

## CSO Mechanism Zero Draft – Summary of Feedback

Contributions have been submitted by the following Organisations/ Working Groups/ Individuals:

- (AA) Action Aid;
- (AHG) AdHoc Group of INGOs;
- (CIDSE);
- (CONSEA) With contributions from Renato Maluf, CONTAG and the Brazilian Special Rapporteur for the Right to Land, Territory and Food, Sergio Sauer;
- (CS) Coordination Sud, Food and Agriculture Working Group;
- (DB) Dario Belivacqua
- (EFSG) Concord European Food Security Working Group;
- (GK) George Kent, University of Hawaii;
- (IFP) The International Forum of National NGO Platforms;
- (IPC) International Planning Committee for Food Sovereignty;
- (MM) Matias E. Margulis – Adviser to the UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food;
- (MN) Michael Nanz, FIAN Switzerland;
- (NAG) Nutrition Act Group, involving Concern, Save the Children and ACF;
- (WOCAN); and
- (WRF) World Rural Forum

### General Comments

A general appreciation is expressed for the work completed to produce such a comprehensive Zero draft for the CSO Mechanism. CIDSE in particular, praised it for its broad and well thought out methodology. The IFP recognized the quality of the proposal and offered their support to the initiative, while the WRF expresses interest to participate in the design of the CSM in its future development.

#### [CIDSE]

- A stronger effort is needed to reach out to more constituencies, as many important stakeholders are not yet aware of the processes.
- Opportunities to discuss the mechanism need to be sought after at the regional, national and local level. Special efforts from the beginning need to be made in order to ensure that it is broadly owned, and that it supports the capacity of the marginalized to participate, otherwise it may not be finalized by the 36<sup>th</sup> session.

#### [George Kent]

- A more detailed description on the role and functions of the CFS should be made clear at the beginning of the document.
- The definition of food security and nutrition, as well as CSOs/NGOs should be clearly stated at the beginning of the document.

#### [IFP]

- Disregards the need to differentiate between CSOs/NGOs within the text of the draft, as NGOs are acknowledged actors in civil society.

#### [Michael Nanz]

- Proposes that the document should be split into two parts: a descriptive document and a document specifically outlining the Terms of Reference. (*Please refer to Michael Nanz's submitted feedback for a detailed outline of what the ToR's should look like.*)
- Throughout the draft, the term "CFS Meetings" needs to be clarified, whether it is referring to the annual CFS Plenary Sessions, Advisory Group or other intercessional meetings.

[Matias Margulis]

- In reference to the CFS Report, CSOs should submit a separate section, as opposed to a written statement, to highlight key messages and concerns. This would be to ensure greater ownership of the outcomes of the CFS meetings.

[Nutrition Act Group]

- There is a lack of reference to any other statements produced for the same forum such as the one produced by ACF, Concern Worldwide, Save UK, MSF Access Campaign, and Wemos, reflecting a nutrition perspective;
- It is important that the broader views and advocacy from other agencies that do not relate to food sovereignty be reflected throughout the document. One perspective should not lead the thinking and content of the proposal

[IPC]

- There is a need to broaden the drafting committee beyond the three original members (IPC, Oxfam, AAI) to include other organizations.
- The draft should recognize the efforts of civil society up to this point, clarifying that “we are not starting from zero”. Important to reflect on lessons learned from existing experiences, i.e. the Permanent Forum for Indigenous Issues.

## **The Civil Society Mechanism (CSM) – Zero Draft**

### **Role and Functions**

[George Kent, *ref para. 9*] As one of its functions, the CSM will develop common positions as appropriate. The paragraph should also add that the CSM will communicate important *differences* in positions, as stated in *para. 25*. It should clarify whether the CSM will simply deal with important differences among subgroups, or make efforts to reconcile them.

[NAG] There is a need to ensure that agencies representing nutrition are not marginalised, for example, in relation to selection and attendance at CFS plenary sessions as well as CS representation on the Advisory Group.

[NAG *ref para 8*] You will be aware of our concerns over the lack of nutrition representation within the current interim cs representatives – it is important that the gap be addressed from October

### **Organising Principles**

[George Kent, *ref. para. 10*] Create a line within the paragraph about inclusiveness, highlighting that the CSM is to be an inclusive space for all CSOs.

[WRF, *ref. para. 9*] Asks that the Zero draft goes into further detail on the method in which the CSM will “...take on other functions if sees fit to do so”. Will the decisions be made by majority?

[CIDSE, WRF, EFSG, *ref. para, 14*] Confusion on the role of the Secretariat, in particular the reference to “implementing lobby and advocacy strategies...” The Secretariat’s specific tasks and the necessary resources needed should be described in more detail.

[CS, *ref. para, 14*] The Secretariat should not be responsible for implementing lobby and advocacy strategies. Lobbying should be restricted to the activities of the Coordination Committee and specifically, the Advisory Group.

[AA, *ref. para 14*] Recognizes the need for a Secretariat, but affirms that at this early stage, members should not be pre-assigned.

[NAG] The commitment and emphasis on inclusiveness here and throughout the document, is very welcomed. This commitment to inclusiveness however should be clear from the outset and

throughout all stages of the process. To help ensure that the CSO mechanism is truly inclusive, and reflects the perspectives and dimensions of food security, agriculture and nutrition, there is a need to include a nutrition perspective in the drafting committee itself. For example, the drafting committee could be broadened to include representatives from agencies working on nutrition policy and programming

[NAG, *ref para.a 10*] Again this is a very specific view/perspective and do not reflect the overall approach of civil society stakeholders. The goal should reflect the scope of the CFS's focus areas therefore, the eradication of hunger and malnutrition and achieving food security for all.

[NAG, *ref para. 10*] The CSM does not mention nutrition as a key constituency and as part of the stated eradication goal. To be consistent with the CFS reform document, this paragraph should make reference to food and nutrition security.

[NAG *ref para. 11*] How about children and pregnant women who are the most vulnerable to and most affected by under-nutrition. What is the rationale for giving particular priority for those groups? Again, the proposal needs to reflect ALL stakeholders' areas. There is a need to refer to and acknowledge groups most affected by under-nutrition, i.e. children and women. Agencies working with communities are able to convey the issues faced by those groups and the voices of children and women should be also sought.

## **Participants**

[CONSEA, *ref. para. 16*] Important to add the category: "traditional communities", due to the fact that "Artisanal fisherfolk" and "herders/pastoralists" do not cover all the diversity of traditional communities in places such as Brazil.

[EFSG, *ref. paras. 15-16*] The introductory lines of *para.16* should be reworded to make it clear that priority is not only given to *victims* of hunger, but also those constituencies that have the *solutions* to hunger.

[EFSG, IFP, *ref. para. 16*] The "INGO" constituency should be renamed "NGO", to include International NGOs, National NGOs and NGO Platforms.

[EFSG] a code of conduct for NGO participation in the CS Mechanism should be prepared highlighting their support/facilitation role vis-à-vis small food producers' organizations of the South. As well, a ToR should be prepared for the NGO constituency mechanism.

[CS, IFP, *ref. para. 16*] The seats available at the CFS should not be restricted to only 11 constituencies, but to all members of the Coordination Committee.

[IPC] The CSM should aim for at least 100 seats in the CFS plenary session. Strong efforts/arguments need to be made to the CFS Bureau.

[CS, *ref. para. 16*] Expressed doubt on the relevance of the 11 categories, considering that some may not be sufficiently organized to be international movement representatives. Suggest combining certain categories (*but did not specify*).

[CIDSE] A proposal on ways to guarantee effective participation of Southern stakeholders remains to be developed.

[NAG, *ref para. 16*] Add children to the list of constituencies.

## **Governance and structures**

To ensure the mechanism's credibility, most contributions stressed the importance of a transparent and democratic selection process for the representatives of the **Coordination Committee**.

[CONSEA, CS, EFSG, IFP, *ref. para. 18*] Clarity is needed on how the Coordination Committee will connect with the regional and global movements. It is also important to clarify the link between regional movements and its representatives. How will they interact?

[EFSG, *ref. para. 18*] The mechanism to be established at the regional level should have a facilitating role, and carry out its activities on an on-going basis to prepare positions and participants for the global meetings.

[AA, CS EFSG, *ref. paras. 27-29*] The 4 Civil Society Members to the Advisory Group should be elected by and among the Coordination Committee in order to maintain continuity and accountability.

[CIDSE, EFSG, *ref. paras. 27-29*] A minimum of 2 Civil Society Members of the Advisory Group should be Southern representatives from Southern Organisations, based in the South. Moreover, 2 of them should be women.

[CIDSE, EFSG, *ref. para. 19*] Given the large body of persons (approx. 50) suggested to represent the Coordination Committee, there is concern on how such a large group will organize themselves logistically, i.e. meetings, coordination of group, representation to CFS Bureau etc. Clarity is needed in this respect as well as in regards to: what capacity do the AG members assist with the preparation and coordination of meetings etc.? Will the 4 AG members be chosen from the Coordination Committee?

[CS, IFP, *ref. paras. 19-26*] Thematic working groups should be established to facilitate the work between Committee members.

[CS, *ref. para. 19*] Two colleges/working groups should be established to elect representatives to the Mechanism: (1) comprising the 11 constituencies and small producers, and (2) comprising the National and/or Regional movement.

[IPC] In reference to the Constituency members of the Coordinating Committee, each constituency should establish a "council", grouping members of that constituency in all regions, which would decide upon the two people to be represented in the CC. It is important that the 2 constituency representatives are rotated by region and gender. It is important to ensure that the sub-regional Coordinating Committee members are not dominated by NGOs.

[AHG, *ref. par. 17*] The AHG/INGOs in Rome propose the following insertion in the zero draft text of the document, to be included as para. 17 under "participants": "The AHG/INGOs, which is composed of Representatives to FAO in Rome of International NGOs with formal status with FAO (as well as with ECOSOC, and other UN Agencies), will participate in the Mechanism as an independent INGOs network, in accordance with the official note agreed upon between the AHG and IPC in February 2003 and sent officially to FAO on that date."

[EFSG, *ref. para. 26*] It should be clarified that members of the Coordination Committee are not necessarily and automatically allocated seats in the CFS plenary. Line 3 should be read "Seats allocated to CSOs in CFS meetings will be distributed among the constituencies an the sub-regions..."

[WOCAN] Suggests the terms of office for CS representation in the Adivosry Group should be 1 year, to be renewed annually by the Coordination Committee before the Annual CFS Session.

[IPC] The membership of the Coordinating Committee should be changed on a rotational basis.

Within the Coordinating Committee, they should strive for operating via consensus as opposed to voting.

[NAG, *ref para 19*] There is need for clarity as to how this committee would be selected

[NAF, *ref para 19*] What is the rationale for having 4 focal points for smallholder family farmers and 2 for the other constituencies. The proposal needs to be balanced. The focal points also need to reflect the groups most affected by hunger and malnutrition. There seems to be a disparity between 4 focal points for one area yet only 2 for other constituencies. As the nutrition perspective is not reflected in any proposed constituency, in particular from a children's point of view, the proposal as it stands, seems to suggest that there will be no focal point for nutrition – including in the 2 focal points for International NGOs.

[NAG, *para 26*] add: “. Sufficient notice should be given to participants in order for them to organise travel etc.” At the end of paragraph add, “The CS reps on the Advisory Group should be allocated on a rotational basis, changing every 2 years, in line with the term for focal persons on the Coordination Committee. This would also help ensure all regions/constituencies get to feed into the work of the AG”.

[NAG, *ref para 28*] How will members actually be selected? A voting process? How will balance be ensured?

[NAG, *ref para 30*] Add “and which will address food security and nutrition” after “the Annual CFS Session”. Add “and nutrition” after “priority food security”.

### **Operations and resource requirements**

[CONSEA, CIDSE, CS, IFP, EFSG, IPC, *ref. para. 33*] It is the role of the CSM to ensure sufficient funds for effective participation of CSOs in the CFS process. It should therefore be stated more clearly that the financial resources should be made available by the governments, and not that of the CSOs.

[CS, IFP, *ref. para. 33*] It is contested that the budget should not only fund the airline tickets of the Southern constituencies/developing countries, but also cover costs associated with the participation of all CSOs during the CFS (including representatives' salaries for the preparation and participation to events).

[CS, *ref. para. 32*] The responsibilities of the Secretariat should only be temporarily carried out by the IPC, with a Secretariat to be formally chosen by the Coordination Committee.

[NAG, *ref para 32*] We would welcome clarification about the implications of having the IPC host the Secretariat. Will a Secretary/coordinator be appointed?

[NAG, *ref para 33*] Facilitation and conflict resolution should be added to costs/budget

### **Accountability and Evaluation**

[Michael Nanz] For complete and genuine accountability, an accountability agency should be established apart from the Coordination Committee.

[Michael Nanz, *ref. para. 34*] Clarity needs to be made that the website, email list and the CC's annual report are not mechanisms of accountability, but devices that facilitate accountability.

[NAG, *ref para 34*] Greater expansion of how the Coordination Committee will be accountable to CSOs worldwide would be important. Also a greater explanation of how participants will be able

to feedback would be useful – would it be through a survey, meetings, voting process?

#### Process

[EFSG] Proposals need to be further developed ensuring the wide participation and involvement of Southern stakeholders/constituencies.

(CIDSE, EFSG) An interim mechanism should continue to operate until October 2011, allowing awareness raising and consultation to continue in 2010 and into 2010.

[NAG, *ref para 36*] We would like to suggest that a nutrition rep be added to the drafting committee. SCUUK, Concern and ACF represented nutrition on the CFS contact group and it is important that this is reflected.

[NAG] It is important to look at other for a/meetings that are not related to the IPC and farmers organizations so as to ensure that the proposal is discussed in other relevant constituencies – particularly meetings around the Policy brief on scaling up nutrition and review of the CFA.

#### ANNEX 1

[NAG] Please add to the first bullet; mothers and children.