

Thematic Integration Brief (TIB)

Governance... and Food Systems



Thematic Integration Brief Food Systems and Governance

This Thematic Integration Brief (TIB) explores the interconnections between food systems and governance. The brief aims to :

- Identify the benefits as well as the challenges of integrating a governance perspective in food systems.
- Put forward policy recommendations for working on the interconnections between food systems and governance.
- Suggest action areas for strengthening food systems governance.

Interconnections at a glance

- Food systems and governance are deeply interconnected. Food systems are shaped by formal and informal rules, institutions, power relations and decision-making processes that determine who sets priorities, who controls resources, whose interests and knowledge count, and who is accountable. Because food systems cut across sectors, actors and levels, from local communities and markets to national institutions and global processes, addressing challenges such as food and nutrition insecurity, environmental degradation or unequal access to resources requires not only technical solutions, but also effective, inclusive and accountable governance. A governance lens helps make power relations and political incentives visible, manage competing interests and trade-offs, and identify politically feasible pathways for food systems transformation.
- The interconnections can be understood through three complementary levels. Together, they help identify both how governance shapes food systems and how working on food systems can contribute to better governance:



Governance **OF** food systems

How are food systems governed?

looks at the structures, actors, rules and processes through which food system priorities, policies and resources are decided and coordinated.



Governance **IN** food systems

How do we govern our food system interventions?

looks at applying good governance principles to food system policies, programmes, institutions and partnerships.



Governance **THROUGH** food systems

How can food system interventions strengthen governance?

looks at strengthening voice and agency, citizen-state relations, institutional capacities, accountability, social cohesion and locally led decision-making.

- SDC applies guiding principles on good governance to strengthen food systems, among which :
 - » **Accountability** - to ensure that powerholders and duty bearers are answerable for their decisions and actions, and can be held to account when obligations are not met.
 - » **Non-discrimination** - to ensure equal rights and opportunities, address exclusion and inequalities, notably valuing indigenous knowledge and practices, and women empowerment.
 - » **Participation** - to ensure every actor in the food system has a voice, including those both in the formal and informal sector, indigenous peoples and/or marginalised groups, and that they are heard by powerholders.
 - » **Partner governance** - to strengthen the internal governance, structures and capacities of food system actors, including leadership, decision-making, accountability, strategic planning and resource management.
 - » **Rule of law** - to ensure that food system actors operate within clear, fair and consistently applied legal and regulatory frameworks, with equal protection of rights and access to justice.
 - » **Transparency** - to ensure that all food system actors have access to understandable and relevant information and decision-making processes, enabling food system actors to make informed choices and exercise oversight.

1. Food Systems Governance in practice

Benefits of integrating a governance perspective in food systems

Applying a governance perspective in food systems analysis, planning and transformation has multiple benefits:

- Ensuring **alignment with international frameworks and rights** is a core function of governance in food systems. This includes adherence to global commitments such as the human [right to food](#), which guarantees regular, permanent and unrestricted access to “quantitatively and qualitatively adequate and sufficient food corresponding to the cultural traditions of the people to which the consumer belongs, and which ensure a physical and mental, individual and collective, fulfilling and dignified life free of fear.” Governments are therefore obliged not only to avoid any measures that result in preventing such access, but also to proactively support activities that strengthen people’s access to and utilisation of resources.
- Food systems governance must account for the diversity of stakeholders and their differing interests and incentives. Tools such as **Political Economy Analysis¹ (PEA)**, help identify the actors, motivations and power dynamics that shape decision-making. This allows to better understand who can drive or block change, and helps facilitate consensus-building and cross-sector collaboration among food systems actors.
- **Political incentives** play a crucial role in driving food systems transformation. Such incentives include fiscal policies, taxation measures and regulatory frameworks that can influence consumers choice and encourage more sustainable and healthier diets, while national policy frameworks can shape the way the private sector actors operate within food systems.
- Effective governance also ensures the **provision of services** along the entire food supply chain, including those reaching producers and consumers. While public institutions such as the public extension systems still play an important role, private service provision has been on the rise particularly in rural areas where public institutions often face chronic underfunding. Digital services are a promising solution for reducing inequality of access and improving distribution efficiency and transparency.
- **Inclusive governance** is essential to ensure that all population groups are considered in food system decision-making. This includes vulnerable and marginalised groups whose participation is often limited. By considering their position in the current food systems status quo, understanding their degree of inclusion and their barriers, local-tailored actions can be designed to increase their participation and strengthen their voice.
- Ensuring **transparency and accountability** within food systems is another key governance function. Robust mechanisms should ensure that decision-makers and powerholders are responsible and answerable for their actions, through e.g. transparent reporting obligations, opportunities for meaningful public participation, and accessible communication channels between citizens and the institutions. Ensuring that information is readily available, reliable, and open to public scrutiny fosters trust, empowers communities, and enables informed decision-making, ultimately driving more equitable and sustainable food systems.
- Good governance facilitates **coordination** across different sectors, levels of government (local, national and global) and communities. By bringing together these different stakeholders, a coordinated and systemic approach is adopted that ensures a diverse range of voices are heard, sectoral silos are avoided, accountability mechanisms are strengthened, and policy formation works across all levels of government.

In Nigeria, the successful introduction of an e-wallet programme for subsidised fertilisers resulted in a higher number of recipients at lower costs and lower leakage. In 2011, the government spent approximately US\$180 million for 600,000–800,000 smallholders, most of which did not reach the intended beneficiaries. However, with the e-wallet digital payment system, the government reached 4.3 million smallholders at a cost of approximately US\$96 million.

¹ References : [Tool for Conducting a Political Economy Analysis of Agrifood Systems and Food Security and Nutrition Policies and Programmes](#), FAO and Institute of Development Studies, December 2024 , and : [Political Economy for Food systems pathway – A new decision tool](#), GAIN, September 2024.

- Finally, governance frameworks should recognise the important role of **civic engagement** and social movements in driving food systems change. Movements advocating for food sovereignty, such as La Via Campesina and Alliance for Food Sovereignty in Africa, have played a significant role in amplifying the voices of marginalised food system actors, including smallholder farmers, challenging the status quo and pushing for change. Civil society organisations have also been instrumental in shaping international instruments such as the [Voluntary Guidelines on Food Systems and Nutrition](#) or on [Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries, and Forests](#) in the context of national food security.
- **Corruption:** can become a significant issue where food-related resources (land, seeds distribution, subsidies, access to markets) are diverted for personal gain and political patronage. Negative impacts include weakening of food system governance and regulatory structures, threatening health, safety, and food security, and leading or contributing to environmental degradation, economic loss, erosion of trust, social inequities, and decreased agricultural productivity.
- **Limited Opportunities for Public Participation:** Food systems are inherently fragmented, with decisions often made within isolated sectors, creating barriers for holistic approaches. As a result, public involvement is restricted, and various dominant interests—ranging from political and economic to ecological and agricultural—compete for influence. This fragmentation makes it difficult to address food system challenges in a unified way, leaving little space for broad public participation in shaping policies or practices.

Challenges of integrating a governance approach in food systems

There are also multiple challenges to working on strengthening good governance in food systems:

- **Working in authoritarian contexts:** We are currently witnessing democratic backslides or recessions of democracy in many countries as they move further towards authoritarianism. There are also other countries that have never experienced a robust democracy to begin with. In authoritarian contexts, there is little possibility for citizens to take part in public decision making, political processes are opaque, and information is often intentionally distorted, while political authority is often concentrated in the hands of a small elite while decentralisation processes are not respected. This means, for example, that working on participative and inclusive decision-making concerning food systems can be challenging when decisions are made by a small group of powerholders, with limited input from civil society or other stakeholders. In some contexts, food may be used for political instrumentalisation; governments might control food access or supply chains to reward political loyalty, for example.
- **Working in war-prone and fragile contexts:** war prone contexts can also have a profound impact on food systems, disrupting access to essential resources and destabilizing production. Conflicts often sever supply chains, isolate communities from food sources, and destroy agricultural infrastructure. Additionally, border closures and trade restrictions, such as heavy tariffs or embargoes, can further limit the availability of nutritious food, exacerbating food insecurity and hindering local economies.
- **Exclusion and marginalisation:** vulnerable and marginalised actors are typically left outside of food systems discussions at all levels, e.g. informal street sellers (which are often women) or small-scale farmers. Policies that formalise markets or are preferential towards supermarkets or large-scale global farming practices are a direct threat to these groups as they potentially lead to eviction/dispossession. Often such policies do not allow them to raise their voice or ensure their voices heard. Furthermore, resource and power concentrations by food system stakeholders and interest groups can further contribute to exclusion i.e. corporate entities capturing the agenda of food systems and dominating policy processes.
- **Inequitable budget allocation for food products/ systems in a country:** A potential challenge for the transformation of food systems includes insufficient and inequitable budget allocation for food systems actions. In general, food systems transformation requires time and therefore investments in strengthening food systems will only show results after a certain time – this length of time is often not attractive at the political level. Furthermore, investments in agriculture as a key sector of food systems might not be perceived as investments in a ‘modern’ and profitable sector and therefore not supported as much as investments in other sectors – all of it resulting in low budgets for food products and food systems.

2. Main areas of action

The following main action areas should be considered for strengthening food systems governance.

Power and authority

Effective food systems governance requires clarity on who has the authority to decide, who implements, and who is accountable at different levels of the system. While food systems are multi-actor and multi-sectoral by nature, decision-making authority is often unevenly distributed and not always transparent. For food systems transformation to be effective, governance arrangements should make authority explicit, ensure mandates are aligned with resources, and clarify whether multi-stakeholder platforms and coordination bodies have advisory, co-decision, or implementation-support functions. Ambiguity around authority can create accountability gaps, slow decision-making, and weaken policy implementation.

- Foster an **in-depth understanding of power relations** and the political economy. This involves recognizing that power is not evenly distributed across the food system and some actors are more marginalised than others. Engage with powerful champions if they are fundamental for achieving policy reform and be wary of actors that could potentially derail progress towards a common policy agenda which is needed for a successful food systems transformation.
- Establish robust **anti-corruption** measures alongside effective response mechanisms to address any instances of corruption within food systems. Enhancing transparency and reinforcing accountability can drive more equitable, efficient, and sustainable food production and distribution. Key solutions include implementing digital food ration cards to prevent resource misallocation and utilizing blockchain technology to improve food fraud traceability. Additionally, organisational strategies, such as strengthening community-based structures, can disrupt organised crime and reduce criminal influence. Initiatives like social farming and the development of social enterprises play a critical role in empowering local communities.

- Ensure that **authority** is sufficiently considered. Sectoral ministries for multi-sectoral issues can be impeded by both a lack of sufficient authority vis-à-vis single sector ministries and insufficient financing for their activities. Solutions include putting a thematically ‘neutral’ and more powerful ministry such as the finance or planning ministry in lead of multi-sectoral activities or to place multi-stakeholder platforms within the responsibility of high governmental offices such as the President or Prime Minister’s office. In addition, vertically divided authority—whereby control of a subnational entity is by a different political party than that which governs at the centre—generates unique political economy dynamics whereby the central authority might try to block initiatives proposed by the subnational entity. In addition, well-organised and financed actors in the food system may have strong incentives to block reform.

Inclusive food systems

- Food systems do not systematically serve everyone’s needs. Access to products and markets are limited for some – not everyone can afford a healthy diet, and women are 10% more likely to be food insecure than men.² Participation in decision-making and policy design is typically low. **Leaving no one behind** and ensuring all stakeholders, particularly the most vulnerable and marginalised, are included in decision-making is paramount together with understanding the root causes of exclusion. In food systems, this could refer to targeting disadvantaged and marginalised groups which have traditionally not been able to access public and/or private services, and to people with a low purchasing power not able to financially access markets. Approaches to ensure that their needs are addressed and their voices heard include participatory policy processes, support for inclusive value chains and producer organizations, targeted access to finance, markets, and extension services, and the integration of gender and social inclusion frameworks to ensure that benefits are equitably distributed across the system.

In 2025, a landmark High Court ruling in Kenya struck down parts of the Seed and Plant Varieties Act that had effectively criminalized farmers for saving and exchanging indigenous seeds, marking a major victory for smallholder movements. The decision legally recognized farmer-managed seed systems and protected traditional seed-saving practices as part of communities’ constitutional rights to food, culture, and livelihoods, strengthening the institutional recognition of indigenous knowledge in agriculture.

2 World Economic Forum 2025 ‘[Food systems: These innovations could help end world hunger](#)’ | [World Economic Forum](#)

- Promote the **recognition and institutionalisation of indigenous knowledge systems and value systems** countering social stigmas and discrimination. Indigenous communities have tremendous knowledge on local ecosystems and traditional inputs, such as seeds, might be much more resilient than new varieties. For instance, the establishment of seed banks has proven to be a best practice to preserve the knowledge and traditional high-resilient seeds.
- Embrace the principle of **bridging the last mile** to allow everyone access to services and information. It is particularly relevant in geographically isolated regions where extension workers and public institutions often struggle to reach those people due to a lack of resources such as time and fuel. This risk of an extension bias – serving only those living next to the extension worker – has been observed in various cases. E-extension services offer one solution to address the challenge. Through the combination of digital technologies, extension officers can reduce the cost and increase the frequency of interaction with farmers. Another promising solution is the Local Service Provider Model whereby lead farmers are trained by public extension staff in the provision of services such as vaccinations. It ensures that access to such a service is provided independently of the availability of the public extension staff. It also creates a direct link between the farming community and the extension officer allowing for direct share of information.
- **Enhance the capacities of food systems actors** to enable them to effectively fulfil their roles within the system and empower them to advocate for their needs and priorities. Capacity building should go beyond technical skills, addressing critical aspects of organisational development to strengthen their internal governance. This includes improving leadership capabilities, resource mobilisation strategies, financial management practices, and accountability structures, referred to as Partner governance. Strengthening these areas ensures that actors are not only able to contribute meaningfully to the food system but also advocate for systemic change, manage resources efficiently, and sustain long-term impact.

Participatory and transparent food systems

- Facilitate the **strengthening of multi-stakeholder platforms (MSPs)** where food system actors can express their voice and be heard. MSPs allow for decision-making to be transparent and coordinate multiple food systems actors across levels of government, sectors and civil society, private sector and academia. If functioning well, MSPs provide an open public space which is accessible to everyone. Different terminologies for MSPs exist such as food councils, food labs and multi-sectoral or multi-actor platforms, yet they all aim for comprehensive membership covering all food system stakeholder groups, including different sectoral representation and inclusion of community groups. MSPs can be established at all vertical levels from national to local and have been viewed as a way of ensuring that policy actions are not limited to ministerial siloes, improving cost sharing, and enhancing policy coherence.
- Strengthen **transparency in processes** affecting the functioning of food systems and the relationships between food system stakeholders. For instance, a key concern in food systems has been the presence of intermediaries in supply chains charging farmers high prices and thereby dramatically reducing their profit. Transparency in value chains would reveal the prices charged and profits taken and would allow for a fair price to be paid to the downstream supply chain actors particularly farmers. In the last years various initiatives have tried to tackle this issue. For instance, 'equal profit certification' allows the tracing of all products, or component of products, along the supply chain and permits for all supply chain actors to receive an equitable share of the profit.
- Transparency and participation are essential but insufficient on their own. **Accountability** requires mechanisms that ensure decision-makers and powerholders are answerable for their actions and that corrective measures are taken when commitments are not met. Strong accountability in food systems governance typically includes: clear mandates and responsibilities, reporting and review mechanisms, feedback and grievance channels, and the space for corrective measures.

The National Council on Food Security and Nutrition in Brazil (CONSEA) is an impressive example of civic engagement for ensuring the accountability of state institutions. CONSEA was officially established in 1993 after movement around ethics in politics and against hunger sparked a major national mobilisation. CONSEA is an advisory body to the Presidency of the Republic of Brazil and aims to propose and monitor public policies related to food and nutrition security and the Right to Food. One of the key strengths is its diverse membership including civil society, private sector and the government. Civil society plays a key role representing two thirds of the total membership. Other members include 24 government sectors that work in food and nutrition security and private sector entities such as food supply centre associations and organic producers' cooperatives.

- Strengthening the voice of **rights-holders**, particularly consumers, in food systems requires creating mechanisms that allow them to meaningfully influence food policies, markets, and accountability processes. This can include participatory food policy councils, consumer representation in regulatory and standard-setting bodies, stronger transparency through food labelling and information systems, and support for civil society organizations that advocate for safe, nutritious, and affordable food. Together, these approaches help ensure that food systems respond not only to producers and markets, but also to the rights, needs, and preferences of the people they are meant to serve.
 - Engaging the **private sector** is essential, as these shape production practices, market access, pricing, and consumer behaviour. However, governance frameworks must ensure that such engagement supports public objectives. Effective food systems governance balances collaboration with regulation, ensuring that market power does not undermine public interest or marginalise vulnerable actors, and reciprocally that the regulatory framework does not hamper the development of the private sector. This calls among others for clear rules for private sector participation and alignment of public incentives, but also requires safeguards and mechanisms to hold the private sector accountable for its social, environmental and nutritional impacts.
- » Defining a monitoring mechanism for measuring food systems change.
 - Support **global policy dialogues** and peer-to-peer exchanges on food systems transformation to share successes and learn about best practices to sensitise decision-makers and motivate them to apply such actions in their own food system(s). It is encouraging to see that various global policy dialogues have recognised the importance of food systems governance, including the UN Food Systems Summit and the follow-up process, which will end in 2030.
 - Facilitate **integrated, multi sectoral planning and coordination** through jointly prepared workplans that link financing, planning, implementation, and monitoring across sectors and levels of government. Such workplans should clearly define priorities, sectoral responsibilities, budgets, and reporting mechanisms, and support both horizontal (cross sector) and vertical (national–local) integration. National action plans on nutrition, including those developed under the Scaling Up Nutrition initiative, provide concrete examples of how multi sectoral food related interventions can be coordinated and financed in a coherent manner.
 - Strengthen governance mechanisms to manage **policy coherence** and **trade offs** inherent in food systems transformation. Any intervention in one part of the system can have ripple effects elsewhere (e.g. wage regulations affecting food prices or nutrition outcomes), requiring systematic assessment of impacts, explicit prioritisation, and transparent decision making. Good governance does not eliminate trade offs, but ensures they are recognised, openly debated, and politically owned, using tools such as policy dialogues, impact assessments, and participatory decision making processes to manage tensions and build consensus.
 - Ensure **fair taxation** of food items incentivizing healthier food items and take account of hidden costs paid by the larger society such as public health costs linked to the treatment of overnutrition. In recent years, various countries have introduced taxes on high sugar-sweetened beverages and food items. It was observed that this led to a reformulation of those drinks and overall reduced the sugar intake therefore contributing to healthier food products and healthier living.
 - **Subsidies** to the private sector play a major role in shaping food systems, influencing production choices, market dynamics, and environmental outcomes. However, many existing subsidies inadvertently incentivize practices that undermine sustainability or nutrition goals. Governments need to be able to identify these conflicting subsidies, and address these by gradually reducing harmful subsidies, redirecting public support toward sustainable practices and innovation, and aligning incentives with policy priorities such as climate resilience, biodiversity protection, and healthy diets.

Policy coordination, coherence and dialogue

- **Strengthening of policy dialogues** fosters an understanding of and increasing awareness between different actors on their motivation and interest in the food system. The action supports compromise and consensus-building, helps to create a common vision across a broad range of actors and contributes to making discussions on food systems more inclusive by allowing those not normally empowered to raise their voice. A successful food system policy dialogue requires the following actions:
 - » Defining the key food system outcome to be addressed;
 - » Understanding the relevant food system(s) including food system stakeholders, their interest and influence in the food system as well as their relation among each other;
 - » Assessing key bottlenecks and malfunctioning in the food(s) systems;
 - » Selecting the right participatory mechanisms;
 - » Agreeing jointly on the objective concerning food systems change/transformation;
 - » Agreeing on interventions and responsibilities;

Decentralisation and territorial food systems governance

- Strengthening the **territorial governance** of food systems is crucial, as these systems are inherently spatial and deeply interconnected. Urbanisation, for example, has not only restructured the spatial dynamics of food systems but also shifted consumer preferences. While urban agriculture holds significant potential to contribute to resilient urban food systems, it cannot fully replace agricultural production in peri-urban and rural areas, which remain vital for ensuring the availability and accessibility of healthy food for urban populations. Unfortunately, spatial planning and land-use management across the rural-urban continuum are often fragmented, with responsibilities divided among multiple municipalities. To address this, mechanisms are needed to foster collaboration between municipalities, enabling the development of integrated and coherent approaches to spatial planning and land-use management. Consequently, effective territorial food systems governance must consider urban-rural linkages and regional development balances to ensure sustainable food access and resilience.
- When implemented effectively, **decentralisation** can significantly empower local decision-making, enabling more tailored and context-specific approaches to food system challenges. Devolving authority to local governments fosters greater accountability in shaping food system changes and ensures that policies align more closely with local needs. For example, localised food system strategies are designed to address the unique dynamics of each community, leading to more effective food system outcomes. When political responsibility is transferred to local governments, accompanied by adequate budget allocation, it facilitates the development of solutions that are not only locally relevant but also more effective.
- Robust infrastructure, such as roads, storage facilities, and market access, is essential for ensuring the availability and accessibility of food, especially in rural or underserved areas. Investing in **local economic development** not only bolsters food system efficiency but also enhances resilience, enabling vulnerable households to maintain access to nutritious food during periods of economic shocks or environmental stresses. A prime example of this was during the Covid-19 pandemic, when many households faced challenges in accessing healthy food due to trade disruptions and rising prices.

A case in point is Tanzania, where a dedicated budget for nutrition initiatives is allocated to local governments based on the number of children under five years old. Additionally, local governments in Tanzania have the authority to create and implement food strategies as part of their broader urban development plans, ensuring that food systems are integrated into overall community growth and sustainability.

3. Key Recommendations and resources

Recommendations

- **Analyse power relations on a continual basis and adapt food transformation actions accordingly** – use political economy analysis to analyse stakeholder interactions and power-related aspects. This can also help unpack the ‘black-box’ of political will, and develop food systems actions that are realistic and locally-led. Political economy analysis also provides a means of pinpointing champions who can drive change and identifying potential blockages to change.
 - **Establish multi-stakeholder platforms (MSPs)**
 - MSPs allow for a diverse range of stakeholders across different sectors and localities to come together and work towards policy coherence and consensus. These MSPs should be inclusive ensuring that everyone, including the most marginalised and vulnerable, have a voice and are heard so no one is left behind in food systems transformation.
 - **Strengthen transparency and accountability mechanisms** for more responsive, equitable, and resilient food systems, ensuring that policies and investments deliver tangible benefits for producers, consumers, and the environment. This can include publicly accessible data on food production, pricing, and trade, participatory monitoring of policies and programmes, and mechanisms that allow citizens and stakeholders to provide feedback or challenge decisions. **Digitalisation** can further strengthen these processes by e.g. enabling real-time data, traceability tools, and platforms for stakeholder engagement.
 - **Support locally-led and decentralised decision-making** - by ensuring that policies and interventions reflect the realities, priorities, and knowledge of the communities most directly involved in food production, distribution, and consumption. Food systems can become more context-specific, responsive, and resilient, while strengthening ownership, accountability, and the integration of local and indigenous knowledge.
 - **Enhance organisational development of food systems actors** – such as institutions, producer organizations, and civil society - to improve among others governance, leadership, coordination, technical expertise, strategic and budgetary planning, and/or resource mobilisation, strengthening their capacity to effectively and sustainably participate in, influence, and benefit from food systems.
 - A commonly used framework for assessing whether a food system delivers for people is the “5 A’s”:
 - » **Availability** – Sufficient quantities of food are produced and supplied through markets or other channels.
 - » **Accessibility** – People can physically reach food (through markets, infrastructure, or distribution systems).
 - » **Affordability** – Food prices are within the economic reach of households without compromising other essential needs.
 - » **Acceptability** – Food is culturally appropriate, safe, and aligned with dietary preferences and norms.
 - » **Adequacy** – Food provides the necessary nutritional quality and diversity to support healthy diets.
- An additional dimension has emerged over the past few years, emphasizing the structural issue of inclusive governance :
- » **Agency**, which refers to people’s ability to make their own decisions about food: what they eat, how food is produced, and how food systems are governed. It includes having the understanding, power, voice, and rights to influence food choices, food environments, and policies that shape the system.

Recommended reading

SDC tools and approaches :

- [Transversal/Cross-cutting Governance approach](#)
- [Governance work](#), including the [Guidance on Locally-Led Cooperation](#)
- [Governance Tools](#), including :
 - » [Tools on Political Economy](#), incl. [SDC's Political Economy Approach](#)
 - » [Tools on Anti-Corruption](#)
 - » [Tools on Digital Governance](#), incl. [SDC Working Aid on Artificial Intelligence](#)
- [Governance Reference Indicators](#) (measuring all aspects of this paper), as well as the Policy Marker Governance

Further tools :

- FAO and Institute of Development Studies, [Tool for Conducting a Political Economy Analysis of Agrifood Systems and Food Security and Nutrition Policies and Programmes](#), 2024
- GAIN - [Political Economy for Food systems pathway – A new decision tool](#), 2024.

Further readings & references :

- Committee on world Food Security CFS – the [HLPE frameworks](#) on food systems governance, including :
 - » [Harnessing Artificial Intelligence, Digitalization and Data Governance for Food Security and Nutrition](#), 2026.
 - » [Reducing Inequalities in Food Security and Nutrition](#), 2024
 - » [Voluntary Guidelines on Food Systems and Nutrition](#), 2021
 - » [Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security](#), 2012
- UNFSS – [Policy Brief - Governance of Food Systems Transformation](#), 2021
- FAO - [Policy Support and Governance Gateway](#)
- OHCHR – [About the right to food and Human rights](#)
- U4 Anti-corruption resource centre, [Anti-corruption measures for reducing corruption in agriculture](#)

Imprint

Publisher:

Federal Department of Foreign Affairs FDFA

Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation SDC

Section Health & Food

Design:

StudioAlmo

2026 / © SDC