the Rio Conventions

Promoting agroecological transitions rooted in food sovereignty principles is the main common transformational proposal that connects the global food conversation with the three Rio Conventions (UNFCCC, U.N. CBD, and UNCCD).

This transformational potential is currently at risk. Within the UNFCCC agriculture negotiations, agroecology is constantly challenged by less politically powerful concepts such as "climate smart agriculture" — which, with its narrow focus on greenhouse gas emissions, dilutes the structural and rights-based dimensions of agroecology rooted in food sovereignty. Regenerative agriculture is similarly misused by some actors, as is "nature positive agriculture." Civil society and Indigenous Peoples' organizations should, together with like-minded Member States, defend the integrity of the agroecology concept in the ongoing UNFCCC work program on agriculture.

The Brasilia reflection process did not focus on the other two Rio Conventions. However, many of the commitments made at UNCCD and UNCBD COPs touch directly on agriculture, such as Target 18 of the UNCBD Kunming-Montreal Framework, which commits governments to reform harmful agricultural subsidies. Yet there is little systematic engagement of small-scale producers or other food systems actors at these conventions. Nor is there a collaborative engagement with the CFS.

From the CFS side, the right to food has been an important connector of high priority in bridging with the Rio Conventions, as discussed at the CFS High-Level Forum on "*Tackling climate change, biodiversity loss and land degradation through the right to food*" in 2025. The CFS Land Tenure Guidelines have become a vital policy guidance instrument in all four policy arenas.

Considering the increasing role of agriculture and food systems in the UNFCCC Climate Negotiations and particularly towards COP32 in Addis Ababa (to be held in November 2027), important themes on the civil society agenda such as **gender equality, regulating the corporate sector, and effective and meaningful social participation,** could be topics for enhanced interplatform exchange, mutual learning, and stronger cooperation among the civil society and Indigenous Peoples' organisations, as well as interested delegates from academia, governments, and U.N. institutions.

xi. Right to Food as a topic for ECOSOC, UNGA, UNSC, and UNSG

The **UN80 Reform** initiative proposed by the U.N. Secretary General in March 2025 and welcomed by the U.N. General Assembly (UNGA) in July 2025 has introduced a new dynamic into the entire U.N. system. The initiative includes efforts to improve efficiency, a review of institutional mandates and consideration of possible organizational mergers in the areas of gender equality (U.N. Women and UNFPA), sustainable development (UNDP and UNOPS), learning (UNITAR and U.N. University), and the establishment of a new humanitarian compact that includes UNOCHA and WFP. There is also a proposal to enhance interagency coordination through a Human Rights Group led by OHCHR, which could have implications for the food, nutrition and agriculture sectors.

Connections and cooperation between Rome, Geneva, and New York on issues related to food security and the right to food would **support stronger advocacy for action to address persistent food emergencies and protracted crises**, which inflict severe harm on millions of people every day. The CFS regularly reports to ECOSOC, but the interaction and collaboration between the two bodies, including during the High-Level Policy Forum (HLPF), should be more fluid and effective, particularly on Sustainable Development Goal 2 (SDG2) to end global hunger.

Major debates and resolutions of the U.N. General Assembly have addressed the challenges of food being used as a weapon and starvation being used as a method of warfare. Also, the U.N. Security Council held controversial discussions on these topics, involving particularly the protection of the right to food in armed conflicts. The U.N. Secretary General has repeatedly warned against policy decisions that openly breach the U.N. Charter, international human rights law, international humanitarian law. These same policy decisions have also led to global economic shocks and food inflation.

The U.N. General Assembly considers a Right to Food Resolution each year after the report from the U.N. Special Rapporteur on the right to food is presented, which will happen this year in October 2026. Member States and U.N. institutions could seize the moment to strengthen the right to food agenda in New York and ensure an enhanced collaboration between New York, Geneva, Rome and country capitals.

xii. Human Rights and social participation in the post-SDG process

One of the major shortcomings of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) was the **lack of integration of human rights** into the formulation of each of these global goals, resulting in weakened accountability. The realization of SDG2 (to end global hunger) is effectively out of reach for 2030, yet it is difficult to track responsibility and hold anyone accountable, despite the evidence that some countries are more responsible for this failure than others. The U.N. programmatic goals should be formulated in a way that countries can be held accountable, especially when they explicitly reject the global agreements previously reached by consensus.

The right to food is fundamental for human life and dignity, and should therefore be considered as a **core element of the post-SDG process.** The right to food is a long-term political commitment on the global level that requires effective monitoring and accountability mechanisms. At the same time, meaningful and effective social participation mechanisms should be applied to the preparations of the post-SDG process, starting with the initial deliberations at the SDG Summit in September 2027.

5. Conclusion

The identified challenges and gaps point to the need of a **comprehensive and intersectoral approach** that considers inclusive social participation and connects the different spaces and levels of food governance, including global food governance. The 12 elements listed as part of a comprehensive response are neither complete nor exhaustive, but each is critical to an integrated response to the multiple crises affecting food sovereignty, food security and nutrition, and **the right to food**.

The **outlined elements demonstrate the potential of an interconnected agenda for renewed global food governance** oriented towards the progressive realization of the right to food. The first set of elements directly address specific urgent questions such as the weaponization of food, the erosion of norms, the central importance of social participation, and the need to limit corporate power and reform financial institutions. The second set of elements describes specific steps for FAO and CFS, while the third and final set identifies concrete entry points to connect with other U.N. institutions that could support food system transformation.

Together, these elements illustrate how the right to food can serve as a **convening cornerstone for collaboration** among actors across the U.N. and from the territorial to the global level.

These results and suggestions from this reflection exercise will be shared with a broad range of actors involved in the different spaces and levels of governance related to food systems, as a contribution to ongoing debates in different platforms, and a reflection for further conversations on global food governance reforms.

Appendix: Agendas of the International Workshop and the Dialogue

See following pages.

Agenda of the Brasilia Workshop on

Global Food Governance Reforms

29-30 April 2026

Instituto Rio Branco, Ministério das Relações Exteriores. Brasília

Organized by the Brazilian National Food and Nutritional Council (CONSEA) and the Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policies (IATP)

We are hosting a discussion in Brasilia to take stock of the global context of geopolitical turmoil and its effects on the global governance structures and processes that relate to food systems, the human right to adequate food, food sovereignty, food security and nutrition.

Some powerful governments as well as a number of private actors with global reach are actively seeking to weaken the United Nations. These efforts are undermining the principles of international law. In this context, we are inviting participants to consider seven serious questions linked to food system governance and the future of the multilateral system.

The seven key questions to be addressed by the workshop participants are:

1. In the context of fracturing multilateralism, which are the major gaps and challenges in global food governance and how can they be addressed?
2. Which are the revision and reform processes under way within the United Nations with relevance to global food governance, and how do they evolve in the current geopolitical context? Which are the opportunities to strengthen social participation, democratisation and representativeness in these processes?
3. Which are the challenges and opportunities to strengthen the CFS as the main UN policy coordination platform on food security and nutrition?
4. What should be the role of FAO in global food governance in both its normative and its technical cooperation function? Which are the opportunities to strengthen FAO towards democratisation, social participation and representativeness?
5. Which are the challenges and opportunities to achieve a more effective collaboration between the three Rome-based agencies?
6. What are key proposals to address, limit and prevent corporate power in global food systems governance? Which are the specific implications of such an approach for the UN and different governance spaces such as FAO, CFS, UNDP, etc?
7. Which are proposals that connect with efforts addressing food system transformation in the global finance and climate justice agendas?

Draft agenda:

(Schedule in Brasilia Time, - 2 for Minneapolis, +5 for Rome, +11 for Kuala Lumpur)

<u>29 April - 1st day</u> (hybrid)

9:00-13:00h **Opening, Analysis of the global context and its implications for the discussion on global food governance reforms**

9:00-9:45h **Opening Session: Welcome, introduction to the objectives of the reflection process, framing of the debate**

- Elisabetta Recine, President, CONSEA
- Sophia Murphy, Executive Director, IATP
- Valeria Burity, Extraordinary State Secretary, Ministry for Social Development (MDS), Government of Brazil
- Josué Augusto do Amaral Rocha, Executive-Secretary, General Secretariat, Presidency of the Federative Republic of Brazil

9:45-11:00 **Panel on questions 1 and 2**

The global context of geopolitical turmoil, with massive efforts of powerful actors to weaken the United Nations and undermine the principles of international law, raises heavy questions on the future of the multilateral system, including the future global governance structures and processes related to food systems.

1. In this context, which are the major gaps and challenges in global food governance and how can they be addressed?
2. Which are the revision and reform processes under way within the United Nations with relevance to global food governance, and how are they evolving in the current geopolitical context? Which are the opportunities to strengthen social participation, democratisation and representativeness in these processes?

<u>Inputs from:</u>

- Sofia Monsalve, newly appointed UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food (online)
- Saulo Ceolin, Brazilian Ministry for Foreign Affairs
- Julie Kim, Global Policy Forum (NY perspective on the UN context)
- Ana María Suárez Franco, FIAN International (Geneva perspective on the UN context)
- David McCoy, United Nations University, International Institute for Global Health (online)
- *Facilitation by Sophia Murphy*

Open debate with the audience

11:00-11:30h *Break*

11:30-13:00 **Panel on questions 3-5**

3. Which are the challenges and opportunities to strengthen the CFS as the main UN policy coordination platform on food security and nutrition?
4. What should be the role of FAO in global food governance in both its normative and its technical cooperation function? Which are the opportunities to strengthen FAO towards democratisation, social participation and representativeness?
5. Which are the challenges and opportunities to achieve a more effective collaboration between the three Rome-based agencies?

Inputs from:

- Nosipho Jezile, Ambassador of South Africa in Rome (online)
- Carla Carneiro Barroso, Ambassador of Brazil to the UN in Rome (online)
- Sam Ikua, Habitat International Coalition, CSIPM WG on Global Food Governance
- Carlos Alberto Bona Vargas, MIJARC, IPC WG on FAO Reform
- *Facilitation by Elisabetta Recine*

Open debate with the audience

13:00-14:30h *Lunch Break*

14:30-16:00h: **Analysis of interlinkages between global food governance and corporate power, finance and climate (questions 6 and 7)**

6. What are proposals to address, limit and prevent corporate power in global food systems governance? Which are the specific implications of such an approach for the UN and different governance spaces such as FAO, CFS, UNDP, etc?

7. Which are key proposals that connect with efforts addressing food system transformation in the global finance and climate justice agendas?

Inputs from:

Nathalie Beghin, INESC/Latindadd, on link Food – Debt/tax

Flora Sonkin, SID/CSO for FfD, on Food – Finance

Maureen Santos, FASE, on Food – Climate

Anna Pascal, UNDP, on Power in Food Systems (online)

Hakim Baliraine, African Food Sovereignty Alliance, a regional perspective on food governance

Facilitation by Martin Wolpold-Bosien

Conversation with audience

16:00-16:30h Coffee Break

16:30-18:30h Reflection in Plenary on the day's discussions:

Three Guiding questions, to which participants are invited to respond in light of their own backgrounds, in response to the prior panel discussions of the day :

- What have been the key gaps and challenges for global food governance when analysing the global context?
- What are the priorities and the specific proposals for global food governance reforms we should support and further develop?
- What has come out as specific interlinkages between food governance reforms and corporate power, finance and climate?

Moderator: Silvia Zimmermann, CONSEA

Rapporteur: Magdalena Ackermann, CSIPM Secretariat

30 April - 2nd day (in-person)

Strategy Discussion on global food governance reform proposals from a transformative perspective

Guiding Question for the day: ***How to reinforce, advance and connect specific proposals and ongoing initiatives for global food governance reforms, oriented towards a different script for food system transformation?***

9:00-9:30h Presentation of results from discussions on Day 1

9:30-10.30h **Presentation of specific global food governance proposals** related to key questions of the workshop 3, 4, 6 and 7

- CFS (Input by Melissa Gomes Gil, CSIPM, tbc)
- FAO (Input by Guido Andres Soto, MAELA Chile, IPC)
- Limiting corporate power (Input by Ana Maria Suárez)
- Link to finance and climate (Input by Flora Sonkin and Maureen Santos)

Moderator: Taily Terena, International Indian Treaty Council (tbc)

10:30-10:45h Break

10:45--13:00 Parallel Working Groups:

Discussion on specific global food governance reform proposals related to key questions 3,4, 6 and 7, and their strategic potential for interconnected agendas

Guiding questions:

- In which way can these proposals contribute to a different script of food system transformation?
- Which kind of social and political energy could be mobilized for promoting these proposals?
- In which way can these proposals reinforce each other and be advanced as part of interconnected strategies for transformational change?

Note: Two WG with in-present participants will discuss these questions: one WG will be interpreted in PT and EN, the other one in ES and EN.

Moderators for WGs: Miriam Nobre and Jônia Rodrigues de Lima (tbc)

Rapporteurs for WGs: Nora McKeon and Pascal Benincasa

13:00-14:30 *Lunch break*

14:30-15:00 Presentation of Working Groups

Moderator: Elaine Pasquim, CONSEA

15:00-16:00 Open discussion among participants on their presentation

16:00-16:30 Coffee break

16:30-17:00 **Preliminary summary of the discussion of Day 2**

Moderators of final sessions: Elisabetta Recine and Sophia Murphy

Rapporteurs: Nathalie Beghin and Martin Wolpold-Bosien

Reports based on WG conclusions and discussion in plenary on:

- The potentials of the discussed global food governance reform proposals for transformational change
- The possibilities to advance and mutually reinforce these proposals through interconnected strategies

17:00-17:30 Reactions, comments, amendments from participants, responses from rapporteurs

17:30-18:30 **The way from here to the Online Dialogue and beyond**

Clarification how the workshop reflections will be documented and shared, next steps towards upcoming online Dialogue, exchange of ideas for beyond

Closing round with all participants

Draft agenda of the Political Online Dialogue on:

"Informal Exchange on Needs and Opportunities for Global Food Governance in the Context of a Changing UN"

Preliminary Agenda

Online, 15 May, 3:00-5:00pm Rome time

The online event of 2 hours will be divided in **four moments**

- Opening by Co-convenors Elisabetta Recine (Brazilian National Food and Nutritional Council, CONSEA, and Sophia Murphy (Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policies, IATP): Introduction to the topic and the objectives and agenda of this dialogue (10')
- Sharing reflections from the Brasilia workshop, facilitated by Sophia Murphy, Executive Director, IATP (30')
    - Elisabetta Recine, President of CONSEA - Main reflections and outcomes of the Brasilia workshop
    - Delegates from IPC/CSIPM - Concrete proposals for FAO and CFS
    - Nathalie Beghin, INESC/Latindadd
- Sharing thoughts and reflections on the needs and opportunities for global food governance reforms within an changing UN – A conversation with a panel and participants, facilitated by Elisabetta Recine

  Reactions from a panel (30') composed by:

    - Saulo Ceolin, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Brazil
    - Nosipho Jezile, Ambassador of South Africa in Rome
    - Sofia Monsalve, UN Special Rapporteur on the right to food
    - Anas A. Al-Nabulsi, CFS Chair
    - Andrew Bovarnik, Global Head, Food Systems, UNDP

  Conversation with participants (40')

- Round of conclusions by Sophia Murphy, IATP, and Elisabetta Recine, CONSEA (10')