



Photo: Patrick Gruban, Creative Commons

UNITED NATIONS AGREEMENTS: ADOPTED, FILED, FORGOTTEN?

A brief assessment of selected UN settlements with a relevance to the right to food and rural development

A study commissioned by Deutsche Welthungerhilfe e.V., Bonn

Author:
Uwe Kerkow

May 2012

Abstract

As the Rio+20 summit approaches with its aim of defining “The Future We Want”, it is time to do some stocktaking on past and recent UN documents that serve to shape international law and agendas on the road to freedom from poverty and a life in dignity for everybody.

UN agreements too weak

The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) has been signed by all nations, giving the covenant a high normative impact. With the exception of South Africa and the United States – practically all states have ratified it too. However, many states have filed reservations to specific provisions of the ICESCR. And chances of effectively asserting their rights remain very slim for the citizens of the overwhelming majority of signatory states.

The Convention on Biological Diversity and the Framework Convention on Climate Change are relatively successful legal instruments too. Their character is binding: international law and the *pacta sunt servanda* rule demand their fulfilment. But again: unless this is stipulated by the respective treaty or convention – as for example in the World Trade Organization – there is no mechanism, let alone third parties, to sanction signatory states that do not comply. National sovereignty prevents this.

UN General Assembly resolutions are not binding if they deal with matters external to the United Nations. Therefore, in assessing their significance, caution is particularly necessary. States tend to participate in the adoption of these resolutions because of their non-binding character. The signatory states are very conscious of the lack of legal relevance of UN resolutions. In spite of this, the agreed language in the overwhelming majority of the documents revised here is still rather weak.

On the institutional side, the reformed Committee on World Food Security (CFS) has increasingly become the central UN political platform and decision-making forum on food security, agriculture and nutrition. The reform process is still ongoing. The CFS is very inclusive and is not only open to all member states of the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) or the UN, the World Food Programme and the International Fund for Agricultural Development, but also to international and regional organizations with food security agendas: international and regional financial institutions, civil society organizations, philanthropic organizations, and foundations as well as the private sector (i.e. businesses).

Civil society participation is decisive for success

To a large extent, the importance and success of large summits depend on the contributions of civil society. If large groups of civil society engage in specific issues, the impact of internationally concerted action on these subjects is significantly larger. Examples are the aspect of alleviating poverty and promoting equal opportunities embedded in the MDGs and the notion of gender equality that promotes many activities connected to the International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD) in Cairo in 1994.

And the intervention of civil society is not only vital for the outcome of many processes. It is also of intrinsic value: lively democratic processes help build up worldwide acceptance of ideals like human rights and dignity and thus encourage the coherence of relating regional or global political processes like poverty eradication or the promotion of gender equality.

Do new developments and new ideas require new conferences?

On the one hand, additional texts might become necessary if groundbreaking ideas or developments require a review of the

strategies in place. With respect to the right to food, a UN treaty or convention on land grabbing might be useful if the Voluntary Guidelines on Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the context of National Food Security fail to impact the present imbalances. On the other hand, lively global discussions, activities, and considerable financial contributions during recent years with regard to health issues prove that mass conferences or summits are no *conditio sine qua non* for mainstreaming innovative concepts.

The Millennium Summit and its follow-up provide further evidence that it is not the thematic scope but the political will that decides the success of a conference agenda. Although they cover quite a number of thematically diverse issues, wide-ranging achievements have been made. This success must be attributed primarily to the global – and mutual – mobilization of civil society, national administrations on all levels and international bodies with respect to the MDGs. And what is more: the Millennium Process is a good example that innovative ideas, such as reducing maternal mortality or a new focus on peacebuilding measures, can be integrated into new contexts. The other main advantage of the MDGs is their clear-cut goals that can be used for broad mobilization and for controlling progress. This makes it relatively easy to insist on fulfilling the commitments.

Rio+20 must not fall behind existing agreements

The Rio Declaration of 1992 does not mention the terms ‘food’ or ‘agriculture’ and weighs the right to development against proposed needs of ‘future generations’. It would be helpful if these shortcomings were adjusted now, 20 years later. This is especially important as the Agenda 21 does not mention the right to food either. It solely mentions ‘responsibilities’. Chapter 3 and especially Chapter 4 of this study show historically younger resolutions being more accurate on

the subject of food security and rural development.

Welthungerhilfe has worked for over fifty years to make the vision of a world without hunger come true. In recent years it has become increasingly obvious that in advocacy work longstanding agreements on fundamental goals like combating hunger, poverty eradication and promoting rural development must not be neglected in favour of day-to-day or ‘summit-to-summit’ policies.

Conclusion

Overall, international agreements are too weak. There are several possibilities for states to undermine their binding character: they can dilute the language to reach consensus, refrain from ratifying the treaty or file reservations to it. In many cases a combination of these tactics is used. Although UN General Assembly resolutions lack binding character their language is still quite weak.

It is obvious that the UN summits represent not only different strands of negotiation but also different schools of thinking. Although the participants always work on the overarching goal to improve the situation of people on the planet, the aims of the diverse agreements differ a lot and partly lack coherence. Only sometimes are concerted efforts made to work on the interfaces between these different strands of negotiation. In most of the documents, the parties merely recall earlier results or reaffirm them without defining their relevance for the ongoing process.

However, the lack of consistency cannot hide the interdependencies that exist between the different issues and interests that shape the diverse strands of negotiation. Nor does it hide the fact that none of these processes can be feasible on their own. The question remains if the multitude of consultations points to a lack of efficiency or – in spite of all constraints – to an abundance of resources. Moreover, agendas are often debated much more quickly than they can ever be implemented

– and this would even be the case if resources were considerably higher than they are today.

All this leads to the conclusion that the relevance of the international treaty system rather lies with the process than with the result: talking to each other and to civil society, comparing and relating different interests, working on compromise and consent, and finally formulating common goals are fundamental procedures on the way to a better mutual understanding and cooperation.

With the exception of land grabbing, practically all important subjects connected to rural development and the right to food have been mainstreamed in different UN resolutions so far. Chapter 4 points to this in many vital points. Therefore it may well be argued that it already is an important next step if “The future we want” does not fall behind these agreements. The safest way to ensure this is to reiterate existing documents in the Rio+20 final resolution.

Content

Abstract	2
1 Introduction	6
2 How binding is ‘binding’?	7
2.1 Pact (Human Rights) including Optional Protocol	7
2.2 Convention / Framework Convention including Protocol	8
2.3 Resolutions and Programmes of Action	10
2.4 Conclusions	10
3 Which UN agreements are relevant to the right to food?	11
3.1 Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights	11
3.2 Convention on Biological Diversity	11
Box: The International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture	12
3.3 The Rome Declaration on World Food Security and its follow-up	13
3.4 The Millennium Summit and the Millennium Development Goals	15
3.5 The Earth Summit with follow-up	16
Box: Climate Protection	18
3.6 World Social Summit	20
3.7 The World Conferences on Women with follow-up	21
3.8 Financing for Development	22
3.9 The International Conference on Population and Development (Cairo)	23
3.10 Conclusions	23
4 Recent important resolutions with a relevance to food security and rural development	25
4.1 Equitable economic growth	25
4.2 Food prices	25
4.3 Rural Development	25
4.4 Financial resources	26
4.5 Food security	26
4.6 Gender equity	26
4.7 Smallholders	26
4.8 Environmental sustainability	26
4.9 Access to land and water	27
4.10 Climate change	27
4.11 Energy	27
4.12 Biofuels	27
4.13 Microfinance	27
4.14 Research	28
4.15 Sanitation	28
4.16 Civil Society	28
4.17 Conclusions	28
5 Appendices	29
5.1 Acronyms	29
5.2 Timeline	30
5.3 Link list of all UN agreements examined in the study	31

1 Introduction

From June 20th to 22nd, 2012, the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (UNCSD) will take place in Rio de Janeiro. It is the fourth Earth Summit, also referred to as Rio+20 since the initial conference was held in Rio de Janeiro in 1992. The objectives of the meeting are: “to secure renewed political commitment to sustainable development; to assess progress towards internationally agreed goals on sustainable development and to address new and emerging challenges”.¹

Like all of its predecessors, the Rio+20-Conference will adopt a resolution. And there is a realistic possibility that this text will fall behind earlier resolutions in scope and ambition. The second danger is that the text will lack commitments that are codified in other UN documents like, for example, the declarations of the various food summits, the World Summit for Social Development 1995 in Copenhagen (WSSD) or even the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR).

This study also aims to help “secure renewed political commitment to sustainable development”. In order to achieve this difficult task, we will compare and assess some of the more important UN documents in regard to the right to food. To keep focus, the study concentrates on the last 20 years – with the exception of the ICESCR.

Of course the UN is not the only regulatory body on the international level. However, this study ignores the inconsistencies of the diverse policies that are pursued within the UN system and the organizations attached to it. This is especially important as there is no assessment of the policies of the UN Security Council, the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank and the World Trade Organization. The influences of other international bodies like the OECD, the G8, the G20 or regional partnerships are also omitted.

¹ <http://www.earthsummit2012.org/beta/objectives-and-themes>

2 How binding is 'binding'?

Before we embark on a comparison of the different texts in respect to the right to food we will very briefly examine the different types of UN documents such as covenants, conventions, protocols, treaties, resolutions and programmes of action. In the context of the right to food, food security and rural development, three layers of international law and agreements are relevant: covenants, conventions and (UN) resolutions.

2.1 Covenant (Human Rights) including Optional Protocol

The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights has been signed by all nations worldwide. These rights were proclaimed on the December 16th, 1966 and came into force on the January 3rd, 1976. Practically all states – except South Africa (signature in 1994) and the United States (signature 1977) – have ratified the ICESCR. This provides a high normative significance to the covenant.² However, many states have filed reservations along with their ratifications.³

All state parties that have ratified the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) have to submit regular reports to the UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ECOSOC) on how the rights – including the right to food – are being implemented. ECOSOC then states its concerns and recommendations to the reporting state. There is no direct possibility to prosecute a signatory state that does not make progress in taking appropriate steps to ensure the realization of these rights.⁴

However, the lack of sanctioning mechanisms does not mean that signatory parties may act as they wish. One of the universal principles of law is the "*pacta sunt servanda*" obligation. This Latin phrase means that a party having signed a contract is obliged to live up to its rules. Explicit reference to this principle was made in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties of 1969.⁵ In the preamble, the UN document notes "that the principles of free consent and of good faith and the *pacta sunt servanda* rule are universally recognized".

If a signatory state follows the principles of the ICESCR, it installs economic and social policies to provide an adequate standard of living to all its citizens. If that is not possible it should make gradual preferably measurable progress in its economic and social development (indirect obligation). On top of that it should provide communication mechanisms to allow its citizens to file a complaint if they see their rights mistreated. The least signatory parties should do, is not to discriminate its citizens – or certain groups of them – as these try to make a living (direct obligation).

But the possibilities to effectively file a complaint remain very weak for the citizens of the overwhelming majority of the signatory states. The "enforcement of international law by individual states" comes with some uncertainties.⁶ Rules to the exception are a few international bodies like the European Court for Human Rights.⁷ In spite of that the ICESCR is

² Status of Ratification of the ICESCR: http://treaties.un.org/Pages/ViewDetails.aspx?src=TREATY&mtdsg_no=IV-3&chapter=4&lang=en

³ Ibid

⁴ For example, see: <http://library.thinkquest.org/C0126065/billsanctions.html>

⁵ Compare http://www.judicialmonitor.org/archive_0908/generalprinciples.html and http://untreaty.un.org/ilc/texts/instruments/english/conventions/1_1_1969.pdf.

⁶ See <http://www.eolss.net/EolssSampleChapters/C14/E1-44-01/E1-44-01-TXT-02.aspx>, Chapter 4.3

⁷ See http://www.echr.coe.int/NR/rdonlyres/5C53ADA4-80F8-42CB-B8BD-CBBB781F42C8/0/FAQ_ENG_JANV2012.pdf.

Some states extended the geographical scope of their national legislatures in cases of severe human rights violations (like

for the time being the most important reference for the majority of citizens around the world with respect to the right to food.

To complement the ICESCR the UN adopted an Optional Protocol to covenant in 2008 that offers communications and complaint procedures to groups of people and even single persons should they feel that the state they live in is depriving them of their right to food.⁸ Although the complaint procedure is confidential and the communication procedure does not imply any sanctions to date (March 2012), only 39 states have signed and only 8 of those have ratified the Optional Protocol to the ICESCR.⁹ No G7 and none of the BRICS¹⁰ states can be found among the signatory states so far. The protocol has not entered into force yet because at least 10 signatory states have to ratify. As it has been already four years since the Optional Protocol was adopted by the UN General Assembly, it can be assumed that the small number of signatures results from a lack of political will to strengthen human rights such as the right to food.

There are more signs of insufficient political commitment to enforce these – and other – human rights which cannot be discussed here. In the context of this paper it suffices to note that the dedication of civil society to holding their governments and administrations accountable on their human rights performance is indispensable and will remain so for the foreseeable future.¹¹

2.2 Convention / Framework Convention including Protocol

The Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) was adopted in 1992 and entered into force on December, 29th, 1993. It has been ratified by 193 states (March 2012). Only Andorra, the Holy See, South Sudan and the USA have so far refrained.¹² The high number of signatory parties makes this instrument a very successful one. The character of this – and other conventions – is binding: international law demands the fulfilment of the respective specifications. But again: unless this is stipulated by the respective treaty or convention, there is no mechanism to sanction signatory states, let alone third parties, that do not comply. National sovereignty prevents this.¹³

The CBD has three major goals: the conservation of biological diversity, the sustainable use of the components of biological diversity and the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits resulting from the utilization of genetic resources. This means that the convention *de facto* regulates access to genetic resources (Art. 15) and – if adhered to – serves in this respect as an international market regulation mechanism. The importance of the CBD for the right to food derives is based on its significance for agriculture. As farmers hold a considerable sum of genetic resources (seeds) they belong to the group of core stakeholders in using and protecting biological diversity.

crimes against humanity and torture) worldwide. For more details, see:

<http://www.law.harvard.edu/students/orgs/hrj/iss12/gibney.shtml>.

A second recent development is the “Responsibility to Protect”. It originated from the Rwandan experience and its application has been discussed to prevent people from dying in a natural disaster:

http://www.welthungerhilfe.de/fileadmin/media/pdf/Pressemitteilungen/Brennpunkt_Myanmar_Bomben_auf_Rangun.pdf. Compare <http://un.org/ga/president/63/interactive/protect/conceptnote.pdf>.

⁸ Text of the Optional Protocol to the ICESCR: <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cescr/docs/A-RES-63-117.pdf>

⁹ Status of Ratification of the Optional Protocol to the ICESCR:

http://treaties.un.org/Pages/ViewDetails.aspx?src=TREATY&mtdsg_no=IV-3-a&chapter=4&lang=en

¹⁰ Brazil, Russia, India, China, South Africa

¹¹ For example, refer to the work of the worldwide alliance of watchdog NGOs Social Watch: <http://www.socialwatch.org/>.

¹² Status of ratification of the CBD: <http://www.cbd.int/convention/parties/list/>

¹³ Compare <http://www.eolss.net/EolssSampleChapters/C14/E1-44-01/E1-44-01-TXT.aspx>, Chapters 3 and 4

The CBD is complemented by two protocols. The Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to the CBD¹⁴ is of a predominantly technical nature and regulates the traffic of genetically engineered organisms. With this protocol the international community has reacted to widespread fears that unchecked movements of living, genetically modified organisms pose a considerable ecological risk.¹⁵

In the context of the right to food, the “Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from Their Utilization to the CBD” is much more important as it offers a legally binding framework with respect to access to genetic resources and the sharing of benefits that might result from using genetic resources. The Nagoya Protocol is signed by 92 parties (March 2012) but not yet ratified by any. It will come into force after 50 states have ratified it.¹⁶

The necessity to protect the climate and to mitigate global warming led to the adoption of another international treaty in the form of a convention, the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). The legal character equals that of the CBD. Like the CBD, the UNFCCC was agreed in 1992, and it is currently (March 2012) ratified by 194 States and the European Union (EU).¹⁷ The Convention entered into force on March 21st, 1994; ninety days after the fiftieth ratification. This makes it a very strong instrument – especially as the USA has ratified it too.

The relevance of the UNFCCC to the right to food is substantial. On the one hand, worldwide agriculture has to cope with the effects of global warming. The fewer greenhouse gases that are emitted into the atmosphere, the easier it will be to produce enough food for all. On the other hand, agriculture is a major emitter of greenhouse gases – especially when it comes to rice and beef production and where forests are cleared to farm the land. So the way farmers produce in a certain country influences the balance sheet of greenhouse gases of that state. That in turn influences goal- and agenda setting with respect to future greenhouse gas emissions.

In the following years, countries realized that emission reduction provisions in the Convention were inadequate to reach the common goal of keeping the global temperature increase below the two degrees Celsius threshold: if temperatures rise above this above, scientists fear some environmental changes will become irreversible. They launched further negotiations to strengthen the global response to climate change. To boost the international response to climate change and solve the vast technical challenges, the Kyoto Protocol was attached to the UNFCCC. The protocol entered into force on February 16th, 2005. It has been ratified by 191 states and the EU,¹⁸ which shows that the overwhelming majority of nations is committed to work on the challenges. The Protocol’s first commitment period started in 2008 and ends in 2012.¹⁹

¹⁴ For the full text, see <http://bch.cbd.int/database/attachment/?id=10694>

¹⁵ List of signatories and ratifications of the Cartagena Protocol: <http://www.cbd.int/abs/nagoya-protocol/signatories/>

¹⁶ List of signatories and ratifications of the Nagoya Protocol: <http://www.cbd.int/abs/nagoya-protocol/signatories/>

¹⁷ List of signatories and ratifications of the UNFCCC:

http://unfccc.int/essential_background/convention/status_of_ratification/items/2631.php

¹⁸ List of signatories and ratifications of the Kyoto Protocol:

http://unfccc.int/kyoto_protocol/status_of_ratification/items/2613.php

¹⁹ Compare http://unfccc.int/essential_background/items/6031.php and http://unfccc.int/kyoto_protocol/items/2830.php.

2.3 Resolutions and Programmes of Action

UN resolutions that are legally binding (and legally binding for third parties) have to originate from the UN Security Council. General Assembly resolutions are only binding if they deal with matters internal to the United Nations, such as budgetary decisions or instructions to lower-ranking organs. Most experts consider all other General Assembly resolutions to be non-binding: Articles 10 and 14 of the UN Charter (Chapter 4) refer to the General Assembly as “recommendations”.²⁰ Although it has to be noted that “certain resolutions of the UN General Assembly, in particular those setting out declarations of principles, may be considered as relevant, especially when adopted by consensus”, it is also obvious that “in assessing their significance, caution is particularly necessary, as States often participate in the adoption of these resolutions in view of the fact that they are not binding”.²¹ Of course the *pacta sunt servanda* obligation remains valid once a state has actually ratified resolutions of the General Assembly.

When attempting to implement the human rights promised during the various summits, civil society is predominantly left with the political symbolism built up by the appearance and speeches of the head of states before the UN General Assembly. However, some resolutions of the UN General Assembly have reached considerable relevance – namely the Millennium Declaration and the Agenda 21. The United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED, Earth Summit 1992 in Rio de Janeiro) gained additional momentum as both the Convention on Biodiversity and the Convention on Climate Change were adopted during that summit.

2.4 Conclusions

Overall, international agreements are too weak. If a pact is binding (like the ICESCR or the UN Conventions) there are several possibilities for states to undermine its obligatory character: they can dilute the language to reach consensus, refrain from ratifying the treaty or file reservations to it. In most cases, a combination of these approaches is used. Although UN General Assembly resolutions lack binding character their language is still quite weak.

This leads to the conclusion that the relevance of the international treaty system lies more with the process than with the result. Talking to each other, comparing and relating different interests, working on compromise and consent, and finally formulating common goals are fundamental procedures on the way to a better mutual understanding and cooperation.

²⁰ See <http://www.un.org/en/documents/charter/chapter4.shtml>. Compare http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_Nations_resolution. (This fact seems so obvious to the experts that no one – except Wikipedia – mentions the reason for it; compare, for example, footnote 20.)

²¹ See http://www.mpepil.com/sample_article?id=epil/entries/law-9780199231690-e1393, paragraph 44.

3 Which UN agreements are relevant to the right to food?

This Chapter aims to highlight key passages from various important UN agreements with a relevance to the right to food. The order of the sub-chapters – with the exception of the UNFCCC – follows that of Chapter Two, starting with the more fundamental documents (pact, convention treaty) to proceed to the UN summits. Each sub-chapter starts with the respective summit and then adds some remarks on the follow-up.

3.1 The Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights

Among the miscellaneous UN agreements, the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights is the most fundamental (and oldest) piece of international legislation in force with regard to the right to food. It has to be stressed that the ICESCR does not merely endorse the right to food. It demands to “take appropriate steps to ensure the realization of [the] right” to an “adequate standard of living (...), including adequate food, clothing and housing, and to the continuous improvement of living conditions”.¹ The ICESCR then prescribes measures to reach these goals:

International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, Part III, Article 11:¹

1. The States Parties to the present Covenant recognize the right of everyone to an adequate standard of living for himself and his family, including adequate food, clothing and housing, and to the continuous improvement of living conditions. (...)

2. The States Parties to the present Covenant (...) shall take, individually and through international co-operation, the measures (...) which are needed:

(a) To improve methods of production, conservation and distribution of food by making full use of technical and scientific knowledge, by disseminating knowledge of the principles of nutrition and by developing or reforming agrarian systems in such a way as to achieve the most efficient development and utilization of natural resources;

(b) Taking into account the problems of both food-importing and food-exporting countries, to ensure an equitable distribution of world food supplies in relation to need.

3.2 The Convention on Biological Diversity

The Convention on Biological Diversity does not explicitly refer to food – except in the preamble. The CBD completely lacks references to agriculture and the right to food.

Convention on Biological Diversity, Preamble:¹¹

The Contracting Parties, [are] (...)

Conscious of the intrinsic value of biological diversity and of the ecological, genetic, social, economic, scientific, educational, cultural, recreational and aesthetic values of biological diversity (...)

Recognizing that economic and social development and poverty eradication are the first and overriding priorities of developing countries (...)

Aware that conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity is of critical importance for meeting the food, health and other needs of the growing world population (...)

However, the character of the CBD as a market regulation tool (see Chapter 2) makes it necessary to quote its crucial Article 15 on access to genetic resources in this study:

Convention on Biological Diversity, Article 15. Access to Genetic Resources

1. Recognizing the sovereign rights of States over their natural resources, the authority to determine access to genetic resources (...) is subject to national legislation.
2. Each Contracting Party shall endeavour to create conditions to facilitate access to genetic resources for environmentally sound uses by other Contracting Parties and not to impose restrictions that run counter to the objectives of this Convention (...)
4. Access, where granted, shall be on mutually agreed terms (...)
5. Access to genetic resources shall be subject to prior informed consent (...)
7. Each Contracting Party shall take legislative, administrative or policy measures, (...) with the aim of sharing in a fair and equitable way the results of research and development and the benefits arising from the commercial and other utilization of genetic resources (...)

As the CBD is exclusively directed towards signatory parties (i.e. states), it soon became clear that it is important to create a mechanism to protect the interests of farmers. Especially civil

Box: The International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture^A

Although the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture is not a UN document proper, it was negotiated and approved under the auspices of the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and is thus sufficiently close to the UN system to be mentioned here. In November 2001 the FAO Conference approved the International Treaty. It came into force on June 29th, 2004. So far, it has been ratified by 127 states (March 2012).^B

The Treaty has the same goal as the Nagoya Protocol. Signatory parties recognize the contribution of farmers worldwide to the diversity of crops that feed humanity. Hence, it seeks to establish a global system to provide farmers, plant breeders and scientists with access to plant genetic materials while ensuring that recipients share benefits they derive from the use of genetic materials with the countries and stakeholders that these originated from. In the preamble, the signatory parties acknowledge

“that the conservation, exploration, collection, characterization, evaluation and documentation of plant genetic resources for food and agriculture are essential in meeting the goals of the Rome Declaration on World Food Security and the World Food Summit Plan of Action and for sustainable agricultural development for this and future generations, and that the capacity of developing countries and countries with economies in transition to undertake such tasks needs urgently to be reinforced;”

The text is legally binding but again lacks provisions to sanction defaulting signatory states. However, the treaty is a strong and important link between the Rome Declaration and the policies of the diverse nations. Germany, for example, has proclaimed the treaty to be national legislation^C. This should be the rule, however, more often than not, this is not the case.

A: Full text of the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture see: <ftp://ftp.fao.org/docrep/fao/011/i0510e/i0510e.pdf>. German translation see: [http://www.bgbl.de/Xaver/start.xav?startbk=Bundesanzeiger_BGBI&bk=Bundesanzeiger_BGBI&start=//*\[@attr_id=%27bgbl203s0906.pdf%27\]](http://www.bgbl.de/Xaver/start.xav?startbk=Bundesanzeiger_BGBI&bk=Bundesanzeiger_BGBI&start=//*[@attr_id=%27bgbl203s0906.pdf%27])

B: The list of signatures and ratifications is found at <http://www.fao.org/Legal/treaties/033s-e.htm>

C: See footnote A.

society feared that the more powerful stakeholders in industrialized countries could easily exploit the genetic resources and the knowledge of the people who hold them. The Nagoya Protocol was designed to protect the interests of people who protect genetic resources locally – and thus make further protection of genetic resources economically more interesting for them.

Nagoya Protocol, Article 1:^{III}

The objective of this Protocol is the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising from the utilization of genetic resources, including by appropriate access to genetic resources and by appropriate transfer of relevant technologies, (...) and by appropriate funding, thereby contributing to the conservation of biological diversity and the sustainable use of its components.

Although the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing to the CBD has not come into force as of March 2012, it is important to introduce it here. It has the potential to become an important tool to defend farmers', indigenous peoples' and local communities' rights to their seeds and production systems in the future. However, if civil society does not act as a vigilant watchdog in this arena, the protocol may easily be outweighed by the interests of more powerful actors like national administrations or multinational companies.

3.3 The Rome Declaration on World Food Security 1996 and its follow-up

The Rome Declaration on World Food Security 1996 endorsed the protection of all human rights and fundamental freedoms, "including the right to development and the full and equal participation of men and women".^{IV} On the weaker side, it has to be noted that the language of this resolution is not very forceful: phrases such as "strive to ensure" or "endeavour to prevent" are not very strong. The text is centred on a set of commitments which are quoted below. Each of these commitments is laid out in the Plan of Action. First it describes the underlying challenges, then it explains the "Bases for Action". From these it derives different objectives.

Rome Declaration on World Food Security, Preamble, Commitments^V

we will ensure an enabling political, social, and economic environment designed to create the best conditions for the eradication of poverty and for durable peace, based on full and equal participation of women and men, which is most conducive to achieving sustainable food security for all;

we will implement policies aimed at eradicating poverty and inequality and improving physical and economic access by all, at all times, to sufficient, nutritionally adequate and safe food and its effective utilization;

we will pursue participatory and sustainable food, agriculture, fisheries, forestry and rural development policies and practices in high and low potential areas, which are essential to adequate and reliable food supplies at the household, national, regional and global levels, and combat pests, drought and desertification, (...);

we will strive to ensure that food, agricultural trade and overall trade policies are conducive to fostering food security for all through a fair and market-oriented world trade system;

we will endeavour to prevent and be prepared for natural disasters and man-made emergencies and to meet transitory and emergency food requirements in ways that encourage recovery, rehabilitation, development and a capacity to satisfy future needs;

we will promote optimal allocation and use of public and private investments to foster human resources, sustainable food, agriculture, fisheries and forestry systems, and rural development, (...);

Additionally, the Food Summit adopted a definition of food security that is worth quoting:

Rome Declaration on World Food Security, Plan of Action, Paragraph 1

Food security, at the individual, household, national, regional and global levels [is achieved] 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 declaration of the Food Summit “Five Years Later” (Rome+5) held in 2002 consists of four parts: Preamble, Political Will, Challenges and Resources. The document incorporates the MDGs, the Monterrey Consensus on Financing for Development (FFD) and the HIV challenge into the strategy and introduces the fact that most people suffering from hunger live in rural areas. Strong and repeated linkages between poverty and hunger are emphasized throughout the text. In the preamble, it is stated that “hunger is both a cause and an effect of extreme poverty”.^v The declaration also refers to recent developments such as the “overall decline of agriculture and rural development in the national budgets of developing countries, in [Official Development Assistance] ODA and in total lending in international financial institutions”,^v the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) and the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) Initiative. Last but not least, the resolution endorses the “Voluntary guidelines to support Member States' efforts to achieve the progressive realization of the right to adequate food in the context of national food security”.²² Another important new feature on the international agenda was added in Paragraph 7 of the Chapter “Political Will”:

World Food Summit 2002, Chapter Political Will,^v

7. The vast majority of the hungry and those living in absolute poverty are in rural areas. We recognize that reaching the goal of halving the number of hungry requires that the most food-insecure and impoverished countries promote the alleviation of rural poverty especially through sustained growth of agricultural production, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa.

In comparison to its two predecessors, the World Food Summit 2009 was of a more technical nature. However, Principle 3 of the World Food Summit's resolution in 2009 adds an important strategic commitment to realize world food security and rural development that is discussed in Chapter 4.

Additionally, the World Food Summit 2009 took up the challenge of reforming the Committee on World Food Security (CFS). The aim of the reform process is to make it the central UN political platform and decision-making forum on food security, agriculture and nutrition. The reform process is still ongoing.²³ The CFS is a very inclusive UN body and is not only open to all member states of the FAO or the UN, the World Food Programme and the International Fund for Agricultural Development, but also to international and regional organizations with food security agendas: international and regional financial institutions, civil society organizations, philanthropic organizations and foundations and the private sector (i.e. businesses).²⁴

World Food Summit 2009, Principle 2, Paragraphs 12 - 15^{vi}

Principle 2: Foster strategic coordination at national, regional and global level to improve governance, promote better allocation of resources, avoid duplication of efforts and identify response-gaps.

12. We therefore welcome the efforts of CFS to ensure that the voices of all relevant stakeholders – particularly those most affected by food insecurity – are heard. We endorse the role of CFS in providing a platform for discussion and coordination to strengthen collaborative action (...).

²² These guidelines were published in 2005 and can be found under <http://www.fao.org/righttofood/publi09/y9825e00.pdf>

²³ Compare “The Committee on World Food Security – a guide for civil society”, http://www.actionaid.org/sites/files/actionaid/cfs_booklet.pdf.

²⁴ For more on the World Food Summit 2009, see Chapter 4.

13. (...) CFS will gradually take on additional roles such as promoting coordination at national and regional levels, promoting accountability and sharing best practices at all levels, and developing a global strategic framework for food security and nutrition.
14. We also call for countries to lead and reinforce food security coordination mechanisms and networks, aiming at strengthening coherence of actions at the national level.
15. (...) we support the creation of a High-Level Panel of Experts, whose goal is to ensure the regular inclusion of advice (...)

3.4 The Millennium Summit and the Millennium Development Goals

The Millennium Summit took place from September 6th to 8th, 2000. It culminated in the famous UN Development Declaration from which the Millennium Development Goals were derived. Although the MDGs are very well known, parts the original text of the declaration are quoted here because they contain some aspects that are practically forgotten, especially in its Paragraph 20. The success of the MDGs must primarily be attributed to the global – and mutual – mobilization of civil society, national administrations of all levels and international bodies.

UN Millennium Declaration, Chapter III Development and Poverty Eradication, Paragraph 19 and 20 (Millennium Development Goals)^{vii}

19. We also resolve further:

To halve, by the year 2015, the proportion of the world's people whose income is less than one dollar a day and the proportion of people who suffer from hunger and, by the same date, to halve the proportion of people who are unable to reach or to afford safe drinking water.

To ensure that, by the same date, children everywhere, boys and girls alike, will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling and that girls and boys will have equal access to all levels of education.

By the same date, to have reduced maternal mortality by three quarters, and under-five child mortality by two thirds, of their current rates.

To have, by then, halted, and begun to reverse, the spread of HIV/AIDS, the scourge of malaria and other major diseases that afflict humanity.

To provide special assistance to children orphaned by HIV/AIDS.

By 2020, to have achieved a significant improvement in the lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers as proposed in the "Cities Without Slums" initiative.

20. We also resolve:

To promote gender equality and the empowerment of women as effective ways to combat poverty, hunger and disease and to stimulate development that is truly sustainable.

To develop and implement strategies that give young people everywhere a real chance to find decent and productive work. (...)

The overarching theme of the Millennium Summit 2005 was peace and security and its most important results were constituted in Chapter III of its declaration, named "Peace and Collective Security" which has several sub-chapters; amongst others "Use of force under the Charter of the United Nations", "Terrorism" and "Peacekeeping". The Sub-chapter "Peacebuilding" endorses the establishment of the Peacebuilding Commission.²⁵ Its function can basically be described as an endeavour to satisfy the temporary lack of attention and monetary support for war-torn countries after the cessation of hostilities and before 'regular'

²⁵ Website: <http://www.un.org/en/peacebuilding/>

development cooperation may commence (see quote below). In Paragraph 100 und 101 the Millennium Summit Declaration 2005 equips the Peacebuilding Commission with a structure and further tools as a Peacebuilding Fund²⁶. In particular, the idea to bring those nations into one of the commissions committees that provide most UN troops (for example, India, Bangladesh, Pakistan, Nigeria, Ghana) added substance to the new UN body.

Additionally, the Millennium Summit 2005 brought some technical progress: the Monterrey Consensus on FFD, the issue of south-south cooperation, a long passage on sustainability and a chapter on “Meeting the special needs of Africa” were incorporated into the Millennium Declaration process.

The Millennium Summit Declaration 2005, Chapter III Peace and Collective Security VIII

97. (...) we decide to establish a Peacebuilding Commission as an intergovernmental advisory body.

98. The main purpose of the Peacebuilding Commission is to bring together all relevant actors to marshal resources and to advise on and propose integrated strategies for post-conflict peacebuilding and recovery. The Commission should focus attention on the reconstruction and institution-building efforts necessary for recovery from conflict and support the development of integrated strategies in order to lay the foundation for sustainable development. (...)

The Millennium Summit 2010 took place as a High-Level Plenary Meeting of the General Assembly under the motto “Keeping the promise” which already indicates the direction of the main activities: stocktaking and renewal of commitments. The resolution that was adopted there even contains a chapter called “A mixed story: successes, uneven progress, challenges and opportunities” wherein it was “acknowledged” (Paragraph 20) “that much more needs to be done in achieving the Millennium Development Goals as progress has been uneven among regions and between and within countries.”^{IX} Another chapter contains an action agenda in which a number of specific actions for each MDG are laid out. The first paragraph of the declaration points out the most pressing issue very clearly:²⁷

The Millennium Summit 2010, Keeping the promise: united to achieve the Millennium Development Goals^{IX}

1. We, Heads of State and Government, gathered at United Nations Headquarters in New York from September 20th to 22nd, 2010, welcome the progress made since we last met here in 2005, while expressing deep concern that it falls far short of what is needed. (...)

3.5 The Earth Summits (Rio 1992 and follow-up)

The Earth Summit which took place from June 3rd to 14th, 1992, became famous as a breakthrough in global environmental politics and policies. The Rio Declaration on Environment and Development and the Agenda 21 as well as the CBD and the UNFCCC were concluded at this summit (compare Chapter 2). To enhance the process of mainstreaming environmental issues, the Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD) was formed. The Rio Declaration and the Agenda 21 were adopted by more than 178 Governments.²⁸ That is less than the response to the CBD and the UNFCCC but still impressive.

²⁶ Website : <http://www.unpbf.org/>

²⁷ For more on the World Food Summit 2009, see Chapter 4.

²⁸ See <http://www.un.org/esa/dsd/agenda21/index.shtml> (no list available).

The 27 Principles of the Rio Declaration do not mention the terms 'food' or 'agriculture'. Principle 3 weighs the "right to development" against proposed needs of "future generations". Principle 5 endorses eradicating poverty as an "essential task":^x

Rio Declaration, Principle 3:^x

The right to development must be fulfilled so as to equitably meet developmental and environmental needs of present and future generations.

Rio Declaration, Principle 5

All States and all people shall cooperate in the essential task of eradicating poverty as an indispensable requirement for sustainable development, in order to decrease the disparities in standards of living and better meet the needs of the majority of the people of the world.

Principle 6 prioritises the "special needs" of "developing, least developed and environmentally vulnerable" countries. Principle 8 assumes that a "higher quality of life for all people" can be realized by the elimination of unsustainable patterns of production and consumption" and the promotion of "appropriate demographic policies".^x The role of women is emphasized in Principle 20, the role of the youth in Principle 21. The Agenda 21 does not mention the right to food either. It solely mentions "responsibilities":

Agenda 21, Chapter 3 "Combating Poverty" Basis for Action^{xi}

3.1. (...) The eradication of poverty and hunger, greater equity in income distribution and human resource development remain major challenges everywhere. The struggle against poverty is the shared responsibility of all countries.

On a more practical note, the Agenda 21 demands that signatory states

Agenda 21, Chapter 3, Sub-section "Activities", Paragraph 3.8

(I) Undertake activities aimed at the promotion of food security and, where appropriate, food self-sufficiency within the context of sustainable agriculture;

In Paragraph 3.10 it demands that the UN "make poverty alleviation a major priority". In paragraph 5.46 (activities for implementation), the Agenda 21 calls upon signatories to implement "determined policies" that include "food security, access to secure tenure, basic shelter, and essential infrastructure, education, family welfare, women's reproductive health, family credit schemes, reforestation programmes, primary environmental care" and "women's employment". Such policies should be implemented with "special attention to women, to the poorest people living in critical areas and to other vulnerable groups". Chapter 6 on the "Protection and Promotion of Human Health" and Chapter 12 on "Combating desertification and drought" contain further aspects relating to the implementation of human rights.

Chapter 14 "Promoting Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development" (SARD) refers to the growing population in developing countries, and states that "the major objective of SARD is to increase food production in a sustainable way and enhance food security":^{xi}

Agenda 21, Chapter 14, "Promoting Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development" Paragraph 14.2

(...) This will involve education initiatives, utilization of economic incentives and the development of appropriate and new technologies, thus ensuring stable supplies of nutritionally adequate food, access to those supplies by vulnerable groups, and production for markets; employment and income generation to alleviate poverty; and natural resource management and environmental protection.

Box: Climate Protection

The UN Framework Convention on Climate Change^D and the Kyoto Protocol^E

In Article 2, (Objectives) the threat climate change poses to food production is declared one of the major reasons for the UNFCCC:

“The ultimate objective of this Convention (...) is to achieve (...) stabilization of greenhouse gas concentrations (...) at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system. Such a level should be achieved within a timeframe sufficient to allow ecosystems to adapt naturally to climate change, to ensure that food production is not threatened and to enable economic development to proceed in a sustainable manner.”

In Article 4 (Commitments) agriculture is mentioned as a contributor to greenhouse gas emissions:

“1(c) Promote and cooperate in the development, application and diffusion, including transfer, of technologies, practices and processes that control, reduce or prevent anthropogenic emissions of greenhouse gases (...) in all relevant sectors, including the energy, transport, industry, agriculture, forestry and waste management sectors;”

Paragraph 1(e) of commitments (Article 4) emphasizes the need to “develop and elaborate appropriate and integrated plans for coastal zone management, water resources and agriculture, and for the protection and rehabilitation of areas, particularly in Africa, affected by drought and desertification, as well as floods” with respect to adaption to global warming.

The Kyoto Protocol does not mention ‘food’ at all. However, it reiterates the commitments on agriculture mentioned above; that is the need for sustainable adaption and for mitigation of greenhouse gas emission in agriculture. In Annex A the Protocol defines the following sources of greenhouse gases in agriculture: “Enteric fermentation, Manure management, Rice cultivation, Agricultural soils, Prescribed burning of savannas, Field burning of agricultural residues.”

D: For the full text of the FCCC see <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/convkp/conveng.pdf>; German translation: <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/convkp/convger.pdf>.

E: For the full text of the Kyoto Protocol see <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/convkp/kpeng.pdf>; German translation <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/convkp/kpger.pdf>

Paragraph 14.3 puts the priority of agricultural production “on maintaining and improving the capacity of the higher potential agricultural lands (...)”. Paragraph 14.4 defines a set of “programme areas” to make agriculture more sustainable:

Agenda 21, Chapter 14, Paragraph 14.4

- (a) Agricultural policy review, planning and integrated programming in the light of the multifunctional aspect of agriculture, particularly with regard to food security and sustainable development;
- (b) Ensuring people's participation and promoting human resource development for sustainable agriculture;
- (c) Improving farm production and farming systems through diversification of farm and non-farm employment and infrastructure development;
- (d) Land-resource planning information and education for agriculture;
- (e) Land conservation and rehabilitation;
- (f) Water for sustainable food production and sustainable rural development;
- (g) Conservation and sustainable utilization of plant genetic resources food and sustainable agriculture;
- (h) Conservation and sustainable utilization of animal genetic resources sustainable agriculture;

- (i) Integrated pest management and control in agriculture;
- (j) Sustainable plant nutrition to increase food production;
- (k) Rural energy transition to enhance productivity; (...)

To give a comprehensive overview of all the references that the 400-page document offers in relation to agriculture and poverty eradication would be beyond the scope of this study. It must suffice to name those chapters (out of 40) that relate to our subject most closely: Chapter 10 “Integrated Approach to the Planning and Management of Land Resources”, Chapter 15 “Conservation of Biological Diversity”, Chapter 16 “Environmentally Sound Management of Biotechnology”, Chapter 18 “Protection of the Quality and Supply of Freshwater Resources”, Chapter 24 “Global Action for Women Towards Sustainable and Equitable Development”, Chapter 26 “Recognizing and Strengthening the Role of Indigenous People and Their Communities”, Chapter 27 “Strengthening the Role of Non-Governmental Organizations”, Chapter 32 “Strengthening the Role of Farmers”, Chapter 33 “Financial resources and Mechanisms”²⁹, Chapter 34 “Transfer of Environmentally Sound Technology, Cooperation and Capacity Building”, Chapter 36 “Promoting Education, Public Awareness and Training”, Chapter 37 “National Mechanisms and International Cooperation for Capacity-Building in Developing Countries”. Additionally, Chapter 39 “International Legal Instruments and Mechanisms” refers to the commitment to further develop “international law on sustainable development, giving special attention to the delicate balance between environmental and developmental concerns”.

The “Rio+5” conference was designed as a Special Session of the General Assembly to “Review and Appraise the Implementation of Agenda 21” in New York in June 1997. The document adopted by 165 Nations was called “**Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21**”.^{XI} It does not contain any major new political or financial commitments.³⁰ The delegates declared that the state of the environment was “continuously deteriorating”.^{XI} The Kyoto Conference and the adoption of the Kyoto Protocol were prepared.

The “Rio+10” conference took place in Johannesburg from August 26th to September 6th, 2002. It adopted a political resolution and a Plan of Implementation. Its main outcomes were that the understanding of sustainable development was reviewed and strengthened with special regard to the linkages between poverty, environment and the use of natural resources. The role of the private sector was augmented considerably. Over 220 partnerships between governments, business and civil society (worth 235 million US Dollars) were identified in advance of the summit. Around 60 were announced during the conference.³¹ The MDGs were mainstreamed into the Political Declaration and into the Plan of Implementation. An initiative on Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development (SARD) was launched.³² However, the agreed language of the Political Declaration is quite weak.

Rio+10 (Johannesburg 2002) Political Declaration^{XIII}

2. We commit ourselves to build a humane, equitable and caring global society cognisant of the need for human dignity for all.

12. The deep fault line that divides human society between the rich and the poor and the ever-increasing gap between the developed and developing worlds pose a major threat to global prosperity, security and stability.

²⁹ One year before, in 1991, the Global Environment Facility (GEF) had been established. It now (March 2012) has 187 member governments <http://www.thegef.org/>.

³⁰ See <http://www.un.org/ecosocdev/geninfo/sustdev/es5final.htm>.

³¹ See http://www.johannesburgsummit.org/html/documents/summit_docs/2009_keyoutcomes_commitments.pdf.

³² See http://www.fao.org/wssd/sard/SARDO_en.htm. The definition of sustainable agriculture was taken from an FAO resolution in 1989, compare <http://www.fao.org/wssd/sard/index-en.htm>.

14. Globalization has added a new dimension to these challenges. The rapid integration of markets, mobility of capital and significant increases in investment flows around the world have opened new challenges and opportunities for the pursuit of sustainable development. But the benefits and costs of globalization are unevenly distributed, with developing countries facing special difficulties in meeting this challenge.

Today, twenty years after the Rio summit, the international community embarks on the “Rio+20”-follow-up summit which will take place in Rio de Janeiro (June 20th to 22nd). The objectives of the conference are to “secure renewed political commitment for sustainable development, assess the progress to date and the remaining gaps in the implementation of the outcomes of the major summits on sustainable development, and address new and emerging challenges”.³³ The summit will focus on two themes: “(a) a green economy in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication; and (b) the institutional framework for sustainable development”. “Food” appears as one of seven “critical issues” identified in the preparatory process.³⁴

Participants and stakeholders have been equipped by the UN with a “zero draft of the outcome document” which is entitled “The Future We Want”. It endorses the right to food, putting it in a context with local and global markets and for the first time with “reducing waste throughout the supply chain”. In Paragraph 65, the demand for “more transparent and open trading systems” is repeated.^{xiv}

Rio+20 (Rio 2012) V. Framework for action and follow-up; A. Priority/key/thematic/cross-sectoral issues and areas; Food security^{xiv}

64. We reaffirm the right to food and call upon all States to prioritize sustainable intensification of food production through increased investment in local food production, improved access to local and global agri-food markets, and reduced waste throughout the supply chain, with special attention to women, smallholders, youth, and indigenous farmers. We are committed to ensuring proper nutrition for our people.

It will be interesting to see whether this reference to the right to food survives the negotiation process and what the repeated allusion to food markets will mean politically.³⁵

3.6 The World Social Summit

The World Social Summit (WSS) was held in Copenhagen from March 6th to 12th, 1995. The documents that were drawn up during this summit repeatedly stress the right to development and reiterate the right to food as a human right. However, the process never gained the prominence that the Earth or Millennium summits enjoy. Even the UN’s Economic and Social Council seldom refers to the WSS which diminishes the relevance of the meeting considerably.

Copenhagen Declaration on Social Development; C. Commitments, Commitment 1^{xv}

(f) Reaffirm, promote and strive to ensure the realization of the rights set out in relevant international instruments and declarations, such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the Declaration on the Right to Development, including those relating to education, food,

³³ See <http://www.uncsd2012.org/rio20/objectiveandthemes.html>.

³⁴ Ibid

³⁵ In recent years, there has been a significant increase in speculation in agricultural commodities and staple foods.

Compare http://www.welthungerhilfe.de/fileadmin/media/pdf/Studien/Studie_Nahrungsmittelspekulation_Bass_01.pdf.

shelter, employment, health and information, particularly in order to assist people living in poverty;

3.7 The World Conferences on Women with follow-up

The Fourth World Conference on Women (WCW) “Action for Equality, Development and Peace” took place in Beijing in September 1995. In its Declaration the signatory states noted that “inequalities between women and men have persisted and major obstacles remain, with serious consequences for the well-being of all people”. The declaration also states that the lack of equality between men and women “is exacerbated by the increasing poverty that is affecting the lives of the majority of the world’s people, in particular women and children”. Therefore, the Platform for Action was laid out as an “agenda for women's empowerment”. However, it does not mention the right to food. The term food is solely mentioned in the context of discriminating the girl child.

The World Conference on Women, Actions to be taken, Paragraph 58 ^{xvi}

(e) Develop agricultural and fishing sectors (...) in order to ensure, as appropriate, household and national food security and food self-sufficiency, by allocating the necessary financial, technical and human resources;

(f) Develop policies and programmes to promote equitable distribution of food within the household; (...)

(j) Develop and implement anti-poverty programmes, including employment schemes, that improve access to food for women living in poverty, including through the use of appropriate pricing and distribution mechanisms; (...)

(n) Formulate and implement policies and programmes that enhance the access of women agricultural and fisheries producers (...) to financial, technical, extension and marketing services; provide access to and control of land, appropriate infrastructure and technology (...) and, where appropriate, encourage the development of producer-owned, market-based cooperatives;

The “Beijing+5” conference “Women 2000: gender equality, development and peace for the twenty-first century” was designed as a special session of the General Assembly at the UN in New York from June 5th to 9th, 2000. The participants reaffirmed the Beijing document, but did not add many new aspects.

Women 2000, Platform of Action, Section I. Introduction ^{xvii}

4. The Platform for Action emphasizes that women share common concerns that can only be addressed by working together and in partnership with men towards the common goal of gender equality around the world.

Section II. (Achievements and Obstacles) part A. deals with “Women and Poverty”. In Section III. (Current Challenges) the first paragraph of Part D. (Actions to be taken) contains an indirect reference to economic, social and cultural rights. However, Paragraph 90 is worth mentioning because it not only calls on the signatory states to refrain from violating human rights but demands that they do not exert political pressure through food and medicine supplies:

Women 2000, Platform of Action, Section III., Part D (Actions to be taken)

90. Take steps with a view to the avoidance of and refrain from any unilateral measure at variance with international law and the Charter of the United Nations that impedes the full achievement of economic and social development (...) that jeopardizes their well-being and that creates obstacles to the full enjoyment of their human rights (...). Ensure that food and medicine are not used as tools for political pressure.

From February 28th to March 11th, 2005, the **“Ten-year Review and Appraisal of the implementation of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action and the outcome of the 23rd special session of the General Assembly”**^{xviii} was held. The institutional framework chosen for “Beijing +10” was a session of the Commission on the Status of Women (CSW). Such meetings do not, of course, command as much authority as a General Assembly or an international high-level summit where heads of states meet. However, on top of the stocktaking activities, the CSW adopted a declaration and a provisional agenda.

The same applies to the “Beijing +15” which again took place as a CSW session from March 1st to 10th, 2009, which once more concentrated on review and appraisal. The CSW session **“Global 15 Year Review Process”** adopted a political declaration and seven resolutions.^{xix} Amongst other issues these deal with HIV/Aids, economic empowerment of women and maternal mortality. In this respect it reflects the recent worldwide discussion, activities and financial commitments in favour of health issues.

3.8 Financing for Development

The Financing for Development (FFD) conference took place from March 8th to 22nd, 2002, in Monterrey, Mexico. Although the heads of states were resolved “to address the challenges of financing for development around the world, particularly in developing countries” and set themselves the “goal” to “eradicate poverty”, the right to food and other economic, social and cultural rights are not mentioned in the consensus.^{xx} However, Section II. A. Paragraph 11 contains a reference to the right to development and the “respect” for human rights. The whole of Paragraph 11 is quoted below because it concisely reflects the economically liberalistic spirit of the document as such:

Monterrey Consensus, Chapter II. “Leading Actions”, Section A. “Mobilizing domestic financial resources for development”^{xx}

11. Good governance is essential for sustainable development. Sound economic policies, solid democratic institutions responsive to the needs of the people and improved infrastructure are the basis for sustained economic growth, poverty eradication and employment creation. Freedom, peace and security, domestic stability, respect for human rights, including the right to development, and the rule of law, gender equality, market-oriented policies, and an overall commitment to just and democratic societies are also essential and mutually reinforcing.

The follow-up conference on Financing for Development took place from November 29th to December 2nd, 2008, in Doha, Qatar. In its resolution, the signatory states continue and intensify their propagation of a liberal market economy. The resolution contains a whole section entitled “International trade as an engine for development”. However, the global financial crisis had already proven the limits of free-market functionality which is reflected in the quote below:

Doha Declaration on Financing for Development, Section “Addressing systemic issues: enhancing the coherence and consistency of the international monetary, financial and trading systems in support of development”^{xxi}

83. We also underscore the special challenges emerging from volatility in international commodity markets, particularly the volatility of food and energy prices. We (...) will continue to mobilize resources to assist developing countries, in particular the least developed countries, attain food and energy security. At the same time, we recognize the necessity of a substantial sustainable expansion of food production in developing countries by enhancing investments and productivity in the agricultural sector, including in small-scale farms, promoting rural development and intensifying

agricultural research. It is critical to eliminate barriers to food production, to improve processing and distribution over time and to have carefully targeted safety nets in the event of food crises. We recognize that food insecurity has multiple and complex causes and that its consequences require a comprehensive and coordinated response in the short, medium and long terms by national Governments and the international community. (...)

3.9 The International Conference on Population and Development

The International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD) took place in Cairo from September 5th to 13th, 1994. The outcome document, the “Cairo Declaration and Programme of Action”, was signed by 179 States. The drafting of the whole document was driven by a human rights idea, the concept of sexual and reproductive health and rights of women. This may have led to the relatively strong text and the uncompromising reference to economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to food.

The Cairo Declaration and Program of Action, Chapter II, Principle 2^{xxii}

Human beings are at the centre of concerns for sustainable development. They are entitled to a healthy and productive life in harmony with nature. People are the most important and valuable resource of any nation. Countries should ensure that all individuals are given the opportunity to make the most of their potential. They have the right to an adequate standard of living for themselves and their families, including adequate food, clothing, housing, water and sanitation.

The review process of the ICPD was confined to Ad-Hoc Committees of the UN General Assembly and High-Level Meetings within the UN system.

3.10 Conclusions

At the very first glance it becomes obvious that the UN summits represent not only different strands of negotiation but also different schools of thinking. Although the participants always work on the overarching goal to improve the situation of people on the planet, the aims of the diverse agreements differ a lot and partly lack coherence. The Copenhagen Social Summit and the World Food Summit, for example, shed quite a different light on the obligations of the developed world than the Monterrey Consensus. The MDGs represent a methodologically different approach altogether: different issues and inalienable human rights are condensed into quantifiable goals.

It is only sometimes that interfaces between these different strands of negotiation are explicitly worked upon. One example is the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture that strives to adjust the shortcomings of the Convention on Biological Diversity. The World Social Summit can be interpreted as an attempt to mitigate some effects of globalization. However, in most of the documents the parties merely recall earlier results or reaffirm them without defining their relevance to the ongoing process.

However, the lack of consistency cannot hide the interdependencies that exist between the different issues and interests that shape the diverse strands of negotiations. And it cannot hide the fact that no issue can be successfully solved while ignoring the others. Looking at the other side of this argument means to accept that no strand of negotiation can be feasible on its own. The question remains if the multitude of negotiations points to a lack of efficiency or – in spite of all constraints – to an abundance of resources.

All this leads to the conclusion that the relevance of the international treaty system lies more with the process than with the result. Talking to each other and to civil society, comparing and relating different interests, working on compromise and consent, and finally formulating common goals are fundamental procedures on the way to a better mutual understanding and cooperation.

These observations suggest why the importance and success of large summits also depend on the contributions of civil society. If large groups of civil society are engaged in specific issues, the impact of internationally concerted action on these subjects is significantly larger. And the intervention of civil society has an intrinsic value: strong democratic processes help build up the worldwide acceptance of ideals like human rights and dignity and thus encourage the coherence of relating regional or global political processes like poverty eradication or the promotion of gender equality.

But how are external influences incorporated in an existing negotiation process? How does progress happen? On the one hand, additional texts and negotiations might become necessary if groundbreaking ideas or developments require a review of the strategies in place. This was the case, for example, when the ICPD mainstreamed the new understanding of women's sexual and reproductive health and rights including their right to decide the number and spacing of their children. These rights had not been properly codified before. With respect to the right to food, a UN treaty or convention on land grabbing might be useful if the Voluntary Guidelines on Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the context of National Food Security³⁶ fail to impact the present imbalances.

On the other hand, recent worldwide discussions, activities and considerable financial contributions with regard to health issues prove that mass conferences or summits are no *conditio sine qua non* for mainstreaming innovative concepts, i.e. the obligations of states and private companies to enable all mankind to lead a healthy life.³⁷ The struggle to realise the human right to health through a whole variety of different measures can be perceived as proof that it is not essential to have a string of summits on each major issue.

The Millennium Summit and its follow-up are further evidence that it is not the thematic scope but the political will that decides the success of a summit and its follow-ups. Although comprising quite a number of thematically diverse issues, there have been wide-ranging achievements.³⁸ This success must be primarily attributed to the global – and mutual – mobilization of civil society, national administrations on all levels and international bodies with regard to the MDGs. And what is more: The Millennium Process is a good example that innovative ideas, such as the focus on reducing maternal mortality or peacebuilding measures, can be integrated into new contexts. The other main advantage of the MDGs is their clear-cut goals that can be used for broad mobilization and for controlling progress. This makes it relatively easy to insist on fulfilling the commitments.

³⁶ For the full text of the guidelines, see

http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/nr/land_tenure/pdf/VG_en_Final_March_2012.pdf.

³⁷ For example, campaigns to allow access to essential drugs (compare <http://www.msfaaccess.org/>) complemented by the Global Fund; <http://www.theglobalfund.org/> to name just two stakeholders.

³⁸ In March 2012, the WHO claimed that the MDG on safe drinking water had (already) been met. Compare http://www.who.int/entity/water_sanitation_health/publications/2012/jmp2012.pdf.

4 Recent important resolutions with a relevance to food security and rural development

The purpose of this chapter is to demonstrate that many important aspects of rural development are mainstreamed in recent UN resolutions in a very comprehensive way even now. Therefore, we analyse the consensus already documented in the Declaration on World Food Security 2009 (Rome follow-up)^{VI} and in the Millennium +10 Summit resolution “Keeping the promise”.^{IX}

4.1 Equitable economic growth

It seems obvious that the international community is concerned about the way mankind produces and distributes economic wealth. In the MDG +10 Declaration (Art. 43), the signatory states did not merely “stress that promoting sustained, inclusive and equitable economic growth is necessary for (...) promoting sustainable development”, they insisted that this “is not sufficient”. In their view “growth should enable everyone, in particular the poor, to participate in and benefit from economic opportunities and should lead to job creation and income opportunities and be complemented by effective social policies”. This concept of an inclusive economy is sustained in Article 70 (b) where states pledge to adopt “forward-looking economic policies that lead to sustained, inclusive and equitable economic growth and sustainable development, and which increase employment opportunities, promote agricultural development and reduce poverty”.

It is useful to compare this economic understanding to that of the Rome 2009 Declaration in which Article 17 accordingly confirms that the signatory states “support rural development, creation of employment and more equitable income generation and distribution to overcome poverty and increase access to food.” And on a more specific note they promise to “work to increase public investment and encourage private investment (...) for rural infrastructure and support services, including – but not limited – to roads, storage, irrigation, communication infrastructure, education, technical support and health”.

4.2 Food prices

The experience of the food price hike in 2008³⁹ made governments at the 2009 Rome Summit add even more specific economic references (Art. 23, 24). They pledged to “consider non-market-distorting international measures to mitigate the impact of food market volatility on the poor” and to “encourage the development of measures to manage the effects of excessive price volatility and of adverse weather events”. In order to achieve this, they requested “relevant international organizations to examine possible links between speculation and agricultural price volatility” as a prerequisite and – equally important – to research “whether a system of stockholding can be effective in dealing with humanitarian emergencies or as a means to limit price volatility”.

4.3 Rural development

Additionally, the Rome 2009 Declaration on World Food Security reveals a concise concept of rural development. Principle 3 endorses a “twin-track approach to food security” and urges the relevant actors to, on the one hand, tackle hunger by serving vulnerable groups directly. On the other hand, the document prescribes “medium- and long-term sustainable agricultural, food security, nutrition and rural development programmes to eliminate the root causes of

³⁹ Compare, for example, the FAO Initiative on Soaring Food Prices: <http://www.fao.org/isfp/isfp-home/en/>.

hunger and poverty, including through the progressive realization of the right to adequate food”.

4.4 Financial resources

Although the Rome 2009 Declaration relates to the FFD Monterrey Consensus and emphasises the importance of the domestic (financial) resources of the developing world, it underlines in Article 37 that the “fulfilment of all official development assistance (ODA) commitments is crucial, including (...) the target of 0.7 percent of gross national income (GNI) for ODA to developing countries by 2015 (...) as well as a target of 0.15 to 0.2 percent of GNP for ODA to least-developed countries. In the following Article (38) we find a critique that “the share of ODA devoted to agriculture (...) fell to 3.8 percent in 2006.”

4.5 Food security

It comes as no surprise that the “Keeping the Promise” Declaration (Paragraph 78 (f)) on ODA targets uses the same wording. In Rome in 2009, the signatory states additionally committed “to substantially increase the share of ODA devoted to agriculture and food security” and welcomed “the commitments of the “L’Aquila” Joint Statement on Global Food Security⁴⁰ in July 2009, including those towards a goal of mobilizing USD 20 billion over three years, and we call upon the fulfilment of those commitments”.

4.6 Gender equity

As one of the MDGs deals explicitly with gender equality, we can expect its follow-up documents to recognize “that gender equality, the empowerment of women, women’s full enjoyment of all human rights and the eradication of poverty are essential to economic and social development” (“Keeping the Promise”, Art. 12). Article 23 lists the actions needed to reach this goal. Amongst other things, it calls for the promotion of the “the economic, legal and political empowerment of women”.

4.7 Smallholders

The Rome 2009 Declaration too leaves no doubt about who should be addressed when it comes to promoting rural development. Article 19 contains the commitment to “strengthen the capacity of farmers and the capacity of farmers’ organizations”. Additionally, there is a pledge “to building capacity, (...) with a special emphasis on smallholders and women farmers”. This is reaffirmed with a call to ensure “equitable [market] access for all, especially smallholders and women farmers from developing countries”.

The Millennium +10 Summit Declaration pairs these promises in Article 23 (c) with the commitment to “promoting national food security strategies that strengthen support for smallholder farmers and contribute to poverty eradication”.

4.8 Environmental sustainability

One of the MDGs aims at ensuring environmental sustainability. Accordingly, its follow-up document explicitly refers to the Rio Declaration in Article 77 (a). But it also refers to “the three objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity” (e) and the UNFCCC as the “primary international, intergovernmental forum for negotiating the global response to climate

⁴⁰ Full text: [http://www.g8italia2009.it/static/G8_Allegato/LAquila_Joint_Statement_on_Global_Food_Security\[1\].0.pdf](http://www.g8italia2009.it/static/G8_Allegato/LAquila_Joint_Statement_on_Global_Food_Security[1].0.pdf).

change” (g). In the same article the declaration stresses the need to promote “sustainable consumption and production patterns” (n).

4.9 Access to land and water

In the Rome 2009 resolution one can find a more practical notion on the issue: Article 25 is dedicated to the implementation of “sustainable practices, (...) improved resource use, protection of the environment, conservation of the natural resource base and enhanced use of ecosystem services”. This addresses “access to, and sustainable use of, land and water; maintaining the health and productivity of all ecosystems; and better management of the biodiversity associated with food and agriculture”.

4.10 Climate change

The question of sustainability is closely linked to climate change. In “Keeping the Promise” the states recognize “that climate change poses serious risks and challenges to all countries, especially developing countries”. Therefore, they commit themselves “to addressing climate change (...) including the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and (...) capabilities” (Art. 26).

On this pressing issue the states declared in Rome in 2009: “We will take necessary steps to enable all farmers, (...), to adapt to, and mitigate the impact of, climate change.” (Art. 27) As the discussion on financing environmental policies is very prominent in the Rio+20 negotiations, it might be useful to remember that the Rome 2009 resolutions included the promise “to enhance and develop financing mechanisms (...) to support adaptation to, and mitigation of, climate change that are accessible to smallholder farmers (...)” and the signatories stated that they “will support adaptation by the most vulnerable populations to ensure their food security through social protection programmes and safety nets.”

4.11 Energy

These pledges are complemented in the Millennium +10 Summit resolution with respect to energy generation (and consumption; Art. 46): “We emphasize the importance of addressing energy issues, including access to affordable energy, energy efficiency and sustainability of energy sources and use.”

4.12 Biofuels

Another important aspect of the overarching issue of future climate developments and energy production can be found in the FAO Rome 2009 Declaration, which in this respect also addresses concrete details of new economic developments. Article 30 contains the assurance that the states will “continue to address the challenges and opportunities posed by biofuels, in view of the world’s food security, energy and sustainable development needs”. The signatories expressed their conviction “that the continuation of in-depth studies is necessary to ensure that production and use of biofuels are sustainable (...) and take into account the need to achieve and maintain global food security”.

4.13 Microfinance

An economic issue that is often neglected within the context of rural development can be found in the “Keeping the promise” declaration: Article 23 (r) points out the importance of “expanding access to financial services for the poor, especially poor women, including through

adequately funded microfinance plans, programmes and initiatives supported by development partners”.

4.14 Research

Article 28 of the Rome Declaration of 2009 is dedicated to the promotion of research for food and agriculture, “including research to adapt to, and mitigate climate change, and access to research results and technologies at national, regional and international levels”. This pledge is complemented by promises to “improve access to knowledge” and to “improve the quality of national agricultural statistics and early warning and forecasting systems for food insecurity and vulnerability”.

4.15 Sanitation

Because one of the MDGs concerns water and another sanitation, Article 77 (j) of the “Keeping the promise” declaration speaks of “redoubling efforts to close the sanitation gap through scaled-up ground-level action, supported by strong political will and increased community participation” and “promoting the mobilization and provision of adequate financial and technological resources, technical know-how and capacity-building for developing countries”.

4.16 Civil society

Last but not least, the signatory states of the Millennium +10 Summit Declaration in Article 17 call “on civil society, including non-governmental organizations, voluntary associations and foundations, the private sector and other relevant stakeholders at the local, national, regional and global levels, to enhance their role in national development efforts”.

4.17 Conclusions

If an investigation is restricted to strands of negotiation that relate to one another more closely (and on top of that have been concluded in two consecutive years), their degree of coherence increases significantly. The Declaration of World Food Security 2009 and the Millennium +10 Summit Resolution succeed in pointing out the interdependent dimensions of hunger and poverty eradication of poverty to a thorough degree.

However, the chances of realizing these goals rapidly, steadily, sustainably and comprehensively could be enhanced if they were also addressed in the other processes. If this is not feasible, the topics listed in this chapter should serve as minimum standards that should not be undermined in future summits – and, of course, this includes the upcoming Rio+20 Conference and subsequent negotiations on sustainability and climate change.

5 Appendices

5.1 Acronyms

CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CFS	Committee on World Food Security
CSD	Commission on Sustainable Development
CSW	Commission on the Status of Women
ECOSOC	Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FFD	Financing for Development (Monterrey)
GNP	gross national product
ICESCR	International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights
ICPD	International Conference on Population and Development (Cairo)
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
ODA	Official Development Assistance
SARD	Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development
UNCED	United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (Earth Summit, Rio)
UNFCCC	UN Framework Convention on Climate Change
WCW	World Conference on Women (Beijing)
WHO	World Health Organization
WSS	World Social Summit
WSSD	World Summit on Sustainable Development (= UNCED)

5.2 Timeline

1966	Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights
1967	
	//
1992	Earth Summit, Rio Declaration and Agenda 21 Convention on Biological Diversity, Framework Convention on Climate Change
1993	
1994	International Conference on Population and Development (Cairo)
1995	World Social Summit Copenhagen World Conference on Women (Beijing)
1996	World Summit on Food Security (Rome)
1997	Special Session of the General Assembly (“Rio+5”)
1998	
1999	
2000	UN Millennium Declaration, MDGs Special Session of the General Assembly (“Beijing+5”)
2001	International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture
2002	Financing for Development, Monterrey Consensus Earth Summit Johannesburg (“Rio+10”), World Summit on Food Security follow-up
2003	
2004	
2005	Millennium +5 Summit, Kyoto Protocol
2006	
2007	
2008	Financing for Development follow-up, Doha Declaration
2009	World Food Summit follow-up
2010	Millennium +10 Summit
2011	
2012	Earth Summit Rio de Janeiro (“Rio+20”)

5.3 Link list of all UN agreements quoted in the study

^I For the full text of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights see <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/law/pdf/ceschr.pdf>, German translation: http://www.institut-fuer-menschenrechte.de/fileadmin/user_upload/PDF-Dateien/Pakte_Konventionen/ICESCR/icescr_de.pdf

^{II} For the full text of the Convention on Biological Diversity see <http://www.cbd.int/doc/legal/cbd-en.pdf>, German translation <http://www.admin.ch/ch/d/sr/i4/0.451.43.de.pdf>.

^{III} For the full text of the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing to the CBD see <http://www.cbd.int/abs/doc/protocol/nagoya-protocol-en.pdf>, German translation: http://www.bfn.de/fileadmin/ABS/documents/Deutschsprachige_Fassung_Nagoya-Protokoll.pdf

^{IV} For the full text of the Rome Declaration 1996 see <http://www.fao.org/docrep/003/w3613e/w3613e00.htm>; no German translation available

^V For the full text of the Declaration of the World Food Summit 2002 (“Rome+5”) see <http://www.fao.org/DOCREP/MEETING/005/Y7106E/Y7106E09.htm>; no German translation available

^{VI} For the full text of the Declaration of the World Food Summit 2009 see <ftp://ftp.fao.org/docrep/fao/Meeting/018/k6050e.pdf>, no German translation available.

^{VII} Full text of the Millennium Declaration: <http://www.unmillenniumproject.org/documents/ares552e.pdf>, German translation: <http://www.unric.org/html/german/mdg/millenniumerklaerung.pdf>

^{VIII} For the full text of the Millennium Summit follow-up 2005 see <http://daccess-ods.un.org/access.nsf/Get?OpenAgent&DS=A/RES/60/1&Lang=E>, no German translation available.

^{IX} For the full text of the Millennium Summit follow-up 2010 see http://www.un.org/en/mdg/summit2010/pdf/outcome_documentN1051260.pdf; no German translation available.

^X For the Full text of the Rio Declaration see <http://www.un.org/documents/ga/conf151/aconf15126-1annex1.htm>; German translation <http://www.un.org/depts/german/conf/agenda21/rio.pdf>.

^{XI} For the full text of the Rio Declaration and the Agenda 21 see <http://daccess-ods.un.org/access.nsf/Get?OpenAgent&JN=N9283655>; German translation http://www.un.org/depts/german/conf/agenda21/agenda_21.pdf.

^{XII} For the full text of the „Rio+5“-resolution see <http://www.un.org/documents/ga/res/spec/ares19-2.htm>. No German translation available.

^{XIII} For the full text of the “Rio+10” Johannesburg resolution see http://www.johannesburgsummit.org/html/documents/summit_docs/2309_planfinal.htm. For the Plan of Implementation see http://www.johannesburgsummit.org/html/documents/summit_docs/2309_planfinal.htm, no German translation available.

^{XIV} For the Zero Draft of the Outcome Document of the Rio+20 summit see http://www.uncsd2012.org/rio20/content/documents/370The%20Future%20We%20Want%2010Jan%20clean%20_no%20brackets.pdf; no German translation available.

^{xv} For the full resolution, the Copenhagen Declaration on Social development and the program of action see <http://www.un.org/documents/ga/conf166/aconf166-9.htm>; German translation <http://www.un.org/Depts/german/wirtsozentw/socsum/socsum1.htm#res1>.

^{xvi} For the full text of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action see <http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/beijing/pdf/BDPfA%20E.pdf>, German translation http://www.un.org/depts/german/conf/beijing/beij_bericht.html.

^{xvii} For the full text of the „Beijing+5“- General Assembly’s political declaration see <http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/followup/ress232e.pdf>. For the “Further actions and initiatives to implement the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action” see <http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/followup/ress233e.pdf>.

^{xviii} For the full text of the „Beijing +10“- CSWs political declaration see <http://daccess-ods.un.org/access.nsf/Get?OpenAgent&DS=E/CN.6/2005/L.1&Lang=E>. For the provisional agenda see <http://daccess-ods.un.org/access.nsf/Get?OpenAgent&DS=E/CN.6/2005/1&Lang=E>. No German translation available.

^{xix} For the full text of the “Beijing +15“- declaration see <http://daccess-ods.un.org/access.nsf/Get?OpenAgent&DS=E/CN.6/2010/L.1&Lang=E>. For the text of the seven resolutions see [http://daccess-ods.un.org/access.nsf/Get?OpenAgent&DS=E/2010/27%20\(SUPP\)&Lang=E](http://daccess-ods.un.org/access.nsf/Get?OpenAgent&DS=E/2010/27%20(SUPP)&Lang=E). No German translation available.

^{xx} For the full text of the Monterrey Consensus see <http://www.un.org/esa/ffd/monterrey/MonterreyConsensus.pdf>. For the (partial) German translation see <http://www.un.org/depts/german/conf/ac198-11.pdf>.

^{xxi} For the full text of the Doha Declaration on Financing for Development see <http://daccess-ods.un.org/access.nsf/Get?OpenAgent&DS=A/CONF.212/L.1/Rev.1&Lang=E>. For the German translation see <http://www.un.org/depts/german/conf/a-conf-212-l.1-rev.1.pdf>.

^{xxii} For the full text of the ICPD Programme of Action see <http://www.un.org/popin/icpd/conference/offeng/poa.html>. No German translation available.