

## 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;
- (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;
- (MD) Martin Drago, Amigos de la Tierra Internacional
- (MM) Matias E. Margulis – McMaster University;
- (MN) Michael Nanz, FIAN Switzerland;
- [NAG] Nutrition Action 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.

Comments from Civil Society Organizations	Decisions of the drafting group
<b>[CIDSE]</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A stronger effort is needed to reach out to more constituencies, as many important stakeholders are not yet aware of the processes.</li> </ul>	Agree; almost all comments received so far are from NGOs. When the first draft is distributed for a further round of comments we must all make the effort to reach out to more organisations, especially the small food producers and poor consumers.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opportunities to discuss the mechanism need to be</li> </ul>	Agree. Some work has been done and needs to be continued for the

<p>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.</p>	<p>second round of comments. For example, efforts have been made to discuss the zero draft at FAO regional consultations. Interested organisations could develop a consultation and feedback plan for next few months. The drafters of this document commit to developing an online list of all the organisations / networks who we know have had the opportunity to feedback on the CSM proposals as well as those who have fed back.</p>
<p><b>[George Kent]</b></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A more detailed description on the role and functions of the CFS should be made clear at the beginning of the document.</li> </ul>	<p>This is included in the new text box that precedes Background section.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The definition of food security and nutrition, as well as CSOs/NGOs should be clearly stated at the beginning of the document.</li> </ul>	<p>Done</p>
<p><b>[IFP]</b></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disregards the need to differentiate between CSOs/NGOs within the text of the draft, as NGOs are acknowledged actors in civil society.</li> </ul>	<p>Please refer to the textbox preceding the Background section in Draft 1 for the definition of civil society.</p>
<p><b>[Michael Nanz]</b></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposes that the document should be split into two parts: a descriptive document and a document specifically outlining the Terms of Reference. <i>(Please refer to Michael Nanz's submitted feedback for a detailed outline of what the ToR's should look like.)</i></li> </ul>	<p>There were no strong opinions about this. Perhaps we could revisit this issue when finalising Draft 1.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<p>Text has been revised to clarify that it is referring to CFS Plenary Sessions.</p>
<p><b>[Matias Margulis]</b></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<p>This is a point to be negotiated with the CFS.</p>
<p><b>[IPC]</b></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a need to broaden the drafting committee beyond the three original members (IPC, Oxfam, AAI) to include other organizations.</li> </ul>	<p>Given the time pressure and the fact that almost all comments received were from NGOs, the three original members of the drafting committee decided to leave the committee unchanged, while also</p>

	emphasising that the CSO Mechanism should be evaluated and adjusted as necessary after one year. Oxfam commits to have regular discussions with the NAG and other NGOs to ensure that they are kept closely informed of developments and are able to feed in on a regular basis.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	Ok. Please refer to text box preceding the background section of Draft 1.
<b>Nutrition Action Group (NAG)</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>[NAG]</b> 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.</li> </ul>	Please submit statements to be discussed for Draft 2.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>[NAG]</b> 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.</li> </ul>	Some changes have been made to emphasise that the CSM will ensure that a range of different views and approaches can be heard and discussed. Common positions will be presented when possible. When not, differing views will be made explicit. Please submit any further proposals for specific text changes.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>[NAG]</b> Suggested various text amendments to the text box: “Role and purpose of the Committee on World Food Security”</li> </ul>	Most suggested text has been integrated in Draft 1, please refer to document.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>[NAG]</b> Substitute the word “victory” with “key achievements”</li> </ul>	Done. refer to <i>para. 2</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>[NAG]</b> The definition of civil society is too important to be a “footnote”, should be integrated into body of text.</li> </ul>	Done. Please refer to the text box preceding the background section of Draft 1.
<b>The Civil Society Mechanism (CSM) – Zero Draft</b>	
<b>Role and Functions</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>[George Kent, ref para. 9]</b> As one of its functions, the CSM will develop common positions as appropriate. The paragraph should also add that the CSM will communicate important <i>differences</i> in positions, as</li> </ul>	The CSM will not be a space for reconciling differences. It will provide a platform where different views can be heard and discussed. In its communication with the CFS through the Coordination Committee, it will seek to “communicate the range of

stated in <i>para. 25</i> . It should clarify whether the CSM will simply deal with important differences among subgroups, or make efforts to reconcile them.	divergent positions that are held by participants in the Mechanism.” Please refer to <i>para. 27</i> for further detail.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[NAG]</b> 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.</li> </ul>	Agreed. It is hoped that all constituencies will endeavour to ensure that nutrition issues are discussed within the CSM and by the CFS. It will be important to provide support to different constituencies to enable this. We welcome concrete suggestions.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[NAG ref para 8]</b> 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</li> </ul>	Nutrition is an issue that affects all constituencies and therefore they should all aim to ensure that nutrition issues are addressed in the CSM and the CFS. Organisations with a key interest in nutrition could potentially be represented in any of the existing constituencies (for example, there are women, youth, farmer, Indigenous organisations and NGOs that focus on nutrition).
<b>Organising Principles</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[George Kent, ref. para. 10]</b> Create a line within the paragraph about inclusiveness, highlighting that the CSM is to be an inclusive space for all CSOs.</li> </ul>	Ok. Please refer to <i>para. 8</i> .
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[WRF, ref. para. 9]</b> 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?</li> </ul>	(ref para. 26) ”Decisions will be made by consensus wherever possible. The Coordination Committee will determine which kind of decisions require consensus and which could be made through voting if no consensus emerges.”
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[CIDSE, WRF, EFSG, ref. para, 14]</b> 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.</li> </ul>	The text has been amended to clarify that the Secretariat should not be responsible for lobbying and advocacy. The Secretariat should be neutral and help the Coordination Committee facilitate the functioning of the CSM as well as provide support to all the CS members of the AG.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[CS, ref. para, 14]</b> 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.</li> </ul>	See comment, above.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[AA, ref. para 14]</b> Recognizes the need for a Secretariat, but affirms that at this early stage, members should not be pre-assigned.</li> </ul>	<p>At this stage, no members of the Secretariat have been pre-assigned. It is only suggested that in the interest of the CSM, the Secretariat build on the experience of the IPC Secretariat. The text has been amended to this affect.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[NAG]</b> The commitment and emphasis on inclusiveness here and throughout the document, is very welcome. 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</li> </ul>	<p>The original drafting committee was maintained recognising time constraints. However, special consultations took place with the NAG to ensure that a nutrition perspective was integrated into the Draft 1 proposal. This will continue during the development of Draft 2.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[NAG ref para 10]</b> Again this is a very specific view/perspective and does 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.</li> </ul>	<p>Please refer to para. 8 of Draft 1 for amended text.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[NAG para 10]</b> 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.</li> </ul>	<p>See comment, above.</p> <p>The CSM constituencies are made up of organisations that share a common identity and that represent themselves (rather than organisations, such as NGOs, that speak on behalf of others, such as children).</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[NAG ref para 11]</b> How about children and pregnant women who are the most vulnerable to and most affected by undernutrition. What is the rationale for giving particular priority for those groups? Again, the proposal needs to reflect ALL stakeholders' areas.</li> </ul>	<p>For the first year, the CSM will not include any new constituencies, and will adhere to those recognized in the CFS reform. Please note that women and youth are already recognized constituencies.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	
<b>Participants</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[CONSEA, ref. para. 16]</b> 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.</li> </ul>	<p>There have been a number of suggestions calling for adding new constituencies. The drafting committee believes that it is not easy at this time, when the CSO Mechanism has not yet been established, to make decisions on which of the proposed new constituencies to add or whether to add all of them. One major concern is increased size of an already large Coordination Committee. Therefore we maintain that in this first year of its existence, the Coordination Committee should include only those constituencies mentioned in the CFS Reform document as adding any new constituencies would increase the size of an already large Coordinating Committee. Following the evaluation of the first year’s experiences, CSOs could decide to change the composition.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[EFSG, ref. paras. 15-16]</b> The introductory lines of <i>para. 16</i> should be reworded to make it clear that priority is not only given to <i>victims</i> of hunger, but also those constituencies that have the <i>solutions</i> to hunger.</li> </ul>	<p>Agree, victims of hunger are also the bearers of solutions. Please refer to para 13 of Draft 1.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[EFSG, IFP, ref. para. 16]</b> The “INGO” constituency should be renamed “NGO”, to include International NGOs, National NGOs and NGO Platforms.</li> </ul>	<p>Agree. “INGO” has been changed to “NGO” and includes International NGOs, National NGOs and NGO Platforms.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[CS, IFP, ref. para. 16]</b> The seats available at the CFS should not be restricted to only 11 constituencies, but to all members of the Coordination Committee.</li> </ul>	<p>Seats at the CFS will be allocated ensure that there is representation of both constituencies and regions. Please refer to para. 19 of Draft 1.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[IPC]</b> 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.</li> </ul>	<p>This is a point to be negotiated with the Bureau.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[CS, ref. para. 16]</b> 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</li> </ul>	<p>See comment, above, about the constituencies.</p>

<i>(but did not specify).</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[CIDSE]</b> A proposal on ways to guarantee effective participation of Southern stakeholders remains to be developed.</li> </ul>	Agree. suggestions would be welcome.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[NAG]</b> add children to the list of constituencies</li> </ul>	See comment, above, about the constituencies. Also, please note that youth are a constituency.
<b>Governance and structures</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To ensure the mechanism’s credibility, most contributions stressed the importance of a transparent and democratic selection process for the representatives of the <b>Coordination Committee</b>.</li> </ul>	Agree. Further elaboration on the selection process to be discussed for Draft 2. Please refer to para. 22.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[CONSEA, CS, EFSG, IFP, ref. para. 18]</b> 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?</li> </ul>	The CC includes regional representatives. In addition to this, we welcome any comments on how to connect the national, regional and global levels, considering that the different levels are key to the functioning of the Mechanism This is a key issue but very few specific proposals have been made so far. Although there was not enough time to add new sections to Draft 1, a proposal for sections on the national, regional and global levels could be added to Draft 2.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[EFSG, ref. para. 18]</b> 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.</li> </ul>	Agree. Please refer to para. 11 of Draft 1.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[AA, CS EFSG, ref. paras. 27-29]</b> 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.</li> </ul>	Agree. Please refer to para 32 of Draft 1.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[CIDSE, EFSG, MD ref. paras. 27-29]</b> 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.</li> </ul>	The CS members of the AG...”will constitute a collective of four people who have the trust of the Coordination Committee and will be allocated on a rotational basis...” The aim is to have a minimum of 2 Southern representatives from Southern Organisations as well as 2 women representatives. It is suggested that the CSM Secretariat should provide the support that is needed for active participation by southern representatives .

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[CIDSE, EFSG, ref. para. 19]</b> 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.</li> <li>• 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?</li> </ul>	<p>A terms of reference for the Coordination Committee is being produced and will be circulated with Draft 2</p> <p>Agree. The text has been clarified to state that the 4 AG members will be chosen by and among the members of the Coordination Committee. Please refer to <i>paras. 29 to 34</i> of Draft 1.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[CS, IFP, ref. paras. 19-26]</b> Thematic working groups should be established to facilitate the work between Committee members.</li> </ul>	<p>The CC can establish any groups it sees necessary as the need arises.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[CS, ref. para. 19]</b> 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.</li> </ul>	<p>Currently the method for choosing the CC members is left up to each constituency and region. It is envisaged that each constituency and region will have a selection committee</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[NAG ref para 19]</b> There is need for clarity as to how this committee would be selected</li> </ul>	<p>Agree. Further elaboration on the selection process to be discussed for Draft 2. Please refer to para. 22 of Draft 1.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[NAG ref para 19]</b> 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</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<p>There are one billion smallholder farmers and along with other rural communities (fisherfolk, pastoralists, etc.) they make up the majority (80%) of the world’s hungry. The small farmers outnumber the other rural constituencies several times.</p> <p>There is a youth constituency and a women’s constituency so they are not overlooked or left out. Nutrition should be an issue of interest for all the constituencies.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[MD, para. 19]</b> No me queda claro el por qué de 4 puntos focales para las organizaciones de familias de agricultores a pequeña escala. Si el resto de los pequeños productores de alimentos tiene 2.</li> </ul>	<p>Please refer to comment above.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[IPC]</b> 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.</li> </ul>	<p>This seems a good idea, but it would be more appropriate for each constituency to make their own decision. We could add in the draft text that we suggest this as a logical method of self-organisation.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[EFSG, ref. para. 27]</b> 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 and the sub-regions...”</li> </ul>	<p>Ok. Please refer to <i>para. 39</i> of Draft 1.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[NAG para 26]</b> add: “. Sufficient notice should be given to participants in order for them to organise travel etc.”</li> <li>• At end of para 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”</li> </ul>	<p>Agree. Please refer to <i>para. 43</i></p> <p>Agree. Please refer to <i>para. 32</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[WOCAN]</b> Suggests the terms of office for CS representation in the Advisory Group should be 1 year, to be renewed annually by the Coordination Committee before the Annual CFS Session.</li> </ul>	<p>The members of the Coordination Committee and subsequently, the 4 cs representatives of the Advisory Group will hold position for 1 year during the first 12 months of operation of the CSM. After the first year, the CC members will be allocated on a rotational basis for a 2-year period.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[IPC]</b> The membership of the Coordinating Committee</li> </ul>	<p>Please refer to paras 32 and 26, respectively.</p>

<p>should be changed on a rotational basis. Within the Coordinating Committee, they should strive for operating via consensus as opposed to voting.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[NAG para 28]</b> How will members actually be selected? A voting process? How will balance be ensured?</li> </ul>	<p>Please refer to “Key Selection Criteria” for the appointment of the 4 AG members in <i>para. 33</i> of Draft 1.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[NAG para 29]</b> For Key Selection Criteria, please include “experience and knowledge of technical food security and nutrition” and “Experience in food security and nutrition policy and advocacy work”.</li> </ul>	<p>These criteria are only valid for NGOs.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[NAG para 30]</b> add “and which will address food security and nutrition” after “the Annual CFS Session”</li> <li>• add “and nutrition” after “priority food security”</li> </ul>	<p>Done see para 17</p>
<p><b>Operations and resource requirements</b></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[CONSEA, CIDSE, CS, IFP, EFSG, IPC, ref. para. 33]</b> 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.</li> </ul>	<p>Agree. Please refer to amended text in <i>para. 45</i> of Draft 1 and the role of the Secretariat in finding financial resources in <i>para 36</i> of Draft 1.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[CS, IFP, ref. para. 33]</b> It is suggested 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).</li> </ul>	<p>The CSM will endeavour to cover the activity costs of people from organisations who are unable to cover the costs with their own resources. Further consideration will be given to the need to cover salary costs.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[CS, ref. para. 32]</b> 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.</li> </ul>	<p>It is suggested that the CSM Secretariat will be selected by the Coordination Committee. It will be important for the Secretariat to draw upon the experience of mechanisms which have experience of facilitating civil society in policy discussions at different levels. Please refer to <i>para. 37</i>. A Secretariat will be appointed</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[NAG para 32]</b> We would welcome clarification about the implications of having the IPC host the Secretariat.</li> </ul>	<p>Please see comment, above. To clarify, members of the CSM Secretariat will be recruited for the posts. The CSM Sec. Will be independent of the IPC Sec.</p>

Will a Secretary/coordinator be appointed?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[NAG para 33]</b> Facilitation and conflict resolution should be added to costs/budget</li> </ul>	Please make specific suggestions for Draft 2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[MD, para 35]</b> Se menciona un Grupo de Consejo, ¿se refiere al Grupo Asesor?</li> <li>• <b>[para 23]</b> Se debería agregar los costos de creación/uso/etc de una tecnología adecuada para la realización de las reuniones virtuales trimestrales del Comité de Coordinación.</li> <li>• Este tipo de reuniones con 42 participantes, si entiendo bien el párrafo 19, necesitan un medio adecuado, muy diferente a las clásicas conferencias telefónicas.</li> </ul>	<p>Yes, sorry for any confusion. It should be “Grupo Asesor”.</p> <p>This has yet to be discussed. Will come back to it for Draft 2.</p>
<b>Accountability and Evaluation</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[Michael Nanz]</b> For complete and genuine accountability, an accountability agency should be established apart from the Coordination Committee.</li> </ul>	Please refer to <i>para 46</i> regarding “Elements of Accountability” and provide further suggestions if necessary
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[Michael Nanz, ref. para. 34]</b> Clarity needs to be made that the website, email list and the CC’s annual report are not mechanisms of accountability, but devises that facilitate accountability.</li> </ul>	Ok. Clarified in <i>para. 46</i> , last bullet point.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[NAG para 34]</b> Greater expansion of how the Coordination Committee will be accountable to CSOs worldwide would be important</li> </ul>	Agree.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[NAG para 34]</b> Greater explanation of how participants will be able to feedback would be useful – would it be through a survey, meetings, voting process?</li> </ul>	Agree. Please refer to <i>para 46</i> ,.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[EFSG]</b> Proposals need to be further developed ensuring the wide participation and involvement of Southern stakeholders/constituencies.</li> </ul>	Yes.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>(CIDSE, EFSG)</b> An interim mechanism should continue to operate until October 2011, allowing awareness raising and consultation to continue in 2010 and into 2010.</li> </ul>	The CSM and it’s Coordination Committee Members will be fully operational after the 36 <sup>th</sup> session of the CFS. For the first 12 months, the CC members will be allocated on a one-year basis, after which , will be on a rotational basis for a 2—year period. There will

	be an evaluation at the end of the 1 <sup>st</sup> year. Over time, the CSM will improve and evolve, with the help from feedback and consultation with CSOs.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[NAG para 36]</b> 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 be reflected</li> </ul>	See above
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[NAG]</b> It is important to look at other fora/meetings that are not related to 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</li> </ul>	Agree. It would be very beneficial if NAG and other NGOs and groups could organise and facilitate some meetings.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[MD]</b> No estoy de acuerdo en que se exija consenso en una declaración para que sea publicada en NUESTRO sito web.</li> <li>• El párrafo 13 establece claramente la necesidad de buscar la unidad y la solidaridad, pero ello no se logra con la exigencia de consenso, una herramienta de veto de las minorías. Si me parece bien establecer mayorías especiales (4/5, 3/4), a la hora de tomar decisiones relevantes, posicionarnos hacia las instancias del CSA, emitir declaraciones, etc. Creo que esto sí colaborará a la construcción de la unidad.</li> </ul>	To clarify, if a decision is not made by consensus, any relevant statements will not be published on the CSM website, but that does not prohibit those organizations who support the statement to make them available on their own website.
<b>ANNEX 1</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[NAG]</b> Please add to the first bullet: mothers and children</li> </ul>	This is text agreed at the Peoples' Forum for Food Sovereignty and quoted from a report so it is impossible to change it.