



REAL REFORM FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT

**SUBMISSION TO THE SOUTH AFRICAN HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION'S NATIONAL
INVESTIGATIVE HEARING INTO THE RIGHT TO FOOD**

Date: 27 February 2026

Submitted to: South African Human Rights Commission's National Investigative Hearing into the Right to Food, by email: foodinquiry@sahrc.org.za

Submitted by: Real Reform for Early Childhood Development (RR4ECD)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	2
1. INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXT.....	4
1.1. Who is Real Reform for ECD (RR4ECD)?.....	4
1.2. Relevance of this Submission to the SAHRC's Terms of Reference.....	4
2. CONSTITUTIONAL AND LEGAL FRAMEWORK.....	4
2.1. The Right of Young Children to Basic Nutrition as Part of the Holistic Right to ECD.....	4
2.2. The State's Constitutional Duties.....	5
2.3. Legal basis for ECD nutrition support.....	6
3. EVIDENCE OF SYSTEMATIC RIGHTS VIOLATIONS.....	6
3.1. The Crisis of Child Malnutrition.....	6
3.2. Inadequacy of Current Nutrition Support for Young Children.....	7
3.3. Other Measures: Fragmented And Insufficient.....	8
3.4. Failures To Implement Nutrition Guidance.....	8
3.5. Poor Coordination Undermining Effectiveness.....	8
4. STRUCTURAL FACTORS PERPETUATING VIOLATIONS.....	9
4.1. Registration Requirements as a Barrier to Rights Realisation.....	9
4.2. Dependency of ECD Programmes on Unstable Funding Sources.....	9
4.3. Affordability Crisis and Nutritional Quality.....	10
5. LACK OF ECD NUTRITION PILOT, DESPITE DEDICATED FUNDING.....	10
6. IMPACT AND CONSEQUENCES OF RIGHTS VIOLATIONS.....	10
6.1. Immediate Developmental Harm.....	10
6.2. Lifelong and Intergenerational Consequences.....	10
6.3. Violations of Human Dignity and Equality.....	11
7. EVIDENCE-BASED SOLUTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	11
Recommendation 1: Create a Comprehensive ECD Nutrition Programme.....	11
Recommendation 2: Pilot and Test Implementation Models.....	11
Recommendation 3: Roll out training and support for ECD practitioners.....	11
Recommendation 4: Strengthen data collection and monitoring.....	12
Recommendation 5: Improve Coordination and Oversight.....	12
Recommendation 6: Strengthen Legislative and Policy Framework.....	12
7. CONCLUSION.....	12

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

South Africa is systemically failing its young children by failing to ensure that they receive the nutritious meals they need to grow, develop and thrive.

Early childhood is a critical time in a person's life, laying a foundation for future flourishing. Historic neglect of the early childhood development (ECD) sector, persistent under-funding and inadequate government support for ECD programmes contributes to a situation where one in four children under five suffers from stunting due to chronic malnutrition.

Despite having set aside a budget for an ECD Nutrition Programme in 2024, the national Department of Basic Education (responsible for ECD since April 2022) has yet to launch a pilot.

Current measures to ensure that young children receive adequate nutrition fall short of being 'reasonable and effective', as required by Constitutional jurisprudence. This amounts to a violation of young children's constitutional rights to basic nutrition, protected by sections 28(1)(c) and 29(1)(a) of the Constitution, and to early childhood development, protected by sections 10 and 11 of the Constitution.

Key Facts:

- **28% of children under five are stunted**, a rate unchanged since the transition to democracy.
- Just **41% of ECD programmes are eligible for nutrition support** through the ECD subsidy. The majority of ECD programmes receive no state support.
- **Unregistered programmes and Bronze-registered programmes** serving the most vulnerable communities are **systematically excluded** from nutrition support.
- Despite recent increases, the **value of the ECD subsidy remains inadequate**. R9 of the per child per day subsidy is allocated for nutrition, while the cost of a nutritiously adequate diet is R31,61 leaving a **shortfall of R22,61**.
- The DBE set aside a budget for an ECD Nutrition Programme pilot in 2024, but **a pilot has yet to be launched**.
- **Weak coordination** between departments has resulted in **fragmented, ineffective interventions**.

OUR CALL: We call on the Commission to make findings and recommendations to secure urgent redress for the ongoing violation of young children's fundamental rights. In particular, DBE must pilot an ECD Nutrition Programme as a matter of urgency.

1. INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXT

1.1. Who is Real Reform for ECD (RR4ECD)?

Real Reform for Early Childhood Development (RR4ECD) is a movement of 300 organisations and ECD 1,000 practitioners across 6 provinces in South Africa, advocating for holistic, well-funded, inclusive, and quality ECD services for all young children in South Africa. Our goal is to ensure an enabling legal, policy, and regulatory environment for all young children to thrive.

This submission draws on [collaborative research conducted on behalf of RR4ECD](#) by experts from the DG Murray Trust, Do More Foundation, Equal Education Law Centre, Ilifa Labantwana, Legal Resources Centre, South African Medical Research Council, and University of Cape Town.

1.2. Relevance of this Submission to the SAHRC's Terms of Reference

This submission directly addresses the following areas outlined in the Commission's Terms of Reference:

- Structural dynamics and economic factors perpetuating hunger despite national food sufficiency (Section 3.1.1)
- The intersection between the right to food and related constitutional rights including dignity and health (Section 3.1.4)
- Institutional coordination, policy coherence, and legislative adequacy (Section 3.1.6)

2. CONSTITUTIONAL AND LEGAL FRAMEWORK

2.1. The Right of Young Children to Basic Nutrition as Part of the Holistic Right to ECD

Section 28(1)(c) of the Constitution guarantees that 'every child has the right to basic nutrition.' This right is unqualified and immediately realisable. It is not subject to progressive realisation or resource constraints. Section 29(1)(a), which guarantees the right to basic education, is properly interpreted to include the right to early learning and necessarily encompasses basic nutrition as a precondition for meaningful participation in that learning.

The Constitutional Court in *Minister of Health v Treatment Action Campaign (No 2)* 2002 (5) SA 721 (CC) confirmed that children's rights under section 28 are not merely derivative of their caregivers' rights. They are direct constitutional entitlements. The right to basic nutrition in section 28(1)(c) must therefore be read alongside the state's broader duty to support children's survival, development, and dignity.

Nutrition is not incidental to ECD. It is foundational. Without adequate nutrition, the developmental promise of early learning cannot be realised. Cognitive development, physical growth, and the capacity to engage in early learning environments are all directly dependent on adequate and sustained nutritional support in the first years of life. Thus, the right to basic nutrition is part of a [holistic right to early childhood development](#), protected by sections 10 and 11 of the Constitution.

Definition of 'Basic Nutrition': In the context of young children, 'basic nutrition' means the minimum amount and type of nutrition required for their holistic development, as defined in the Children's Act of 2005. This differs from 'sufficient food' in that nutrition has a specific developmental purpose beyond mere sustenance.

While section 28(1)(c) does not define "basic nutrition" in quantitative terms, its content is not legally indeterminate. Domestically, the Department of Health's Nutrition Guidelines for Early Childhood Development Programmes (2013, updated 2021) provide the most operationally specific standard, specifying recommended meal and snack patterns, food groups, portion sizes, and frequency for children aged 0–5. These Guidelines, read together with the developmental framework in the Children's Act and the norms and standards for partial care facilities, establish that basic nutrition must support children's physical, cognitive, emotional and social development and not merely prevent starvation. Internationally, the UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights in General Comment No. 12 (1999) defines adequate food as that which is sufficient in quantity, nutritionally adequate in quality, safe, and accessible, and distinguishes between freedom from hunger as a minimum core obligation and the fuller right to adequate nutrition. The CRC Committee's General Comment No. 15 (2013) reinforces this, explicitly linking nutritional adequacy to children's dignity and stating that malnutrition constitutes a rights violation. Read together, these sources give section 28(1)(c) judicially enforceable content.

2.2. The State's Constitutional Duties

Under section 7(2) of the Constitution, the state bears a duty to respect, protect, promote and fulfil the rights in the Bill of Rights. Applied to children's right to basic nutrition under section 28(1)(c), this duty has immediate force. Unlike section 26 (housing) and section 27 (health care, food, water), which are expressly subject to progressive realisation within available resources, section 28 rights carry no such qualification. The Constitutional Court confirmed in *Minister of Health v Treatment Action Campaign (No 2)* that section 28 rights are not contingent on resource availability. They impose obligations that are both immediate and absolute in their application to children. The state cannot defer, phase, or condition a child's right to basic nutrition based on fiscal constraints.

The 'Reasonable and Effective' Standard: In *Government of the Republic of South Africa v Grootboom* 2001 (1) SA 46 (CC), the Constitutional Court held that a programme which fails to respond to the needs of those in most desperate need cannot pass constitutional muster, regardless of how comprehensive it appears on paper (para 44). The measure must be reasonable in both design and implementation. A programme that is structurally incapable of reaching the most vulnerable children – whether through registration requirements, inadequate funding, or coordination failures – does not satisfy this standard. The state's duty is not discharged by the existence of a policy or a budget line. It is discharged by effective delivery to those whose need is greatest. Further, it should be noted that the 'reasonable and effective' standard sets a *floor*, not a *ceiling*.

The State's Duty in Relation to Children in ECD Programmes: While parents and caregivers bear primary responsibility for children's nutrition, the state's duty is triggered when parents are unable to fulfil this obligation. This is not an exceptional circumstance in South Africa. It is the structural reality facing millions of households below the food poverty line. Where a parent cannot afford to feed their child adequately, the state's constitutional obligation activates directly and immediately. The state cannot satisfy this obligation by pointing to the Child Support Grant as a general income transfer. A

grant that falls below the food poverty line, and that is not targeted at nutritional outcomes, does not constitute fulfilment of the right to basic nutrition.

Moreover, the state cannot rely on the absence of a binding statutory definition of 'basic nutrition' to avoid accountability for the adequacy of its measures. Where the state itself has produced a technical nutrition standard through the DoH Guidelines, and has simultaneously failed to fund or implement that standard, it cannot claim that any intervention, however inadequate, satisfies the constitutional minimum. The reasonableness standard established in *Grootboom* requires that measures be capable of realising the right progressively for those most in need. A non-binding guideline that the majority of ECD practitioners have never received, paired with a subsidy that cannot cover the cost of the meals that guideline recommends, does not meet that threshold. The gap between the standard the state has set for itself and the resources it has provided to meet it is itself evidence of unreasonableness.

2.3. Legal basis for ECD nutrition support

The transfer of the ECD function from the Department of Social Development to the Department of Basic Education, effective April 2022, was grounded in the recognition that ECD forms part of the continuum of basic education. This transfer did not just give DBE a mandate for early learning. DBE assumed the responsibilities in relation to the full, comprehensive package of ECD services contemplated in the National Integrated Early Childhood Development Policy. In respect of nutrition, DBE therefore holds both direct responsibility for nutrition support to children in registered ECD programmes, and coordinating responsibility for ensuring that nutrition interventions delivered by other departments, including the Department of Health, form part of a coherent, integrated response. DBE cannot discharge its constitutional obligations by pointing to the DoH's Integrated Nutrition Programme or to the Child Support Grant. It is the lead department. Constitutional accountability lies with it.

Early learning programmes are the most efficient available mechanism for the state to discharge this duty. They are routine gathering points for young children. They are a hub for ECD practitioner capacity that can be leveraged. The infrastructure for reaching children is already there. What is absent is adequate, consistent, and rights-compliant state funding and support. The failure to provide this funding and support is not a discretionary matter. It is a question of constitutional compliance.

3. EVIDENCE OF SYSTEMATIC RIGHTS VIOLATIONS

3.1. The Crisis of Child Malnutrition

National Statistics:

- **28%** of children under five are stunted (HSRC Food Security Survey, 2023).
- 44% suffer from vitamin A deficiency (hidden hunger).
- 14 million South Africans went to bed hungry in 2024 (22.2% of households).
- Stunting rates have remained unchanged since democratic transition. This is a collective failure of governance.

Geographic disparities: The Northern Cape (34.3%), Eastern Cape (31.3%), and Mpumalanga (30.4%) report the highest levels of household food insecurity, demonstrating that malnutrition disproportionately affects rural and marginalised communities.

Demographic vulnerabilities: Female-headed households, African-headed households, large households, and those dependent on social grants face particular vulnerability to food insecurity.

3.2. Inadequacy of Current Nutrition Support for Young Children

The ECD subsidy: Too little for too few

The ECD subsidy is the state's primary mechanism for supporting nutrition in early learning programmes, but it fails children on two fronts: *who* it reaches (coverage) and the *amount* it provides (value).

Limited coverage: The subsidy is structurally exclusionary. Registration at Silver or Gold level is a prerequisite, and only 41% of early learning programmes meet this requirement. This means the majority of programmes operating in the country receive nothing. ECD programmes excluded for the subsidy tend to serve the poorest communities, where infrastructure is weakest, barriers to registration are highest, and children's need is greatest. The subsidy, as designed, systematically bypasses the children it should most urgently reach. In addition, not all Silver-registered programmes—some of which serve disadvantaged communities—actually receive the ECD subsidy, even though they are theoretically eligible.

Low value: Even where the subsidy does reach a child, it is grossly inadequate. The full daily subsidy of R24 is already far below the R91 estimated to run a basic quality ECD programme, meaning centres are operating at 26 cents to every rand needed. Within that R24, approximately R9 is allocated for nutrition. But the actual daily cost of a nutritionally adequate diet for a child is R31,61, according to January 2026 PMBEJD data. The nutrition allocation therefore covers less than 29% of what a child actually needs to eat, leaving a daily shortfall of R22,61 per child. Centres cannot make up this difference by reallocating from other budget lines because those lines are equally depleted. The shortfall is borne by the child.

Limited coverage	<p>Just 41% of ECD programmes are registered at Silver or Gold level and are eligible for the ECD subsidy.</p> <p>Most ECD programmes do not receive the ECD subsidy.</p>
Low value	<p>The ECD subsidy is R24 per eligible child per day.</p> <p>R9 is allocated for nutrition.</p> <p>R31,61 is the cost of a nutritionally adequate diet.</p> <p>The shortfall is R22,61.</p>

The result is a system that is both too limited in reach and too low in value to fulfil the state's constitutional obligation to provide children with access to basic nutrition.

Legal Implications: The subsidy's inadequate coverage and low value mean that it falls short of the 'reasonable and effective measures' standard set by Constitutional jurisprudence. The systematic exclusion of unregistered programmes and Bronze-registered programmes is particularly problematic. Registration barriers disproportionately affect the poorest communities. A programme that structurally excludes the most vulnerable children cannot satisfy the *Grootboom* standard, regardless of how it performs for those it does reach.

3.3. Other Measures: Fragmented And Insufficient

While other interventions exist, they are inadequate:

- National School Nutrition Programme: Does not cover children in early learning programmes, creating a nutrition gap for children aged 0-5.
- Child Support Grant: Provides general household assistance, not targeted nutrition support. Moreover, the amount is insufficient.
- Integrated Nutrition Programme: Health interventions have not been sufficient to address malnutrition rates.

3.4. Failures To Implement Nutrition Guidance

The Department of Health's Nutrition Guidelines for Early Childhood Development Programmes provide evidence-based recommendations for providing nutritious meals to young children. However:

- Most ECD practitioners have not received training on the guidelines.
- The guidelines assume affordability and capacity that most ELPs lack.
- Over 20% of programmes do not follow the recommended menu.
- Too few programmes provide the full complement of recommended meals and snacks.

3.5. Poor Coordination Undermining Effectiveness

The National Integrated Early Childhood Development Policy (NIECDP) established coordination mechanisms that have failed to function:

- The Inter-Ministerial Committee for ECD has not met regularly.
- The advisory committee envisaged by the National Policy on Food and Nutrition Security has never been established.
- Varied departmental measures are implemented in an uncoordinated manner, reducing effectiveness.

Result: Despite multiple interventions across different departments, child malnutrition rates remain stubbornly high, demonstrating systemic coordination failure.

4. STRUCTURAL FACTORS PERPETUATING VIOLATIONS

4.1. Registration Requirements as a Barrier to Rights Realisation

Making the ECD subsidy conditional on registration at Silver or Gold level creates a structural barrier that disproportionately excludes the most vulnerable:

- Registration requirements are onerous, poorly understood, and vary across provinces and across municipalities.
- Barriers to registration overlap with socio-economic disadvantage.
- Unregistered programmes are more likely to be in vulnerable communities serving children from vulnerable households.

While the DBE is making concerted efforts to improve the registration system – making it more streamlined and less onerous – initiatives like the Children’s Amendment Bill will likely take some years to come into effect. Even when these reforms have taken effect, it is very likely that there will continue to be some unregistered programmes and programmes registered at Bronze level. These programmes tend to serve the poorest communities and are not currently ineligible for the ECD subsidy.

Constitutional analysis: The state’s constitutional obligation to fulfil children’s right to basic nutrition cannot be negated by a programme’s unregistered status. The obligation extends to all eligible children, regardless of the registration status of the ECD programme they attend.

4.2. Dependency of ECD Programmes on Unstable Funding Sources

The inadequacy of the ECD subsidy forces programmes to rely on:

- Parent fees: Problematic given high poverty rates and reinforcing inequity.
- Food donations: Unreliable and insufficient in the current economic climate.
- Private feeding schemes: Not available to all programmes and dependent on philanthropic goodwill.
- Self-funding: ECD practitioners are often forced to subsidise children’s meals from their own income. This pattern is documented across rural KwaZulu-Natal, the Eastern Cape, and the North West, where practitioners report pulling food from their own households to feed the children in their care.

Equity implications: This dependency perpetuates inequality. ECD programmes in wealthier areas can charge higher fees; programmes in poor areas cannot. The state’s failure to provide adequate nutrition support thus reinforces existing socio-economic stratification, violating constitutional principles of equality and dignity.

4.3. Affordability Crisis and Nutritional Quality

The gap between the subsidy allocation and the cost of adequate nutrition forces programmes to compromise on food quality:

- Meals are often dominated by starchy foods and poor quality proteins, with inadequate fruits and vegetables.
- This contributes to 'hidden hunger' (micronutrient deficiency) for e.g. vitamin A and iron deficiency affecting 44% of children under five.
- Failure to provide the balanced, nutrient-dense diet necessary for optimal development.

5. LACK OF ECD NUTRITION PILOT, DESPITE DEDICATED FUNDING

Funding to pilot an ECD nutrition support programme was allocated to the Department of Basic Education in 2024. But no pilot has yet materialised, leaving some of South Africa's most vulnerable children without access to nutritious meals.

In the 2026 budget, R772 million has been retained over the medium-term for piloting a nutrition support programme at low-income ECD programmes.

It is crucial that DBE spends this money wisely, to test different implementation models. In particular, DBE should test ways to reach children attending:

- Bronze-level ECD programmes, who are not eligible for the ECD subsidy;
- Silver-level ECD programmes serving poor communities, who are eligible for the ECD subsidy but have not yet been subsidised; and
- Unregistered programmes.

6. IMPACT AND CONSEQUENCES OF RIGHTS VIOLATIONS

6.1. Immediate Developmental Harm

The first 1,000 days of life - from conception to the first two years of life of a child - are critical for brain development. Inadequate nutrition during this period and through early childhood causes:

- Compromised growth and development with stunting (35% of children under 2 years): irreversible damage to physical and cognitive development
- Limited stimulation or engagement leads to or Impaired social and emotional development
- Reduced capacity to engage with caregivers and learning environments
- Increased vulnerability to infectious diseases

6.2. Lifelong and Intergenerational Consequences

Childhood malnutrition creates cascading harm throughout the lifespan:

- Compromised health, growth and development with lower educational attainment and reduced lifetime earnings
- Higher risk of obesity and non-communicable diseases (diabetes, heart disease) in adulthood
- Intergenerational transmission of disadvantage
- Estimated cost to GDP: 1.3% annually, approximately R62 billion per year

6.3. Violations of the Rights to ECD, Human Dignity and Equality

The normalisation of child hunger in a food-secure nation violates constitutional commitments to human dignity and equality. South Africa maintains one of the largest social protection systems in Africa, yet its inadequacy permits one in four children to suffer from stunting. This represents:

- A violation of children's rights to early childhood development (protected by the right to life, as interpreted in light of international law)
- A denial of children's inherent dignity
- Institutionalised inequality based on socio-economic status
- A collective failure of governance and accountability

7. EVIDENCE-BASED SOLUTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1: Create a Comprehensive ECD Nutrition Programme

Primary Recommendation: The Department of Basic Education must develop a comprehensive ECD nutrition programme ensuring all Child Support Grant-eligible children attending early learning programmes receive adequately nutritious meals, regardless of registration status.

Proposed Dual Implementation Approach:

- For Silver and Gold Registered Programmes: Increase the value of the ECD subsidy and ensure it reaches all eligible children at all registered programmes, continuing the direct transfer model.
- For Unregistered Programmes and Bronze-Registered Programmes: Provide nutrition support, potentially using provincial procurement and delivery and leveraging existing National School Nutrition Programme infrastructure where feasible.

Recommendation 2: Pilot and Test Implementation Models for Unregistered Programmes and Bronze-Registered Programmes

Primary Recommendations: In Piloting an ECD Nutrition Programme, the DBE must prioritise testing implementation models for Unregistered Programmes and Bronze-Registered Programmes.

If DBE wishes to leverage the NSNP in this regard, we direct them to our [paper on implementation models](#).

Possible Models to Test:

- Centralised NSNP provinces: Test whether existing NSNP service providers can effectively deliver to nearby registered and unregistered ELPs.
- Decentralised NSNP provinces: Pilot contracting strategic implementing partners (ECD-focused NGOs/private sector actors) or new commercial service providers to procure and deliver to nearby unregistered ELPs.

Recommendation 3: Roll out training and support for ECD practitioners

- Implement comprehensive training on the Nutrition Guidelines for all ECD practitioners including support infrastructure for functional kitchens and food service.
- Assess guidelines' accessibility, affordability, and feasibility.
- Provide guidance on cost management, including establishment of food gardens.
- Ensure guidelines are evaluated and updated every five years.

Recommendation 4: Strengthen data collection and monitoring

- Collect anthropometric data on children's growth indicators.
- Track attendance rates to determine impact of meal provision.
- Ensure evidence-informed programme adjustments.

Recommendation 5: Improve Coordination and Oversight

- Urgently revitalise the Inter-Ministerial Committee for ECD.
- Establish the advisory committee mandated by the National Policy on Food and Nutrition Security.
- Create similar coordination mechanisms at provincial and municipal levels.

Recommendation 6: Strengthen Legislative and Policy Framework

Shorter-term:

- Update the National Integrated Early Childhood Development Policy to reflect ECD function shift to DBE.
- Develop a stand-alone ECD nutrition policy to support programme roll-out (following the pilot).

Longer-term:

- Consider legislative reforms providing a firmer statutory basis for the ECD nutrition programme
- Define the state's duty to provide nutrition support more explicitly, potentially as part of a new Early Childhood Development Act or through targeted amendments to the Children's Act that give nutrition provision a clear, enforceable statutory basis independent of programme registration status.

7. CONCLUSION

South Africa's inadequate nutrition support for young children in ECD programmes constitutes a systematic violation of their constitutional rights to basic nutrition, early learning, and early childhood development. The evidence in this submission demonstrates that current measures fail the constitutional standard on every material dimension: coverage of the ECD subsidy is too limited, its value is too low, implementation is too fragmented, and structural barriers systematically exclude the children whose need is greatest. The state has set a standard for itself through the DoH Nutrition Guidelines—but this standard has not been met, or given adequate funding. That gap is not a mere policy shortcoming. It is a rights violation.

We request that the Commission:

1. Make findings that the current state of nutrition support for children in early learning programmes violates sections 10, 11 and 28(1)(c), 29(1)(a) of the Constitution.
2. Recommend that the Department of Basic Education urgently develop and implement a comprehensive ECD nutrition programme reaching all eligible children, regardless of registration status – starting with a pilot to test different implementation models.
3. Recommend legislative and policy reforms to provide a firmer statutory basis for ECD nutrition support.
4. Recommend strengthening of coordination mechanisms, particularly the Inter-Ministerial Committee for ECD.
5. Call for regular monitoring and reporting on implementation of nutrition support measures.

The normalisation of child hunger in a food-secure nation represents a profound failure of our constitutional commitments. Ensuring all young children receive the nutrition they need to grow, develop, and thrive is both a human rights imperative and a sound investment in South Africa's future. We urge the Commission to use its powers to secure urgent redress for this ongoing violation of young children's fundamental rights, including by calling on DBE to pilot an ECD Nutrition Programme as a matter of urgency.

Real Reform for ECD Steering Committee Logos

