1000 CSOs Worldwide
17 Sub-Regions
11 Constituencies

Strengthening civil society Participation

Developing Common Policy Positions

Influencing the CFS
The Civil Society Mechanism (CSM) is the official mechanism for civil society organisations (CSOs) seeking to influence agriculture, food security and nutrition policies and actions at the national, regional and global levels in the context of the Committee on World Food Security (CFS).

The CSM is an inclusive space open to all civil society organizations, with priority given to the organisations and movements of the people most affected by food insecurity and malnutrition.

At the core of the CSM is the understanding that those most affected, must be the agents of their own development.
Introduction

The International Food Security & Nutrition Civil Society Mechanism (CSM) facilitates the essential and effective participation of social movements and other civil society organisations (CSOs) in policy discussions in the context of the UN Committee on World Food Security. The CSM strives to unite our voices, whilst recognizing diversity and gives priority to those most affected by food insecurity and malnutrition to ensure that policy decisions are being influenced from the ground-up. At the core of the CSM is the understanding that those most affected must be the agents of their own development and change!

2012 marked the third year since the reform of the CFS and two years since the endorsement of the Civil Society Mechanism. It represented a year of growth and accomplishment for CSOs within the CSM and CFS, with major developments such as the endorsement of the Voluntary Guidelines for the Responsible Tenure of Land and Natural Resources to protect peoples’ right to land, fisheries and forests; and the Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition to act as the primary global reference for policy coherence and coordination. After years of civil society engagement within consultation and negotiation processes at all levels, such progresses constitute a step forward in promoting a new model of governance on food, agriculture and nutrition. Building upon a human-rights approach with small-scale food producers at the centre, CSOs promoted inclusive, multi-stakeholder policy development, and continued to hold governments and intergovernmental organisations accountable for the implementation of decisions between governments in the CFS.

2012 was also a year that CSOs promoted and participated in several critical policy discussions within the CFS including, the process of developing principles for responsible agricultural investment, climate change, social protection, food security and nutrition in protracted crises countries and the monitoring of CFS decisions.

2012 saw more diversified civil society participation in the CSM and CFS, whilst maintaining priority on social movement engagement and leadership. There was an increased focus on support CSO participation in regional policy mechanisms to influence the global CFS agenda and discussions from the ground-up. The first manifestation of such efforts were evident during the CFS multi-stakeholder events at the FAO Regional Conferences in 2012, whereby social movements and peoples’ organisations provided invaluable input into the development of the Global Strategic Framework. In continued efforts to promote the inclusive, transparent and accountable functioning of the Mechanism, we have not only seen improved legitimacy and credibility but also an increase interest in, and understanding of, the CSM and CFS. The new website launched in 2012 is now available in three languages, ensuring accessible and timely information to those with access. However, increased emphasis has been placed on verbal and face-to-face communications given the reality and difficulties many civil society organizations experience in utilizing electronic means of communications.

Despite these successes, facilitating participation of social movements and peoples’ organisations remains a major challenge. At times, it is difficult for them to see how the CFS issues relate to their struggles on the ground; they endure competing demands on their precious time; the need to prioritize country level work; encounter difficulty using electronic means of communications, and language barriers. These constraints risk marginalising social movements and peoples’ organisations in the decision-making process. Supporting social movements to overcome these constraints is a major priority in the coming months and years.

Looking to 2013, social movements and other CSOs have set clear political priorities, including land and investments, protracted crises, local production and consumption and the monitoring and accountability of CFS decisions. They have made it clear that issues such as food sovereignty, genetic resources and agroecology cannot be ignored and must be taken into consideration and further discussed within the CFS context.

We are pleased to share our Annual Report with you, as we are committed to ensure that the CSM functions with full transparency and accountability. Feedback on the work of the Mechanism are highly valued and members of the CSM Coordination Committee are available to provide further information if required. Please see the CSM website www.csm4cfs.org and send any feedback, comments or questions to: cso4cfs@gmail.com.
The thematic policy working groups of the CSM are open to all interested civil society participants, and aim to promote dialogue and common policy positions amongst CSOs on issues being discussed in the CFS. These working groups provide a streamlined way of feeding into the CFS Open-Ended working groups and Task Teams, ensuring effective, diverse, and expertise-driven civil society inputs into the policy discussions and negotiations.

In 2012, several new CSM working groups were established in response to the CFS 39 agenda, including Climate Change, Social Protection and Nutrition. Pre-existing groups, such as Land Tenure, Protracted Crises, GSF and Investment continued working towards their intended objective.

In accordance with the mandate of the CSM, working groups prioritise the participation of, and inputs from small food producers, and other people most affected by food insecurity and malnutrition, whilst ensuring civil society participation during meetings are representative of a regional, gender and constituency balance.

The CSM promotes a diverse range of civil society inputs is by:

- Making all documentation/information available in the 3 working languages of the CSM (English, French and Spanish);
- Collating inputs, usually done by the CSM working groups Coordinator(s) with the help of resource person(s); and
- Circulating the collated CSO position document for endorsement either through the CSM website, working group email lists, and other communication channels.

2012 set several benchmarks for the reformed CFS. Starting the year off with the finalization of the Voluntary Guidelines for the Responsible Governance of Land, Forests and Fisheries and its subsequent endorsement in May. Civil society played an imperative role in the development and negotiation of this text, along with other equally important processes such as the adoption of the Global Strategic Framework, working towards developing principles for responsible agricultural investment, the High Level Expert Forum on Protracted Crises, and the CFS 39 policy roundtables on Climate Change and Social Protection.

Prior to each CFS intersessional meeting, CSM working groups organised preparatory meetings to further develop lobby strategies and elaborate on

### Thematic Working Groups 2012

- **Land Tenure**: 75 active WG members
- **Global Strategic Framework (GSF)**: 64 active WG members
- **Responsible Agricultural Investment**: 100 active WG members
- **Climate Change**: 40 active WG members
- **Social Protection**: 16 active WG members
- **Protracted Crises**: 94 active WG members
- **Nutrition**: 15 active WG members

*For most instances, “active” members of the working groups represent an entire network of CSOs, whereby they reach out and collate policy positions from a wider range of CSOs. Therefore, it is difficult to accurately account for and quantify the hundreds of civil society representatives who provide their expertise and inputs into the WGs on a collective basis.*
Land Tenure & the Voluntary Guidelines
After 3 full and challenging rounds of negotiations, 2012 was the year in which the benchmark “Voluntary Guidelines for
the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries
and Forests in the Context of National Food Security” were
finalised and endorsed!

One of the first “products” coming out of the CFS reform, civil
society played an instrumental role in each phase leading
up to its endorsement.

The CSM working group on Land Tenure was responsible
for organising civil society participation and inputs into all three
rounds of negotiations, and throughout the intersessional
processes. In preparation for the negotiations, intersessional
work included gathering and collating civil society input, drafting strategies for influencing the discussions and
undertaking advocacy work in key capitals prior to the
negotiations using the common messages agreed through the
CSM. Before the endorsement of the VGs, the working group
developed and circulated a joint statement and press release, undersigned by 29 international and regional networks and 21
national organisations.

CSOs concluded that the VGs represent a significant step forward in the fight against food insecurity and malnutrition. They
acknowledged that several key principles have been recognized, in particular the need to respect and protect human rights in
the context of tenure. Principles of implementation have been clearly established, in particular respect for human dignity, non-discrimination, equity and justice, gender equality, a holistic and sustainable approach to the management of natural resources, and consultation and participation.

CSOs considered that the guidelines fall short on a number of crucial issues, thus failing to provide a comprehensive set of
rules to counter effectively widespread grabbing of natural resources. The text is too weak in prioritizing essential support to
small-scale producers, who are the absolute priority if governments are to achieve sustainable development. They were
disappointed that the guidelines fail to further protect the rights of indigenous peoples already recognized by international
instruments and do not include water as a land resource.

“Many of the civil society participants contributed enormously in the negotiations, in many instances assisting Members to better understand technical issues. Two notable participants, who remained committed to the goals of the reformed CFS, and provided technical guidance were Sofia Monsalve of FIAN and Antonio Onorati of the IPC.”
- Dr. Gregory Myers, Chair of the OEWG and negotiations

Below: Sofia Monsalve of FIAN, Coordinator of the CSM Working Group and Angel Strapazzón of La Via Campesina share a
good laugh after the VG adoption!
GLOBAL STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK
On October 17th, 2012 during the 39th Session of the CFS, civil society organisations welcomed the adoption of the first version of the *Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition (GSF)*.

The GSF, as the overarching framework of the CFS, is intended to be the primary global reference for coordination and coherence in decision-making on food and agricultural issues. Since the CFS reform, the development of a global strategic framework has been a central demand for CSOs.

Throughout the negotiation process, the GSF working group drew upon inputs from all other CSM working groups to ensure that the CSO positions on the GSF were informed by experts on the different issues and to ensure consistency and coherence with existing joint CSO positions.

Through the CSM working group on the GSF, civil society participants were able to effectively engage in all of the OEWG meetings, and push on several key issues. Consultations on the GSF even made it so far as the FAO regional conferences, during a CFS multi-stakeholder event on the GSF, which took place between March and May 2012. The CSM was able to fund and support civil society consultations prior to each Conference to further elaborate positions on the GSF from a regional perspective.

**What was achieved?**

CSOs concluded that the GSF constitutes a step forward in promoting a new model of governance on food, agriculture, and nutrition. The document is built upon the human rights approach, women’s rights and the recognition of the central role of smallholder farmers, agricultural and food workers, artisanal fisher folks, pastoralists, Indigenous Peoples, landless people, women and youth to food and nutrition security.

The GSF also recognizes that formal employment of rural workers and assurance of minimum living wages are key for food security and nutrition. The document mentions the potential of agroecology and provides important guidance on nutrition based on the Right to Food Guidelines. It also reaffirms the strong commitment of States to the implementation of the VGs, including through agrarian reform.

The GSF negotiations reached an important consensus on human rights-based monitoring and accountability, which implies that States, intergovernmental institutions and the private sector are held accountable for their actions and omissions regarding their obligations under international human rights law.

**What are the limitations?**

Several issues that are important to civil society are not addressed in the current version of the GSF. In particular the lack of recognition given to food sovereignty is a major concern for social movements who affirmed their commitment to ensure that the new paradigm for food security policy will be based on this concept and approach.

Information on the membership, activities and outputs of the WG can be found here: [http://www.csm4cfs.org/policy_issues-6/global_strategic_framework-8/](http://www.csm4cfs.org/policy_issues-6/global_strategic_framework-8/)

“Hunger still exists - what are WE going to do about it?”

- Andrea Ferrante, of LVC during day 3 of the June OEWG negotiations on the GSF
RESPONSIBLE
AGRICULTURAL INVESTMENT
During the 37th Session of the CFS, the CFS Plenary approved the launch of “... an inclusive consultation process within the CFS for the development and the broader ownership of principles for responsible agricultural investment that enhance food security and nutrition”. Otherwise known as “rai”, and not to be confused with PRAI - principles developed by the World Bank, UNCTAD, FAO and IFAD in 2009.

Throughout 2012 the CSM working group on agricultural investment participated actively within the CFS rai OEWG to find agreement on the Terms of Reference (ToRs) for the proposed consultation process (purpose, intended recipients, type of instrument, scope, process). Negotiations for defining the ToRs happened over the span of 3 OEWG workshops at FAO from July - September 2012, with the participation of all stakeholders and a strong civil society presence. The resulting ToRs were presented and adopted during the 39th CFS Session.

Phase 2 of the process commenced just after the adoption of the ToRs and a draft Annotated Outline was prepared by the Secretariat and discussed during the November 20th OEWG meeting. The CSM working group provided a detailed counter-proposal for the Annotated Outline, the arguments for which were presented during the meeting and can be found on the CSM website. Although there have been and still remain some challenges, the persistent and legitimate contributions provided by civil society throughout the OEWG process had a very positive impact on the outcomes.

Information on the membership, activities and outputs of the WG can be found here: http://www.csm4cfs.org/policy_issues-6/agricultural_investment-7/

**What was achieved?**
Civil society members of the working group were pleased that the development of the principles will be done through an open and inclusive consultation process, building on important existing frameworks such as the Guidelines on Responsible Governance of Tenure and Guidelines on the Right to Food. We also endorsed the decision to follow a 2-year process to develop the principles, recognizing that this is entirely new.

**What are the limitations?**
From the outset, civil society’s position on the CFS-rai consultation has been to push for guidelines (not only principles), which prioritise investments by and for smallholder food producers and support local food production systems which protect them against attacks by corporate-driven initiatives. CSOs regretted that there is not a more explicit prioritization and recognition of smallholder food producers as key investors and food security actors throughout the Terms of Reference.

**What are the Challenges ahead?**
CSOs emphasized the importance of States fully supporting autonomous civil society consultations in 2013 and looked forward to participating in a truly inclusive process to develop principles on rai within the CFS by October 2014.

*Keep the Priority on Investment BY and FOR Small-Scale Producers!*

Civil Society Mechanism I 2012 Annual Report
CFS Task team Meeting, 3 July 2012
✓ CFS Task Team Meeting, 13 July 2012
✓ Multi-stakeholder Dialogue, 12 September 2012
✓ 39th CFS Plenary, October 2012

What was achieved?
CSOs were pleased that the decision box recognized the impacts of climate change on small scale food producers, the urgency of action to address climate change impacts and root causes, as well as the fact that adaptation is the top priority for small scale food producers.

What were the limitations?
CSOs were disappointed that there was no agreement on the need to prioritize and increase support to agro-ecological approaches or on the need for an HLPE study on genetic resources achieving food security.

CFS preparations for the CFS 39 policy roundtable discussion on Climate Change and Food Security were late commencing from a civil society perspective. The multi-stakedholder CFS Task Team was only established by late June 2012. Due to this, as well as the extremely tight turnaround times for comments, it was difficult for civil society to ensure the most broad and inclusive participation. However, in anticipation of the process, the CSM established the working group on Climate Change in April 2012 and started to develop common recommendations from May.

Moreover, the CSM working group on climate change shared drafts of the High Level Panel of Experts (HLPE) Zero Draft report on Climate Change amongst CSOs and encouraged them to provide comments. In addition, 53 CSOs signed a letter, which was sent to the HLPE Steering Committee in mid April, expressing some concerns regarding the zero draft.

Information on the membership, activities and outputs of the WG can be found here: [http://www.csm4cfs.org/policy_issues-6/climate_change-15/](http://www.csm4cfs.org/policy_issues-6/climate_change-15/)

“The time is right for the CFS to take up the responsibility and global leadership role to protect the right to food of increasingly vulnerable communities and small-scale food producers, and ensure global food security and food sovereignty in the face of climate change.”

- CSO intervention during 39th Session Policy Roundtable on Climate Change

“We need to consider what climate change means for small-scale food producers, artisinal fishers, pastoralists, the landless, forest dwellers, indigenous peoples, consumers, agricultural workers, urban poor, and particularly women, children and youth and take urgent action.”

- CSO intervention during 39th Session Policy Roundtable on Climate Change
Social protection was the second issue under consideration during a policy roundtable at the 39th Session of the CFS.

In preparation for the Task Team meetings, the CSM working group on Social Protection exchanged analysis and opinions on the draft CFS decision boxes via email and teleconferences. Key outputs included comments on the HLPE draft report, and both drafts versions of the decision box, while effectively integrating those comments during the Policy Roundtable negotiations.

Information on the membership, activities and outputs of the WG can be found here: http://www.csm4cfs.org/policy_issues-6/social_protection-14/

What was achieved?

CSOs appreciated the emphasis given to social protection as a universal human right and the important role of the social protection floor in implementing this right. They commended the leadership that the CFS demonstrated in strengthening comprehensive, nationally owned, context sensitive, social protection systems guided by human rights norms and standards, in particular in relation to the progressive realisation of the right to food.

What are the limitations?

Follow up by recognizing the roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders - remains a critical component to translate the recommendations into concrete impacts on people’s vulnerabilities and resilience. This can only happen when the root causes of poverty and vulnerability are addressed and all people, especially those experiencing vulnerability have the capacity to claim their rights.

Social Protection is a Human Right
Protracted Crises
The CSM working group was fully engaged in the preparations leading up to the High Level Expert Forum on Food Security in Protracted Crises (HLEF) taking place in September 2012. The group nominated the CSM working group coordinator as the civil society member to the HLEF Steering Committee.

It was the role of the civil society member of the Steering Committee to disseminate information on the HLEF to a broad network of CSOs and help identify CSO panelists for the different discussions, among other responsibilities.

It was due to the CSM’s presence within the Steering Committee that the role of the CSM in identifying and supporting civil society panelists and participants in the HLEF was affirmed - in line with CFS ways of working.

Through the working group, information was shared on the HLEF, common CSO positions and recommendations were facilitated on the CFS Agenda for Action, and civil society background papers were developed. Moreover, a two-day civil society consultation was organised just prior to the HLEF to finalise the development of common civil society positions and messages to take into the HLEF as well as discussions during the 39th Session of the CFS.

In 2012, the CSM witnessed a major increase in the number of CSO participants in the Protracted Crises working group since the start of the year, from 15 people in the start of January to 94 by the end of the year.

Information on the membership, activities and outputs of the WG can be found here: http://www.csm4cfs.org/policy_working_groups-6/protracted_crisis_conflict-12/

What was achieved?

Civil society members of the CSM working group were pleased that all governments supported the development of an Agenda for Action on Protracted Crises during the 39th Session of the CFS. In developing an Agenda for Action, CSOs urged governments to continue partnering with civil society, encourage community-driven processes and the protection of the freedom of self-determination and sovereignty over food and natural resources.
NUTRITION

TERM INOLOGY
At the request of the 37th Session of the CFS, a Task Team started developing an options paper on the “meaning and different uses of food security and nutrition terminology”. Throughout 2012, most of the work of the Task Team was done electronically, although a CFS multi-stakeholder meeting did take place in May, whereby civil society was present.

The CSM working group on Nutrition was established in January 2012 to interface with the CFS Task Team on Food Security & Nutrition Terminology. The working group strived to identify social movements working on nutrition issues at a local and country level in order to invite them into the CFS discussions. Several drafts of the paper “Coming to Terms with Terminology” were circulated within the group, whereby comments were received, consolidated and submitted to the Task Team for consideration.

Information on the membership, activities and outputs of the WG can be found here: http://www.csm4cfs.org/policy_issues-6/nutrition-10/

What was achieved?

Although the CFS did not move ahead with a decision, CSOs are still pleased that the decision box acknowledges that the term “food and nutrition security” best reflects the conceptual linkages between food security and nutrition security.

What are the limitations?

Civil society would have preferred the adoption of the new term “food and nutrition security” during the 39th Session. Civil society would have also preferred to see a reference to the Right to Food in the decision box. CSO members of the working group have continued to advocate that the terminology paper should not be an end in itself but should help inform the CFS in defining its role in relation to nutrition and other inter-governmental institutions working on nutrition related issues.
The CSM working group on monitoring and accountability facilitated CSO participation in the CFS OEWG on this issue and inputs into the 39th CFS Session.

**WHAT WAS ACHIEVED?**

CSOs were successful in ensuring that the 39th Session agreed to establish an innovative mechanism to help countries and regions to monitor progress towards achieving food and nutrition security for all, as Member States had agreed during the CFS reform.

**WHAT ARE THE CHALLENGES AHEAD?**

A major challenge for CSOs in 2013 will be to ensure that the CFS not only promotes monitoring of the use of CFS policy guidance but also develops a monitoring mechanism, based on human rights accountability, which also promotes the monitoring of the impact of CFS decisions on policies and ultimately on food and nutrition security.
The CFS Bureau met regularly with the CFS Advisory Group throughout 2012 to:

- Advance the objectives of the CFS
- Ensure strong linkages with the CFS stakeholders
- Give Advisory Group members the chance to provide inputs on the on-going processes/negotiations of the CFS

In 2012, the Bureau and Advisory Group met a total of 7 times. The CSM facilitated the participation of the civil society Advisory Group members.

The joint Bureau/AG meetings provided civil society the opportunity to reinforce civil society positions on the on-going policy processes and discussions, follow up on internal issues such as programme of work and priorities of the CFS and ensure that processes are being dealt with in a timely manner.

**W H O A R E W E ?**

The CSM has nominated 8 AG members, of which 4 participate rotationally based on the agenda items and availability for 2012-13:

- **George Dixon Fernandez**
  - MIJARC

- **Ibrahima Coulibaly**
  - CNOP, La Via Campesina

- **Jorge “Mani” Stanley**
  - Indigenous Caucus

- **Kalissa Regier**
  - La Via Campesina

- **Lalji Desai**
  - WAMIP

- **Margaret Nakato**
  - WFF

- **Maria Noel Salgado**
  - MAELA

- **Svetlana Boincean**
  - IUF
Throughout 2012, FAO Regional Conferences were held in Asia, Africa, Latin America, Europe and North America, and included one full day for CFS multi-stakeholder discussions. In doing so, for the first time in regional conference history, the same participation rules developed in the reform of the CFS, applied. This meant that civil society were able to openly engage in the debate (up to the point of decision making) on an equal footing with governments. The Global Strategic Framework and Mapping were the two topics identified for discussion, and civil society prepared by organising Civil Society Consultations in each of the regions just prior to the multi-stakeholder discussions.

Members of the Coordination Committee gathered in January 2012 to plan for the events. During the meeting, CC members from each region (Europe, Near East, Asia, Latin America, Africa, not North America) agreed that the role of the CSM, in relation to the regional civil society consultations during FAO Regional Conferences was to:

- **Advocate for multi-stakeholder dialogues** (involving governments, international organisations, civil society, etc.) during the FAO Regional Conferences to discuss CFS issues, such as the Global Strategic Framework
- **Promote and facilitate space and dialogue** on CFS issues during regional civil society consultations
- **Promote broad civil society participation** in regional civil society consultations, ensuring balanced participation from all constituencies and sub-regions.

CSM Coordination Committee members worked closely together with representatives from other civil society networks and mechanisms to plan regional consultations on the organising committees / working groups responsible for facilitating regional civil society consultations.

Throughout the preparation process, Coordination Committee members of the CSM participated in the Organising Committees of their respective regions.

During the regional civil society consultations, CSOs developed common positions on CFS related and other policy issues, which informed their interventions during the CFS multi-stakeholder dialogues and the FAO Regional Conferences.
The CSM, mainly through the Coordination Committee members who attended the CSM meeting in Rome in January was successful in ensuring that CFS related issues were discussed during all of the regional civil society consultations. The regional civil society consultations resulted in increased awareness of the CFS and the CSM amongst a wider range of CSOs. They also resulted in the development of common civil society positions amongst CSOs at the regional level on some of he key issues being discussed in the CFS, especially the GSF and agricultural investment.

In terms of CSO impact on the CFS multi-stakeholder events during the FAO Regional Conferences, the results were mixed. CSOs welcomed the opportunity to be able to speak on an equal footing with governments at the regional level, just as they are able to do in the CFS at the global level. CSO interventions were welcomed by various government representatives in different CFS regional multi-stakeholder events and certainly helped to raise awareness of Member States about the GSF and other policy issues being discussed in the CFS.

CSOs recognized that, in general, there is room for improvement in the way that they intervene during regional inter-governmental meetings in order to maximize impact on political outcomes. There is a need to ensure that interventions are short, concise, making specific suggestions in relation to outcomes and supported by hard-hitting evidence.

Key recommendations relating to CFS issues from each region can be found on the CSM website: http://www.csm4cfs.org/resources-7/fao_regional_conferences_12-25/africa-54/
In October, immediately prior to the CFS Plenary, over 150 civil society organisations and social movements, representing farmers, fisherfolk, Indigenous Peoples, pastoralists, agricultural workers, youth and others most affected by food insecurity and malnutrition gathered in Rome for the 2012 Annual Civil Society Forum.

In preparation for the 39th Session of the Committee on World Food Security, the two-day Forum was held to assist in the development and endorsement of common civil society positions and strategies in relation to the CFS agenda.²

The Forum is a space where CSOs can finalise cohesive and strong policy positions, which have been developed through the CSM working groups during the intersessional process. The CSM Forum is open to all interested civil society participants working in the field of food security and nutrition with emphasis on the broad and inclusive participation of social movement representatives.

Hosted by the Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations, the opening ceremony of the Forum set a constructive tone for the weekend, calling all participants to keep in mind the 870 million people in the world who still suffer from chronic undernourishment, and the daily struggles and political attacks social movements and their leaders face on a daily basis. While also recalling the tremendous impact civil society has had throughout the reform process of the CFS and the global governance of food and agriculture as a whole.
Welcome addresses were given by two civil society panelists and members of the Coordination Committee, Sarojeni Rengam and Ibrahim Coulibaly; CFS Chair, Ambassador Yaya Olaniran; and FAO representative, Marcela Villareal from the Office for Communications, Partnerships and Advocacy.

Before splitting into working groups, the morning Plenary sessions focused on introducing new-coming civil society participants to the ways of working within the CFS and CSM, provided an introduction to the agenda of the 39th Session of the CFS, presented the Annual report from the Coordination Committee to the CSM Forum, and finally, CSM working group coordinators gave brief presentations on the policy issues of the CFS 39 agenda – what was at stake, and what would be the controversial issues.

Based on this year’s CFS agenda, participants broke out into 9 separate working groups. Given the high number of issues on the agenda, the 9 working groups were further categorized into 3 different parallel sessions. This allowed participants to focus their expertise on a specific issue, while providing the opportunity to cover more topics over the 2 days.

The final agenda and report for the Forum can be found here: http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/Pagine/27/en_final_csm_forum_provisional_programme_en.pdf

Breakout Session 1:
★ Climate Change
★ Social Protection
★ Responsible Agricultural Investment

Breakout Session 2:
★ GSF
★ Protracted Crises
★ Food Security & Nutrition Terminology

Breakout Session 3:
★ Monitoring & Accountability
★ Policy Gaps & Emerging Issues
★ Global & Regional Coordination and Linkages with the CFS
At the beginning of 2012, the CSM Coordination Committee (CSM CC) endorsed the Annual Programme of Work and Budget for 2012. This laid out the intended objectives, activities and estimated budget of the CSM. Since it is not possible to have a comprehensive plan of activities for many months in advance due to the evolving CFS programme, the CSM responds dynamically and flexibly to changing circumstances and updates its Programme of Work on a 6-month basis.

Throughout 2012, certain members of the Coordination Committee met several times, and the whole of the Coordination Committee met once during the Annual CC meeting in October 2012. The main aims of bringing the entire Coordination Committee together are to:

- Clarify ways of working and reinforce the Mandate of the CSM
- Better refine the role of the civil society members of the Advisory Group, Coordination Committee and Policy Working Groups
- Provide oversight into the financial and administrative works of the CSM (including approval of the CSM programme of work and budget for the following year), and finally,
- Propose global policy priorities for the following year – which is then brought to the CSM Forum for broader civil society approval.

Some of the key decisions coming out of the Annual CC meeting were:

- It was agreed that the CSM should continue to operate in line with the original mandate and role of the CSM as defined in the CFS reform document.
- Establish a Finance and Administrative sub-working group of the Coordination Committee consisting of one person per region, identified by and from CC members within their regional groups.
- CC members agreed that a key strategic priority for the CSM in 2013 is to facilitate consultations and advocacy at regional, sub-regional and national levels.
SECRETARIAT

It was decided during the October 2011 Coordination Committee Meeting of the CSM, that a transparent and open process of recruiting and selecting the permanent Secretariat of the CSM should commence in January 2012. The process proceeded as follows:

2011: Terms of Reference were drafted for the open 3 positions of the CSM Secretariat (Coordinator, Communications Officer, Administrative and Finance Officer), sent the Coordination Committee and finalised;

Jan’ 2012: A Selection Committee consisting of 5 members of the CSM coordination Committee representing 5 regions (North America, Latin America, Europe, Africa and Asia) was formed;

Jan’ 2012: Positions for the open vacancies were advertised;

May 2012: Interviews were carried out with 3 short-listed applicants per post;

July 2012: Results of the interview process were submitted to the Coordination Committee who then had a final vote

July 2012: The positions were offered to, and accepted by, the 3 members of the interim Secretariat.

The role of the Secretariat, like the Mechanism itself, is one of facilitation and support to the Coordination Committee and all CSOs wishing to participate in the CFS. Working for all CSOs and the CC as a whole, the Secretariat is not influenced by any one organisation, network, constituency or geographical region in isolation from agreed CSM decision making structures and processes.

The Secretariat supports the Coordination Committee to enable:

➡ Broad, diverse and complementary civil society participation in the CFS, and

➡ Inclusive, transparent and accountable functioning of the CSM.

Throughout 2012, the Secretariat provided support by:

✓ **ENABLING** civil society participation in all of the intersessional CFS and CSM activities at the regional and global levels;

✓ **ENSURING** the participation and leadership of social movements and peoples organisations;

✓ **ESTABLISHING** the proper functioning of CSM Policy Working Groups;

✓ **GUIDING** CSOs in their work at country, sub-regional and regional levels;

✓ **SUPPORTING** CSOs in their outreach activities through the circulation of weekly newsletters, final meeting reports, multi-media communications materials, etc.

✓ **FUNDRAISING** with Governments and resource-rich NGOs to ensure the smooth continuation of CSM activities, by preparing annual budgets and funding proposals, drafting mid-term and final year financial and narrative reports, etc.
In addition, the Secretariat contributed to the following achievements:

- Increased and more diverse civil society participation in the CSM and CFS, while maintaining priority on social movements and people’s organisations.
- Increased willingness amongst NGOs to provide funding to the CSM and to play roles in support of the participation of social movements and peoples organisations.
- Big increase in the amount of communication and information sent and made available in all 3 languages.
- Ensured the effective administration, transparency and accountability of funds.

Ways of Working

Up until now, the majority of the CSM’s work has been focused on facilitating civil society participation in the CFS at the global level, and developing common policy positions, through the CSM policy working groups.

During 2012, there was increased attention given to facilitating consultations and supporting country level advocacy through CSM constituencies and sub-regions. These continued efforts are to help...

- **Promote the full participation of social movements**
- **Ensure that CFS decisions are implemented at country level**
  - **Ensure that CFS decisions are genuinely informed by grassroots experience**

During 2012, the CSM Secretariat supported the development of:

- Draft guidelines for the development of common civil society policy positions
- Draft guidelines for developing sub-regional work and resource mobilisation plans

Each day we strive to improve the functioning of the CSM and ways of working. While making sure that it operates according to the Organising Principles.
In 2012 the CSM was able to raise a total of 794.381 Euro.

Overall expenditure was 641.921 Euro, equaling to 81% of the total funds raised.

Leaving 19% of the 2012 total funds (152.460 Euro) to be carried over to 2013.
Of the € 794,381 raised in 2012:

21% DONATED BY NGOS

79% DONATED BY GOVERNMENTS

Funds Received From Governments

The majority of Government funds have been channeled via FAO’s Multi Donor Trust Fund, with the minority provided directly to NGOs supporting the CSM:

- The Multi Donor Trust Fund in FAO: €570,981
- Terra Nuova NGO (German Government): €37,290
- FIAN NGO (Swiss Government): €17,933

Funds Received From Governments
In 2012, 21% of total CSM funds came from NGOs. Due to the generous support of the following Organisations, the CSM was able to commence its activities within the first 6 months of the year when funds provided in the MDTF were difficult to access:

- **91,697 €** OXFAM
- **5,000 €** Welthungerhilfe
- **40,000 €** Brot fur die Welt
- **4,980 €** CFGB
- **20,000 €** ICCO
- **1,500 €** CIDSE
- **5,000 €** Misereor

The EU, Brazil, Norway and Italy all provided resources to the CSM via the Multi-Donor Trust Fund. 2012 expenses covered through MDTF resources were:
2012 expenditures (641,921 €) can be divided into 8 different streams of expenses:

- **€11,970**: CSO participation in CFS Advisory Group meetings
- **€44,683**: Support CSOs in influencing CFS policy debates such as the High Level Expert Forum in September
- **€114,589**: Support CSOs in VG, GSF and rai processes
- **€30,488**: Sub regional and constituency consultations
- **€176,528**: CSO participation in FAO regional consultations
- **€112,344**: Annual CSM Forum, CC Meeting & CFS 39
- **€132,981**: Secretariat costs (salaries, VAT and social security, office costs)
- **€18,529**: Communications, website and admin expenses
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CSM activities throughout 2012 were made possible through the generous monetary and in-kind donations from the following Governments and Organisations. For their continued support we would like to thank:
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