



Report on
INCEPTION WORKSHOP
International Food Security Network - Third Phase (IFSN III)
MAY 6-10, 2013, Amari Boulevard Hotel, Bangkok, Thailand

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The third phase of the International Food Security Network, known as IFSN III, began with the Inception Meeting from May 6-10 2013, consisting of two key workshops, of which this is a full report. During the week, all partner organisations were able to discuss the challenges faced, work completed in IFSN II, the new challenges posed by IFSN III, and were then able to demarcate goals for the future of the network beyond 2017 when the third phase ends. The issue of making the regional networks more functional and sustainable was discussed at great detail at the workshop.

In the first workshop on contract management, reporting system communication and finance, the participants were guided through:

- a. Expectations for IFSN III, particularly the ways in which the groundwork of national networks from IFSN II can expedite the functioning of the regional networks
- b. The details of working within European Commission (EC) guidelines, as the EC is funding the network; terms and conditions of EC visibility that all partners must fulfil without fail
- c. Communications facilities and requirements, as well as forms of support for overcoming language barriers. Several commitments were made to ensure all relevant materials (especially contracts and all forms of legal agreements) would be produced in the four key languages: French, English, Portuguese and Spanish. ActionAid gave assurances that whatever interpretation or translation support is needed will be given to partners.
- d. Necessities of finance and narrative reporting, financial process flow, financial and programme



- monitoring protocol and sharing of all relevant templates for each stage of reporting, as well as clarifications on requirements of documentation for narratives and for auditing respectively
- e. The contract requirements for both the EC and ActionAid for all activities, employments and consultations done by partner organisations

The second workshop, from May 8-10, 2013, was on planning, advocacy, regional structure and management captured the state of food security globally: the numbers and distribution of people affected by chronic and hidden hunger as well as malnutrition, the state of policymaking and right to food recognition, and most importantly, the functions of the global platforms and charters with regard to protecting food rights and the farmer, the peasants, and the rural families who contribute substantially to global food production.

Experiences in policy advocacy, social movements and various instances of activism were shared, along with the reasoning behind each approach. Participants were able to learn of various strategies used by their colleagues and sister organisations, and learn of each of their challenges and successes; the World Committee on Food Security (CFS) covered the recent achievements of its Civil Society Mechanism (CSM) and emphasised the need for more linkages at the regional level, and with the workings of Comprehensive Africa Agricultural Development Programme (CAADP) and FAO. Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP) presented its new governance structure that brings all concerned together to strategise; research on its achievements will be completed soon. FIAN International introduced their multi-layered approach in using the different human rights structures that it accesses in order to bring about necessary changes, especially when working in conflict zones. FIAN's strategy was an enlightening one for many of the participants, as the issue of food security can be difficult to prioritise in nations undergoing political turmoil or other forms of crises.

CAADP hammered the need for civil society organisations' active participation from the beginning of any project, and put emphasis on the need to strengthen the family farming unit by giving support and encouragement to youths and women. Several other organisations, such as La Via Campesina, a global platform for peasants' rights, also shared their experiences in both fighting for the rights of the peasants and small farmers, and the routes they have taken in bringing these issues to global platforms.

With clear emphasis on good governance and communication, many of the partners shared individual problems they had faced in practice and looked to each other for support and finding solutions. Many participants expressed the intention to harness successful strategies that they learned about from partner organisations in their own regions. Recommendations were also made for the Steering Committee structure and the role it needs to play in guiding the network.

At the end of the Inception Meeting, all of the partners present appreciated the shared experiences and the new connections made, intent on using these examples and support to push forward the common agenda of ensuring food security. It was collectively agreed that in this phase the linkages built will create a network strong enough to sustain itself without the continuation of IFSN.



1st Workshop: CONTRACT MANAGEMENT, REPORTING SYSTEM COMMUNICATION AND FINANCE, May 6-7, 2013

The introductory session of the workshop was led by IFSN Steering Committee Chair Zakaria Sambakhe from CNCR, Senegal, Thanh Pham Van from CCRD, Vietnam, and Aftab Alam Khan from ActionAid International.

The panel congratulated the IFSN partners for succeeding to the third phase and acknowledged that implementing IFSN3 would be a challenging task. They also added the five-day meeting was an opportunity to look at where partners want to take this network in the next four years, and how the IFSN could be self-sustaining and independent.

IFSN Global Coordinator AFM Shahidur Rahman made a brief presentation on IFSN III that seeks to strengthen the regional IFSN food security networks in helping eradicate hunger in developing countries through advancing food and nutrition security in regional and global political agendas for the next 4 years. This phase is co-funded by the European Commission and 11 official partners including ActionAid International.

I. INTRODUCTION TO IFSN III

The network is linked with over 1100 civil society organisations in 31 countries across 5 continents. This network was established in 2004, and the second phase ended in March 2013. The third phase began from April 2013, with a total fund of EUR 2,666,667.

In Phase III, IFSN now no longer will be working with national networks. The third phase is to make the regional networks functional and effective with the national networks. There are a number of regional spaces that can be influenced which can reach to the national level. The 6 regional networks are: ASASAN (South America), Asia Food Security Network, PALOP (Portuguese speaking African countries), REDCASSAN (Central America), Southern and Eastern Africa Food Security Network and West Africa Food Security Network.

IFSN III's overall objective is contributing to regular, structured and inclusive dialogues between regional and global food security, nutrition civil society networks and governments and international organisations. Its specific objective is to promote and strengthen regional and global food and nutrition networks.

Shahidur Rahman presented a conservative estimate of final beneficiaries: 1 million smallholder farmers (particularly women) fishers, forest dwellers, and indigenous groups. Subsequently this will benefit their community-based organisations and families, resulting in a minimum of 4 million beneficiaries across the



INTRODUCTION TO
IFSN III.pptx

networks.



II. INTRODUCTION TO THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Steve Rusk, IPD Coordinator Asia Region, gave a donor overview of the European Commission where he mentioned that the European Commission is one of seven EU institutions that annually disburse 7.5 billion Euros. These are responsible for the daily running of the European Union agreements. The EC employs 23,000 staff. With so many civil servants, the preoccupation is with following the rules. These rules are outlined in the grant contract, and annexed to the general conditions.

There are two distinct sources of funding from the EC: one is for humanitarian assistance, the other for development aid.

The grant for IFSN III comes from the development aid budget. This is an example of the global reach of the EC. This project is funded from the Development Cooperation Instrument and Neighbourhood Civil Society Facility (European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument).

These all have different beginnings and are managed with different rules. Adherence to the rules is very important. The grant is applicable from April 2013 to March 2017. The delegation is managed from EC headquarters in Brussels. All reporting is to Brussels, not to the country delegation offices. The contract is managed through ActionAid UK, who is the signatory to this grant. For this grant, the contract manager is Katarina Macejakova.

All communication should go via Shahidur Rahman to Katarina Macejakova; who will then give the feedback.

Workshop participants then took part in a series of exercises to help familiarise themselves with aspects of the contract and the grant management guidelines. (Details: Annex I)



1. EC Grant
Management Guidelines

EC Grant Management Guidelines

III. EC-IFSN VISIBILITY GUIDELINES

IFSN Communications Adviser Hillol Sobhan gave a presentation on the visibility guidelines pertinent to the project. Introduced in 2002, these guidelines are also an important condition of the contract that all partners must observe.

All IFSN project network partners (long-term and event/issue specific) have the responsibility to ensure the visibility of the EC, the IFSN and respective IFSN and other key network partners in all activities pertaining to print and electronic Information, Education and Communication (IEC) materials, awareness raising and media/publicity events, press and media releases, and other activity carried out as part of the International Food Security Network (IFSN) project. The products, activity, and events can be singly/jointly produced/organised and/or fully/party funded by IFSN.

In general, in all EC funded/co-funded printed materials, the EC must be acknowledged visibly. This means using the EC logo, font and specified colours. The same conditions apply to television or radio



material. Moreover, all communications materials (print and electronic) must carry IFSUN logo.

Another key requirement is an EC disclaimer: "This has been produced with the financial support of the EC. The contents are the sole responsibility of [Partner name] and in no way can reflect the views of the EC." Additionally all products need to include an "IFSUN Intro" for people to understand what IFSUN is.



IFSUN3 Visibility
Guideline.pdf

EC-IFSUN Visibility Guideline:

IV. BUDGETS: IFSUN SPECIFIC GRANT MANAGEMENT PROCESSES AND REQUIREMENTS

Miranda Davies and Shahidur Rahman outlined the main information all partners must keep in mind: What money you have to spend, how to spend it, and what timeline to spend it in. The main change in IFSUN III is about activities. Last year the actual activity was hidden; this year all activities are listed, and can go 15% over and above. The object is to use the money, so each partner needs to get approval and see what the other partners are doing.

Once the workshop is concluded, regional partners must do planning with the national network, and show the planning and funds to ActionAid. IFSUN III is dealing with less activities, but higher Euro value. There will be bigger events for the region in each country, more regional and international engagement, and less national. This is another reason why travel was identified as a line item. Each budget has to do a code. Based on the budget, these are the coding that must be given: e.g. from farmer-to-farmer meeting in Cambodia. In this instance the finance person must be told the organisation is going on a finance activity, so they need to put it in their system. (In this example the code would be N61A). The auditor will use the budget amount to calculate the volume. When all six regions report to Miranda Davies, she has to put it in a way that each can be summoned anytime.

Templates will have units. IFSUN II looked within, and IFSUN III will look into the national secretariat. The finance people in each region will manage their projects within the national networks. They will have 7 or 6 weeks for getting their budgets approved. Travel is supported by attendees. Each unit is supposed to have these costs on top of the 7 percent that each will also have. This will leave 38 months to complete other activities.

Activities: Will be covered from the direct budget line. There will be maximum 3 to 4 activities per country per year. The level of influence will go down, but partners' engagement will go up. There will be less documentation and less scrutiny.

Within the activities: National networks will be doing work, but may not have a budget set out. Any activity will need resources, travel expenses, per diem; for all of these, ActionAid has templates to share. If more funding is needed, it can be withdrawn from the international fund. The EC has no problem with this: each partner must know their budget and fully utilise it. There will always be activities to use them for.

Where overhead is applicable: National networks are not allowed to charge or get any HR. There will be a 7 percent overhead on the top of the plan. ActionAid Ethiopia has 3 activities planned, but



cannot include any HR cost. However if there is a consultant, the funds can pay for that with the 7 percent overhead. This is applicable for all national networks.

ActionAid Participation: In terms of finance, EC has some flexibility. EC does questioning based on behaviour. There needs to be good communications and good planning. Each region has focuses and priorities. EC doesn't care what those are, but the network must synchronise activities and costs.

Per diem policy: Per diem in each country will follow ActionAid policy. FIAN will have their own policy, as with all countries. There is an official partners' per diem policy.

EC is particular about salaries and hidden consultant costs, and international per diem. They are general otherwise and will accept line item switches as long as they are consistent. Consistent in maintaining specific publications as international travel, per diem, food costs can hardly be hidden. They have to be explicitly mentioned somewhere so the EC knows how much is going to be spent on the programme.

Regional/National Budgeting: Each region will have national networks, and each will have a huge budget. ActionAid will deal directly with the region to demonstrate how to spend that money, working with ActionAid and the national networks. Each national network will have to budget for the specific amounts that they're going to be contributing and getting from EC.

Regions now will have to have the planning meeting at the national level with all the participating countries. The regions must determine the Euro amount for the various countries, then work through the activities. Most of the internal budgets do not have to be run by ActionAid. Most of the activities are going to one line; farmer-to-farmer (but for the national networks, they'll have consulting fees, travel, etc.)

Cash distribution: The cash each partner gets is only 75 percent. The total in the budget is not to be confused with the total cash that everyone gets. There has been trouble with networks not understanding why they were budgeting one amount and receiving another. Whatever is budgeted, EC will cover 75 percent, and the rest from the partner or co-financing. The partner has to submit proof of expenditure for the full amount. It is explicitly mentioned in the yearly contract that each partner will get 75 percent of all expenditure. Reimbursements are against actual expenditure, not the budget.

Cash flow complications: There have been problems with partners who delayed; people run out of cash and can't continue future activities. It is very important for each organisation to understand. ActionAid can take 15 months for the second payment, but the organisation can't wait that long, so must plan from beforehand to ensure that cash flow.

Each of the networks' actions will affect the others within the project. If the EC and ActionAid receive documentation as long as 6 months after the project is closed, other projects are jeopardised. IFSN is by no means the only project or the most important one so it is crucial to understand the complications of working with the EC. The timeliness, auditing, allowances must all be followed. There can be some flexibility within organisations to carry out activities in first few months.

Farmer-to-farmer events: There are six events; first year there are two events and at least two countries organise this event. Here there are two kinds of necessary budget: the first should arrange travel, accommodation. The second covers hosting. For each, the regions must have planning with the national networks. For instance, if Vietnam is contributing Eur 4000, and Bangladesh is contributing



something too, between the contributions what will be spent by the host and the receiving country needs to be calculated, in the total budget.

The planning system proposed, allows regions to manage with that money. The region will plan all the spending together and allocate a lump sum to a region. The budget given will very well accommodate the farmer-to-farmer exchange visit.

One chronic problem during implementation of the IFSN II was there were special activities, but no specific political agenda. This phase needs to implement certain activities within certain time. Hearings before European parliament don't depend on IFSN or ActionAid and so IFSN cannot risk playing around them. It is important for regional networks for them to have the funds on time so the workshop needs to consider solutions for this kind of problem.

It is better to know the project at the regional level. If there are farmer-to-farmer activities, it is very important to know the budget before addressing the regional level. There is already a draft budget that is very specific to region, but not yet finalised. Each region can plan based on it, then report back for the final.



FINANCE PROCESS
FLOW.xlsx



FINANCIAL
MANAGEMENT.docx

Important documents:

V. CLOSING SESSION – DAY I

Shahidur Rahman summarised some of the important points covered in the day and elaborated on issues that needed clarification:

- The output IFSN III will produce over the next 4 years, the expected results, and overall objectives
- The expected number of publications, papers, research and all written documents that constitute policy positions and analysis. There will also be 72 (internal and external) meetings, 35 capacity building workshops.
- Each regional and national network will have 24 annual work plans. All of these must be time-bound activities; no work plan will be prepared solely by any network, and instead will be done with the member networks.
- To engage a consultant, there must be a contract, Terms of Reference, CV of the consultant, and receipt for full cost. If the consultant is engaged for extra days beyond the contract, there must be written approval.

A **capacity building workshop** is time-bound, capacity building, and pre-determined. It must be mentioned in the work plan from before. All documentation – the final workshop report, photos, etc – must be submitted. Declarations are annexed to workshop report.

Meeting documentations requirements are the same as the workshop requirements.

Events: These are time-bound events observed aiming to influence specific policy positions. For



example: Any campaign actions or lobby meetings for World Food Day fall under “Event”. Event celebration report, publications, visibility materials, participants’ attendance sheet must all be submitted.

In all cases the quality of substance in the material is secondary to proper EC documentation protocol. Insightful research that doesn't have the EC logo or colours won't be reimbursed. EC documentation is actually about showing that EC money was used as the EC has directed. Quality will depend on the compliance of the EC rules and laws, the visibility guidelines and the proof of expenditure.

Any documentation in local language must be accompanied with official translation, or seal. When trying to get reimbursement for local expenditure, partners must ensure they are coding properly, or the spending will be disallowed.

Documentation must be delivered on time, following right path and protocol. ActionAid is not expecting direct documentation to be supplied; there are channels by which ActionAid will receive the proofs of expenditure.

Q&A

Cash flow: A possible mechanism in the worst case scenario to ensure cash flow is to have members of regional networks transfer money to each other. The money will be divided to six locations for the regions. FIAN disseminates the funds in its region; this is how the process will flow, as it doesn't come from international, but from ActionAid UK.

Reimbursement process: Quarterly finance reports and programme reports are two faces of the same coin; they need each to validate the other. In first quarter ActionAid will try to send 30%. The secretariat receives funds, and then networks receive it. Expenditure report must be submitted for the next instalment. This is followed by three to four weeks for verification to see if the advance has been fully used. If it is, then the next instalment comes in. There is no problem in sending money on time; ideally partners will always be holding some money in hand. This system needs to be followed because of bad experiences of giving large advances, then the project ending and never getting the money back.

By the time the partners who are doing things on time are paid, ActionAid is getting ready for the next year by the time lagging partners come around with their reports. This has an impact for the partners in the south who don't have the cash flow and are delayed. Organisations have to be very careful; partners can sign something, but everyone can't always deliver and others suffer. FIAN does not always manage quarterly reports, but handles the annual report.

Some months can have various percentages of expenditure; some months have low activity and some months have high activity. Whatever a partner does, it doesn't depend on what the EC is doing. The projects will all be under the same auditor. From project to project there is no problem. It is uniform; there is a net average. The EU is very flexible on that. Additionally, the Euro amount has flexibility of 15%. So what is important is consistency, sticking to the same timesheet, otherwise it complicates things. Implementation is the key thing.

Regional will sign the report with approval of national network. There is a section within the planning template that all networks have agreed to. There does not need to be any fixed number of official partners.



VI. DAY 2 - EXPECTATIONS: WHAT DO PARTICIPANTS WANT BY THE END OF THIS WORKSHOP?

Expectations listed showed that participants need more orientation in the regional networks, as well as project management, financial management, clarification on budgets, MoUs, regional networks, linkages, and management issues. Overall expectations had the theme of 'clarity' on all aspects of functions: communications, feature coordination; how to activate national network, and how regional networks should be working. [Further details in Annex-2]

VII. REGIONAL STRUCTURE

Aftab Alam outlined the IFSN's global and regional framework and the functions in coordinating each region:

- The international secretariat will cover 6 regional secretariats: ASASAN (South America), Asia, East and Southern Africa, PALOP (Portuguese-speaking countries), REDCASSAN (Central America) and West Africa.
- FIAN will provide trainings on right to food and justice at grassroot levels
- Communication hierarchy: While all partner organisations will have direct linkages with ActionAid, organisations must group together according to region and then proceed to discuss challenges with the regional coordinator. If representatives are already in place within organisations, they should be officially introduced to the regional groups.

After regional groups presented their challenges and possible solutions on regional coordination (see Annex 3), Shahidur Rahman summarized the issues raised in three parts:

1. **Financial:** How to manage the required templates, provide supporting documentation, complete tasks according to plan and budget; and ensure sufficient funds for activities. In this regard Shahidur Rahman and Miranda Davies are there to support the regional networks.
2. **Communications within own network, and language barriers:** The secretariats are required to develop specific regional references and protocol.
3. **Functioning of structure:** In some areas it is quite clear how things are functioning. Regional coordinators come up with interesting, challenging structures. This might lead into some kind of bureaucracy, so networks must see how it can function more smoothly without more approving authority. The regional coordination and functional meeting will also be a yearly planning meeting. From now until next 22 months, March 25: what are the major regional and global events in the calendar? This time around the structures will give more solidarity work, less of one-to-one, empowering individual work. Less capacity building, but more engagement.
4. **Dealing with bureaucracy:** This is an area where all networks can improve on and learn from Latin America in particular.



VIII: FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT AND REPORTING SYSTEMS PROTOCOL



IFSN3 Finance
handouts.zip

Important documents:

Miranda Davies covered the financial management requirements and fielded participants' enquiries. The contract is between ActionAid and the European Commission, so the networks need to establish contracts with themselves as the management and money is moving down to the regions. The responsibility of ActionAid to the EC trickles down that network.

Payment structure and cash flow

The flow should be that international secretariat manages the programme and finance. Money is disbursed according to certain guidelines, and there is already a relationship from IFSN I and II that assures ActionAid that reporting will be done. The cash flow follows process, and reporting also must be done in order to allow auditing to be completed in time. This is everyone's responsibility; if FIAN doesn't report on time, Africa doesn't get the next instalment.

ActionAid does not yet have a relationship with some networks. These networks need to think about the placement of the three key positions (regional coordinator, finance officer, policy advocacy and communications officer). Some countries have good systems and receive wire transfers in three hours; this affects how ActionAid does processing. In previous phases ActionAid took responsibility as the money was going directly to partners, but now regional secretariats are taking this on.

There will be budgets within the regional networks so there must be adequate cash flow management to carry on programme work, and HR payments. Within ActionAid UK, certain payments are guaranteed: the initial 30 percent at the start of the programme comes after the work plans, contracts and budgets are cleared. The timelines for Year 1, Year 2 set in. All the partners need to organise work plans, take six weeks and return with the budget on July 15. As soon as those contracts are signed and established the regional networks get their first instalments.

The only partners that ActionAid can transfer money to are listed in the grant. The money can only be limited to facilitating activities; no further transfers are allowed. Cash, contracts can be for official partners only.

ActionAid partners have to be part of MoU; ActionAid India and others have to be seen as part of ActionAid UK, since they are their own entity also.

Quarterly reports are due in July, October, January, April. The quarterly reports do not need to have the full annexes or attachments of vouchers, but the annual report does. The quarterly report template is simple and only two pages, with cash flow analysis only for regions that need it.

Recommendations for preparing reports

FIAN was brought forward as an example of a structure to follow. FIAN recommended preparing a narrative and list of activities with the amount of money spent for the quarterly report, but the league the 200 page report with a hundred supporting documents for the end of the year, otherwise it is a lot of



work.

ActionAid's requirement for reporting each activity does not include attaching every voucher; what is needed is: the attendance sheet, the activity report, photos, any drafts of research, contracts, ToRs. These are applicable for all networks and will allow ActionAid to keep up-to-date on what each partner is doing. The emphasis is on the importance of the financial, contractual obligation. With that in mind, reporting is not an unexpected thing. The requirement lies in good planning.

Supporting documents in local language must be accompanied by a summary that translates the numbers simply, with dates and amounts. Templates must allow incorporation of additional data or details that the partner knows is relevant to the report.

Finance people will find that if they look into procedures of the EU, especially in places where reporting procedures are different, they can avoid a significant amount of overwork.

Partners and ActionAid expressed the logistical difficulties in producing the annual report: partners found that preparing a full report with all the relevant scans and annexes could be a daunting task to complete on time. From ActionAid's side, if the reports come in late, the good work done cannot be shared with the partners. At the end of the day ActionAid cannot put money out there if it is not showing returns. In order to reach a common understanding, regions must follow the guidelines given and ensure activities are happening. The purpose of the IFSN network is not to let partners know what is being done at the end of the year, but to continuously keep one another informed.

Translation:

Translation is a big challenge for this project, every activity, project, needs translators. There is a line item on translations, considering the 29 languages, 31 currencies. The translation or interpretation budget exists and each communications person should be updated in whatever language, every month, and at the end of any activity. This may mean google translate for short exchanges and official translators with documents.

David Archer Address:

Following this detailed discussion on finance protocol, David Archer, head of programme development for ActionAid International, addressed the participants and congratulated them for their work in the first two phases of IFSN, and now making IFSN III possible. He emphasised the need for strong linkage between the local, regional, national and international. The next four years should see partners building the sustainability of the food security network at every level, especially since there will probably not be an IFSN IV. He also praised the diversity of the network, which he said ActionAid recognises, and expressed how important the project is and how committed ActionAid is to see it delivered effectively.

IX: IMPORTANCE OF COMMUNICATIONS

The IFSN network needs greater sharing of good practices and traditional knowledge, and communications need improvement among network members and partner organisations, especially wherever there are language barriers.

While the Regional Policy and Communications Officers and IFSN Communications Adviser will



primarily lead the process, communication is a collective responsibility. It is also the regional coordinator's responsibility to manage communications. Skype and social media can all play their role.

The IFSUN website is currently in English; in future there will be multiple language versions, provided all partners contribute. The bi-annual regional newsletter can come in as many language versions as the secretariats choose.

The HIVE extranet is a recent development that will allow sharing of large files and documents; its primary purpose is sharing narrative and financial reports. The manual for using the HIVE will soon be shared with all the secretariats.



IFSUN3 Inception
Workshop_Comms Pr

For further details:

X: MONITORING PROTOCOL

Global secretariat will be primarily working with the regions. In terms of management global will deal with regional, namely the regional plan and budget. Regional coordinator, communications and finance officer are responsible for the regional annual plan. There won't be any asking for plans from the national partners, instead regional secretariat - in consultation with the national networks - will prepare the regional plan and then send it on to global secretariat.

The regional secretariats are required to use the following template for annual planning which is self-



IFSUN3 Annual
Planning format for p;

explanatory.

Partners must try to foresee when planning; if there is a change, then they must inform and update accordingly. Leave columns blank that don't apply; the deadline is the same for everyone.

The regional reports (from the regional secretariat) must be prepared on time. The plans, budget and reports always need to be sent to all four global secretariat people (Shahidur Rahman, Miranda Davies, Alberta Guerra, Hillol Sobhan).

The quarterly narrative report template is designed to make it more user-friendly. National partners won't be asked to send their reports directly to the Global Secretariat (GS); it will go to the regional secretariat which will prepare the regional report and send to the GS.



IFSUN3 Quarterly
Narrative Reporting I

The financial requirements and the narrative requirements for supporting documents are normally not



the same, e.g. receipts and plane tickets versus photos, press release, and report.

There are three possible categories for activities that need to be mentioned in reports:

1. Activities carried out according to plan
2. Activities that were planned but not carried out
3. Activities carried out that weren't originally planned.

The first year plan is for nine months. When any quarter finishes, partners must send reports within 15 days. The annual report has one month before the first audit in July. The fourth year will also be a nine-month year; the second and third years are 12 month years.



Timeline_Annual Plan
and Reporting.xls

The first annual report (interim annual report), which also counts as the fourth quarter report is due on April 30, 2014.



Annex 6_Interim
narrative report.doc

There is also a format for the interim narrative report.

XI: CONTRACT MANAGEMENT



CONTRACTS
MANAGEMENT.pptx

It is essential to have legal documents to hold each other responsible. While there has not been any court case, these contracts are there to make the functional, fiduciary responsibilities remain and monitor the commitments between partners. Without the MoU it is difficult to monitor performance.

Each contract is very specific; all terms and conditions are laid out. Auditors will come out with this in hand.

ActionAid as an entity will sign an MoU with each of the official partners. This MoU is an overall comprehensive contract that covers four years and outlines the foundation of the partnerships. There are two types of MoU used in the IFSUN network:

General MoU: The subject of the MoU is the project by ActionAid and the European Commission: the agreement specifically outlines the full period. If there are any delays, an annex will be added, mentioning



the extension. This MoU is between the partner organisation (ActionAid) and someone representing ActionAid, the funding partner. The implementing partner's overall responsibilities are outlined, and both signatories officially agree to general and special conditions applied by the EC to make this into effect.

Financial reports and all other financial records shall be retained for 7 years from the date of the end of the contract. The EC can always come back and audit within this period.

Although the EC funds 75%, it doesn't audit 75%, it audits 100%. The co-financing must be in line with EC rules and contract conditions.

To maintain good relations with the EC, it is very important that both signatories to the MoU only work on the activities printed in each budget and is implemented by both parties.

Partners will ensure yearly narrative work plan, in one of the 4 languages. Partners cannot deny access to project, project staff, or project finances at any point during the implementation.

As implementing members, partners are encouraged to establish a relationship with the in-country EC office. Partners must ensure ActionAid is informed if there is any shift of project key contact person at any time during the project life, to ensure proper handover and follow up processes to minimise confusion.

If there is any dispute, partners must refer to the Head Grant Agreement Dispute Regulations.



5 MOU Template -
general.doc



6 MOU Template -
multiple partners.doc

Yearly Contract / Funding Agreement (FA): This is a detailed time-bound contract signed by parties to achieve some output by promising to carry out some activities as well as agreement to receive funds based on agreed budget and plan. Funding agreements are signed between partners and IFSN every financial year during the project's lifetime.

While there is only one MoU between IFSN and partners, there is also a yearly contract with ActionAid. The MoU is the EC requirement, while the yearly contract is an ActionAid condition required for providing funding.

The contracts between national and regional networks need IFSN as a signatory; this keeps all the regional details of disbursement of funds known.

IFSN has four types of funding agreements:

I. Funding agreement template for Actionaid CPs & multiple partners



1 Funding Agreement
Template - ActionAid



2. Funding agreement template for Actionaid CPs & multiple partners (partners withdraw)



2 Funding Agreement
Template - ActionAid

3. Funding agreement template for Actionaid CPs



3 Funding Agreement
Template - ActionAid

4. Funding agreement template for non-Actionaid CPs



4 Funding Agreement
Template - Non-Actio

2nd Workshop: PLANNING, ADVOCACY, REGIONAL STRUCTURE AND MANAGEMENT, May 8-10, 2013

I. GLOBAL SCENARIO

Alberta Guerra, IFSN III Policy Advisor

It is important to identify the IFSN programme initiative and policy intervention. The programme goals are based on the proposal, so all partners need to work within the framework of the European Commission proposal and must reference it regularly in order to be consistent and coherent.

The first step is to identify regional issues and prepare draft plans, then come back with a better plan for region, increasingly coming closer to achieving goals.

The worldwide number of people who are chronically hungry is still high. FAO has released the latest figures: 870 million people, mainly concentrated in sub-Saharan Africa. Most of these nations are not on track to achieve Millennium Development Goal 1. The number of hungry people has increased, as has the major share of the world's undernourished.

The big challenge that lies ahead of IFSN is in governance on food. To respond to the vacuum of a global committee on food security, this network is still facing the problem of making all actors recognise the authority of the Committee on World Food Security. CFS was formed in 2009, and represents main platform and authority on food security, where all stakeholders can build alliances and work together.

The human rights approach and the concept of the right to food is one of the most important aspects in the global discourse. ActionAid wants IFSN III to focus in advocacy for the right to food agenda and the right to food legislation. This principle is less rooted in the regional and national level, where organisations are still struggling to have this right recognised in policy.

In order to plan IFSN III advocacy, the chief thing to keep in mind is the network cannot work on



everything. Some reference documents such as the report on the closure workshop and other such documents present lessons to learn: this new phase must try to capture the major lessons of IFSN II.

The responsible tenure of land, fishery and forests is outlined in the Tenure Guidelines, an important document as land-grabbing is a major issue in some IFSN countries.

Governance is another area IFSN III must create a connection with the CFS in order to create policy space for more security strategies. The network needs to assure that governments apply the minimum standards at domestic and regional levels on the Tenure Guidelines on land, fisheries and forests. There needs to be consistency with international standards.

The CFS is a global platform, but it is not the only actor; several others need to be taken into account. G8 launched the New Alliance, and is expected to launch the Land Transparency Initiative. IFSN can influence these initiatives and can work to improve them. Many IFSN countries are hosting projects by GAFSP as well. More details on CFS, GAFSP, IFSN progress and state of worldwide food security can be



GlobalScenario4.pdf

found in Alberta Guerra's presentation, 'Global Scenario'.

Q&A

Some conflicts in the implementation process exist. These are caused by a limited knowledge on the region by those who negotiate at a global level, or the lack of follow-through; people involved in planning aren't there anymore when it comes to implementation and then the onus lies on the government. This challenge can be addressed at the national and regional levels, to make the issue relevant in a way that regions and countries send the right people to negotiate; it doesn't make sense that CFS negotiates in a closed office with technical people. There is also a need for policy guidance not just with investment. Here there is room for civil society involvement; as it stands now there are no real implications for CSOs, more often than not they wait till the programme is more elaborated on, or react to the plan and project after it has begun. Unless civil society groups are mobilised, it won't be possible to go ahead.

Small scale farmers are losing their lands in many ways; there should be a common position on agriculture, land, and sustainability. The tactic to use is to see which agreement gives more rights, look at the overall community and try making instruments as complementary as possible, and avoiding conflict. In implementation there is no overlap or promoting one brand over another: FAO and EU are in contact with each other and not opening parallel processes, rather using existing instruments.

Ruchi Tripathi described the crux of the project is the focus on small scale, local, family farming, which is a clear model. Partners must be pragmatic about where the energy is: the focus is in regional. If there is energy in Africa (which there was before the Tenure Guidelines had started), it should be harnessed, which is why African negotiators were not involved at CFS. If global gives more rights or if regional gives more rights to women, either should be used, the important thing is to be very clear which gives more rights.

IFSN research in sustainable agriculture has seen four case studies on agroecology, and this work can improve in the third phase. IFSN III agrees the model is family farm model, and hopefully all specificities



will be captured in the regional plan.

Many of these issues are cutting across the regions and will bear on how regional plans are synchronised. Amplifying certain issues at a regional level, such as land, can give rise to an inter-regional issue to further push on by analysing different national possibilities. All these issues – sustainable agriculture, family farming, agroecology – need to be understood, as do the links and articulation between them.

II. PANEL: EXPERIENCES OF ENGAGEMENT IN DIFFERENT ORGANISATIONS

Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP) by Ruchi Tripathi

GAFSP is a multilateral trust fund housed at the World Bank, but not administered by the World Bank. It is a multi-donor trust fund behind national programmes. GAFSP goes to IDA eligible countries. These nations must demonstrate there is a national food security strategy and a commitment of prioritising food security. In the Steering Committee, there are recipients and donors sitting together and deciding who gets the money, which is a unique set up. The governance is very different.

When countries submit their application, they are scored on criteria. The public sector window is administered by the World Bank. This is a grant. Private sector window is managed by IFC; this is not a grant.

IFC gives public loans that are going to private companies, as a subsidy. Farmers need investment, and in this way they get blended finance. The goal of GAFSP is food security, so why not go to small holders and private sector cooperatives rather than intermediaries? This is in opposition to reaching the same group via banks; GAFSP is trying to challenge this model.

GAFSP is country-led, and countries compete. The structure is new, so its results are now slowly coming in. GAFSP was developed after the food crisis in 2008. Its donors' vision is that private investment in agriculture will lead to food security. More details on GAFSP's structure and functions are available in the presentation, 'Ruchi GAFSP presentation.'



Ruchi GAFSP
Presentation.pdf

Comprehensive Africa Agricultural Development Programme (CAADP) by Buba Khan

Agriculture must be brought back on the agenda in Africa. There is food insecurity and hunger in the continent; in 2003 CAADP nations signed a budget commitment to give at least 10 percent allocations to agriculture. The movement is towards bringing back agricultural growth, to help drive the sector. Since 2003, out of 54 nations, only 10 have met the budget allocation commitment, showing there is still a lack of political will to.

The target is to achieve food security and income generation or poverty alleviation, give means for wealth creation and support to industrialisation, socio-economic growth and improved standard of living and clean environment. The goal of 6% annual growth is in the real sense, and can link to poverty



reduction.

CAADP is country-led; it is a government project, not a civil society organisation. It is difficult to involve civil society organisations unless government wants it. (ActionAid has tried to have mediation between civil society and state.)

Buba Khan hoped that peer review processes, mutual accountability, and M&E allow regions to learn from each other, and share what is being done in CAADP. Stakeholders' meetings allow partners to share their experiences; there is a regional integration agenda so that Africa is not so fragmented, so regions can take the comparative advantages and improve. More details on the work and functions of CAADP can be found in Buba Khan's presentation, 'Buba AAI Engagement in CAADP IFSN III Inception meeting'.



Buba AAI
Engagement in CAAD

FIAN International by Angelica Castañeda

Many organisations from other regions have asked about workings of FIAN. It is an international human rights organisation that works on the right to food. FIAN has offices and programmes in all regions in the world, especially in Latin America, also in Mexico, Brazil, Paraguay. They are considering opening an office in Guatemala as well. FIAN started working in this region 27 years ago, working with agrarian reform.

Since FIAN's work in Latin America had all been initiated before the project started, and will continue after it ends. This has been the main challenge in implementation of IFSN project in the region. When starting implementation, it's not happening in a politically neutral environment, but it has to happen.

This is a good opportunity to connect grassroots organisations with international work, which is an area that FIAN has institutional experience in, using the international spaces available.

The first space FIAN has accessed is the Inter-American System for Human Rights, also the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights based in Washington, DC. There are three regional systems: European, African, and Inter-American. In the Inter-American system, there are activities for the commission to lobby governments in the region. This organisation is being used for different judicial cases. Using this mechanism FIAN can present a case against a specific state because of violations of human rights, against a specific group of its citizens.

The second mechanism is the system of human rights from the United Nations. FIAN has a permanent office in Geneva through which FIAN can conduct all activities through the UN system with cases of human rights violations. A third space is the European Parliament's Human Rights Sub-Committee, and finally a fourth space: all the work FIAN does within the FAO.

How is this work allocated in organised and systematic way? FIAN syncs local, national, international levels. It fluctuates within these levels, lobbying in different areas. This multi-pronged approach is in all FIAN's work and explains many positions against global processes as well as their work methodology.

An example of how this is effective is in Honduras: 58 peasants were killed. Crimes involved business



people in the area usurping territory there to gain land to cultivate palm oil.

FIAN's first step was to have audiences in the Inter-American Commission: the audiences there can generate an important political momentum in order to lobby the Honduran government. Before this audience, the position of the government was that this wasn't a human rights issue, just a bunch of terrorists and troublemakers. After obtaining a pronouncement from the Inter-American Commission that described the situation as a human rights issue, they changed their stance. This element was taken into account when EU negotiated a free-trade agreement with Honduras.

The work FIAN does in Rome, in land negotiations and the works being done with civil society mechanisms are based on what FIAN sees on the ground. FIAN facilitates different social movement or fights to spaces for presenting themselves. In this example, these different levels are interrelated. When FIAN works in these spaces, the goal is to make changes in public policy, for solving specific cases.

Where is the momentum in terms of right to food? Is it with the Human Rights Commission, or is it more about national constitution? Within IFSN, FIAN has advanced more in Latin America and strengthened alliances. It is very important to have an overall view; take into account the three different levels that you are working at same time. Networks' strategy should be to prioritise the topics, but have to be respectful of national dynamics. It's very important to provide them with all the information about what's going on at the global level.

International Food Security & Nutrition Civil Society Mechanism by Francisco Sarmiento

The objective of the meeting is to better lobby for food security and nutrition, to be able to conquer the right to participation, and right to policymaking participation. The food security agenda is more and more complex: land, climate change, biodiversity, smallholder farmers – so many issues in the debate, and so many spaces for civil society.

There isn't enough time or staff to participate in all the spaces. The situation nowadays is much more complex; regions are all pieces of the same dynamic in the food system. There are over 850 million people suffering malnutrition, there is hidden hunger; half of humanity is suffering. Food security and nutrition is no longer a question of policy. This is an economic, social and technical crisis; most of this dynamic came from WTO from liberalisation and changes in food chains. Financial capital has shifted, and most food enterprises are in debt, so the real crux is the finance system. This is happening at the cost of depletion of natural resources and biodiversity.

The food system needs to be better governed, which means democratic governance is needed for the food system. There are arguments against a UN government for food security, where the main opponents were the exporters. The creation of the World Committee of Food Security is a success in face of that. The committee's achievements three or four years ago include the right to participate in formation of public policy. At regional and national level this is something that has to be achieved.

Food security and nutrition strategists are approved by the parliaments. In most of the countries in Africa, rather than concentrating on energy, the focus is on the donors. CSM's capacity to participate is reduced. The regional level is especially important: CFS and CSM are important achievements. The risk is now if CFS becomes isolated internationally, becoming a talk show. The real connection with the ground can be somehow lost.



CAADP, regional level decisions and CFS ministerial meetings, lack linkages with each other. CFS needs to be represented at regional level with FAO. What actually should happen is Africa should link the civil society space with CFS and CSM, which are broader than FAO. The CFS would be a UN committee. All the UN organisations working in food security should relate to the CFS.

One of the challenges of IFSN is to promote action, to get NGOs to work together, to participate and find a way for linking those processes from national to regional.

What is happening now in Africa is that it is the next target for the agro-food system, supplying the demand in China. Ethiopia, linking countries, even in the middle of Africa will send produce to ports going to Asia. Without looking at the overall dynamic of the food system, it is more difficult to see where resources, focus and time should go. The idea is Africa will cover the increased demand for food from some countries in Asia. Now, 4000 farmers are producing soy in Mozambique; Brazil's soil is degraded.

IFSN and social movements must promote necessary collective action, and more democratic action. IFSN focuses energy on the level of African union and regional bodies of three different continents.

The regional organisations can be observers; communities of Portuguese-speaking countries were the first to ask for observer status. Other regional organisations can do the same as CPLP, such as the northern organisation of Central America or ASEAN. Food security is no longer just about agriculture, it's about health, education and many other things.

The technical crisis ahead is how to sustainably produce food with half of the water and one third of the land (as the rest is degraded). This added to climate change crisis will affect future decisions. Productivity is no longer improving the way it did. Partners and networks need to research, develop new capacities.

Food security-related advocacy in South Asia by Aftab Alam

The major regional areas of engagement in South Asia are: SAARC, ASEAN, Asia Pacific FAO Regional Conferences.

South Asia Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC): The SAARC Food Bank (established in 2007) is a well-developed framework in which very detailed work was done, but is not functional due to political problems and market-related issues.

The SAARC Seed Bank (agreed 2011) does not have much work done, and there are numerous concerns. There is no momentum as such; it has good records of community seed banks, so it is up to the association and network to see how to develop this, how to scale up at regional level keeping in view different countries needs, and research to form a strategy to engage. Not just IFSN, but other partners can play a role

Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN): The ASEAN+3 Emergency Rice Reserve is an old idea that has gone through many stages; it has many problems in operational issues, delivery, and has conceptual problems with sustainability. Its latest stage was in 2012.

The ASEAN Integrated Food Security Framework's next phase will begin in 2014.



There have been challenges: there is limited space for CSOs to engage in ASEAN and SAARC; only some organisations participate under certain protocol. SAARC is different from CAADP and other processes, which it can learn from. There is a lack of connection between CSO's local, national work with regional opportunities. Wherever engaged, the associations missed those strengths.

Asia Pacific FAO Regional Conferences are held every two years; it approves the regional FAO plans, but it does not engage. Partners cannot do much by participating in a two-day regional conference. It is very important to keep connected with national networks; there is better engagement of CSOs at the regional level.

Civil Society Mechanism has sub-regional contact points: Ujjaini Halim, in India, for South Asia. For South East Asia, Marlene Ramirez in Philippines.

The partners and allies are: Asian Farmers Association; Asiadhrra; Adhoc CSOs steering committee; SPI



Aftab Food security
related advocacy exp

Indonesia; Arab Food Sovereignty Network.

III. TAKING STOCK EXERCISE

Participants were grouped according to region and asked to present the following:

1. Experience in the region: successes and failures in engaging from a regional perspective
2. If there is no engagement in the region, highlight countries' experience in those processes
3. Other regional processes you have been engaged with but aren't captured

Africa

- Successes: CAADP Forum last year had a particular focus; they carried out research to make CAADP more effective for women smallholders
- Senegal, Ethiopia, Nigeria, worked towards an agricultural investment plan
- Increased women and youth presence in agricultural issues
- Participated in FAO meeting in 2012. The Saharan region food crisis was addressed. CSO representatives contributed money.
- CAADP called an event where performance over 10 years was evaluated.
- Previously partners did not know how to organise these two land policies. Held workshop on voluntary guidelines in West Africa involving Burkina Faso alliance, CNCR, ROPA.
- Way forward: Capacity building, more research on CAADP, showing the meaning of a 10 percent investment in agriculture.

Asia-SAARC

Not much space for social advocacy; there is intention to work on food plan, right to food issues. Propose to advocate the legislation. There must be more work on policy and proposal of sustainable



models.

Asia-ASEAN

Impact of the programme is in poor or poverty context. Through policy advocacy, the PM has signed on a decision to remit numbers of land areas. The experiment can be replicated at the regional level. There is need for research on land-related issues in Vietnam; it can also think about how to link rapid response to natural disaster with ASEAN. Many countries have not ratified many such agreements.

Latin America-REDCASSAN

There are many processes that link REDCASSAN, a regional network working together for food sovereignty, to a global level. The preparatory meeting in Rome for the civil society mechanisms has shown how regional networks complement the group there. REDCASSAN consults with the national networks then sends information to the group in Europe.

REDCASSAN has participated in a preparatory meeting for forming an alliance. This meeting will happen in June. At the same time, they will also be working in issues with civil society mechanisms. They have also worked as a region with the FAO and taken part in confirmation of the Frente Parlamentario against hunger in Bogota. The national network there is related to parliamentary entity and belongs to the framework of the initiative against hunger in Latin America. REDCASSAN also worked with SIP in governance of land. As a regional network, they are focused on issues related to food security. The process is to be developed next July in Panama, with four participants. As a regional network, those issues have a real impact. The region has a sustainable agriculture that is friendly to the environment. Both Guatemala and Nicaragua lost their legislation on these issues. The network is trying to support the other countries in relation to human rights and food, even if it's not an issue they're concerned with. In these countries this issue has been stressed.

One of the challenges is related to strengthen the relation with Via Campesina, the international coalition for peasant organisations.

The dynamic of the regional network is that it is a learning process, and important to understand before finding success in any issue. Food security is now a common agenda integrating the network, giving political chances to straighten things out.

Latin America-ASASAN

Some years ago in South America, different social processes culminated politically in situations that relate to power struggle. These can be termed community socialists, or progressive governments: Venezuela, Uruguay, and Brazil.

Already, right to food exists in Ecuador; food security legislation exists in Brazil. The human right to food, water, and clean access are being acknowledged. When it comes to selling food, transporting food, there is now a "declaration of ecologic food production" from America, which is applicable within American states. There is a meeting once a year in Lima, Peru, to discuss peasants' rights. ASASAN considers that the food trade in itself is wrong; what is wrong is the ability. The network has only one country, Paraguay that can't filter the level of decisions into the market.

Portuguese Speaking African Countries - REDSAN/CPLP

The Portuguese network was made up of Angola, Cape Verde, Guinea-Bissau, San Tome & Principe. This Portuguese FSN network was launched in April 2012. In June 2012, the Brazilian network FBSAN joined. The new network is REDSAN-CPLP.

PALOP is five African Portuguese-speaking countries. CPLP includes eight.

The community of Portuguese-speaking countries is an inter-governmental structure of countries with a common plan, cultural similarities, and a shared history.

Concerning food security and nutrition, CPLP has approved strategy on FSN with a right to adequate food approach, via multi-stakeholder regional governance.

Successes lie in the national networks strengthening, more advocacy and lobbying towards formulation and/or revision of national food security strategies. The regional network was created and is functioning. REDSAN-CPLP is invited to lead the process of establishing CONSAN-CPLP civil society mechanism.

REDSAN-CPLP failed to strengthen REDSAN-Guinea Bissau, due to inability of getting government commitment.

Top issues are strengthening social participation, mainstreaming FAO Voluntary Guidelines on right to food and access to land within the CPLP regional strategy. Also they are working to ensure governments and parliaments move forward with the strengthening multi-sectoral institutional mechanism for policy dialogue at the national level. CPLP works to ensure national and regional FNS policies are progressively coherent, convergent and aligned with the FAO voluntary guidelines.



REDSAN-CPLP_BKK.p
df

IV. IFSN POLICY GOVERNANCE: ZAKARIA SAMBAKHE

The network addresses food security and nutrition in the global context, the challenges in global, regional and national levels, and the people and countries facing these problems. IFSN adds value in terms of legitimacy of processes of advocacy and policy influence in international, regional, national and grassroots level.

Vision: IFSN is to work towards a world where every citizen has equal access to safe and nutritious food. Its politics take sides with the poorest and the most vulnerable to create access to safe and nutritious food based on human right approach.

Structure: International Steering Committee, Global Secretariat, National IFSN

The Steering Committee's role is to give policy orientation for IFSN project implementation in global, regional and national level, guide the implementation of IFSN project, and take policy decisions. Members are elected to represent interest of region and country in solidarity in transparency.

The committee's chair gives policy advice, represents IFSN in policy negotiation, and facilitates Steering



Committee meetings. Members are also required to give policy advice, and also to give their region feedback. IFSN organises an election for the Steering Committee, to choose legitimate representatives of each region. There are eight members: two from Africa, two from Asia, two from Latin America, plus one northern and one non-voting member.

However, Shahidur Rahman observed that the present structure has covered IFSN II structure. There is now a new reality at the regional level, so each must present their regions more strongly, to talk and guide beyond IFSN. He requested proposals from the members for reform. The leadership requires a person who can strategise, and show strong political vision and representation. [Participant suggestions listed in [Annex 5](#).]

MAY 9, 2013

V. SHARING NETWORKING EXPERIENCE

This session is to experience sharing especially on networking, from various regions. Working together on a network can be a Herculean task as it involves many organisations, not always with the same goals. In each presentation the partner was requested to share challenges faced and how to overcome them.

Aquiles Davalos



RIO 20 - HUELLA
ECOLÓGICA.pptx

This diagram (ppt slide 2) shows revealing data on children, from the USA, Oman, Norway, India, Ghana, Brazil, and Bolivia. All children, from rich and not so rich countries, from 0-6 months, whether in Africa, Australia, South America, all grow in a similar way. Breastfeeding is the only source of nutrition in the initial six months: after that, when they start consume supplementary food, what happens to the children then? The curve goes down, decreasing and there is chronic malnourishment in Bolivia and other poor nations. This means a reduction in height. (The table is height / age). This explains why children are smaller and not as tall. As long as there is breastfeeding, everything is alright. When people depend on food produced by their own countries, the gap becomes bigger as they become older.

The next infographic shows human development on the vertical axis: the higher the circles, the better the development. In the horizontal axis all the circles represent countries' development index. This horizontal range means, as high as the circles are, there is a negative ecological footprint; the vertical line, the higher this range goes, the more negative footprint of the country. The countries in yellow, they have a development in status that is lower, but they don't make much impact on the planet. Ecological footprint is not as heavy as the countries on the right. These countries grow, but the damage they are causing is devastating. US has high economic development index, but the damage done is remarkable. As countries are richer, more development takes place and more damage environmentally. There is just one country that has reached a good development status but doesn't cause damage, Cuba. Asian countries have many industries, are growing according to their economic development. But don't think Cuba is like this because of its system or politics, it is because of the economic embargo that prevents industrialisation. This situation should make us reflect: more development, more wealth, more industry leads to tremendous ecological damage to the planet.



Legislation has been passed in Ecuador, Bolivia, and Peru for supporting the rights of the indigenous persons. This proposal for legislation is not from bureaucracy but from CSOs. There is a situation here, between rural and urban areas: in 1950 the rural inhabitants made up 70% of population, and in 2010 it is 66%. So who is producing the food in urban and rural areas? In Bolivia, as it happens in the Andean subcontinent, there is a lot of food being produced, so much so that each person can be guaranteed at least two meals a day. So food and production is not lacking: what is lacking is access and good distribution. It is the same with water. There are great projects, plans that start to produce healthy water. Lately water has been privatised, and very few people now consume adequate amount of water.

Lobbying for sustainable agriculture, small farmers, has always been at the core. The articles within the regional network and political constitution articles on water and food outline access as the right of the people. Indigenous people have autonomy. In the Andes region, legislation titled 'Eat Well, Live Well' was created. These are the translations in the regional languages.

More than one thing is necessary to achieve something important. The network is the strength of many things that can be done when there is organisation and there is intention to change things.

Marius Dia



RESEAUTAGE
presentation Marius

Marius Dia spoke of how networking has strengthened ROPPA¹, and for defending the OREFA.

In general, West Africa wants to work on the family farming system in the agro-industry; ROPPA wants to know the structure of family farming to prevent exploitation. The methodology is to work on research and find out the different platforms. The central theme is: to feed the family, to feed the population, to feed Africa. Peasants produce more food in their area. To have more productivity, to be nourished is to have choice.

The meetings have reached certain results today. The family farming system feeds population: there is the contribution of the system to the economy, but what is the connection with the market? What is the income they have: is it static or dynamic? What is the contribution of the youth and women in the system, and how can their presence be increased? How can policy support this? What were the conditions for the success of these networks? In general it's useful if these parties play a key role.

The network must live for the world. When addressing the phenomenon of food insecurity, each partner can look to how IFSN members are facing it. Sharing this information at every level will help build the kind of relationships that are far more important than the documentation.

Each time one problem is resolved, immediately another one crops up. Partners don't match the movement with the reality of the farmers. The problem is that whenever the top tier suggests something new, the risk is borne by the farmer, not the association or the network, or IFSN. Most of the time, those offering to change things for the better think the farmers don't know how to think, but

¹ Réseau des organisations paysannes & de producteurs de l'Afrique de l'Ouest (Network of Farmers' and Agricultural Producers' Organisations of West Africa)



that is not true. That is a big challenge for the farmers' platform.

Indra Lubis

Indra Lubis gave his own personal history as well as the background of the Indonesian peasants' rights union which officially started 9 years ago. It was not possible to make a peasant organisation in 1969 because the government saw them as communists, so they worked through local farmer's groups, or NGOs. At the same time, they collaborated with the alliance of the national organisation for agrarian reform. NGOs, peasant organisations, indigenous people, consumers, and some scholars make up the network, with the same objective as Senegal mentioned: the issue of agrarian reform. It is very crucial to raise these issues. After the 2008 crisis, it shows the future will be in the hands of people controlling the food.

This network is fighting for, and trying to lobby for the conventions on peasants' rights at an international level. Although most of the population is made up of peasants and farmers, until now there is no legislation to protect them. This idea came from the grassroots, and last year, the proposal was officially accepted in the UN Convention on Human Rights in Geneva. It is on the table and up for discussion; already it has changed from 'peasants' rights' to 'rights of people in rural areas', but it is in the system. Now, it needs other organisations' support, like from FIAN, to show their platform the lobbying skills needed. It will be the peasants' organisations that will take the lead, even though other NGOs are involved.

Indra Lubis also spoke of the struggle against the WTO: from the 1990s, its policies are extremely technical, and several anomalies exist, making it very difficult to understand for the actual people affected by them. The Indonesian peasants' platform connected with ActionAid and other NGOs to translate the Agreement on Agriculture and used it in educational materials provided to grassroots communities. From there came the understanding for the need to protest the WTO conference in Hong Kong in 2005. Hong Kong is one of the most expensive cities in the world, and there were no farmers or peasants to ally with. Yet they were able to employ guerrilla warfare tactics and bring the negotiations to a halt. At the end, over 1,000 protesters, including Indra Lubis, were arrested. At the time, this was considered a great victory.

Q&A

Ruchi Tripathi asked what way CEDAW² article 14 could translate to on the ground work. Indra Lubis said gender equity is an issue they have always kept in mind, and it is mentioned in every article.

If the different members of a network don't have food security as a main goal, the sustainability of the work would be in question. However, IFSN has brought many organisations together and they were happy to get this opportunity to move forward. If IFSN stops, these organisations will continue to work together. The most important contribution was the peasant organisation, for the basis of this regional programme should be food sovereignty, which is mainly based on family farming. In the first vision, food sovereignty was not mentioned, so this is a success story, especially for farmers' organisations in West Africa.

² Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women



Research and studies on agriculture show traditional farmers can use technical innovation, in Senegal. They have showed that even if they don't use the technology, they are still able to increase production. If family farming is put in good condition, they can receive credit, finance, they will prove that agro-business is not the future of African agriculture. This will make the government favour family farming.

Explain the process from the peasant movement to the UN: When talking about peasants' rights and the alliance, there is sharing of earlier experience together. The same people struggled against land occupation; they cannot wait for conventions to recognise and raise their issues, they need a different space. 2013 is very crucial; there is some lobbying, there's no hope of support from governments in Asia. So now it's Bolivia and Venezuela who need to take the lead. If China would support this, it would be very easy. They do not want to involve themselves in this. The key elements to build the alliance: the objectives must be the same as the demand is what brought us together in 2005.

The problem of representation remains. What must be done to bring the grassroots level to be represented at national, regional, international levels? In Senegal the solution was to strengthen the capacity of the people in rural areas, to help them understand and master the problem. Government should be part of this process, and involved in studies.

Aquiles Davalos recalled that 20 years ago people asked what it is he was working on. Now, food is a fundamental subject in the world. For one reason or another, politicians who take the worst part of the conflict, but small food producers get the worst blame. There is great worry for trans, genetic food, and related issues too, like transportation, in the effects that one Bolivian banana can cause when consumed in Denmark. How much fuel has the banana spent to make that intercontinental trip? Is it worth it? So it is better to appeal to local food, smaller, cleaner agriculture, small scale, and smaller agriculture. This new awareness inspires people to get together and produce alliances, for networks, national, international and regional, as in the case of IFSN.

VI. VISIONING EXERCISE: POLITICAL VISIONING AND RELEVANT GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE: WHERE IFSN WANTS TO BE BY 2017 AND WHAT SYSTEMS AND STRUCTURES NEED TO BE IN PLACE TO ACHIEVE THAT

What do you think IFSN could be by 2017?

Even if the network isn't getting external funds, the internal network can be used. In this network, partners can continue working together: some were working together before IFSN, except for Portugal. It's important to maintain links and communication, hence the importance of sharing in this phase.

IFSN should have greater independence as a platform, with participation of CFS in all levels. It also needs UN recognition of IFSN processes

IFSN could be strong enough to strategise, identify issues and create spaces of dialogue and defend positions of poor farmers. It should be respected and recognised as a key player in food security discourse.

What would IFSN be known for? Focus and added value. Describe in a few words.

One of the most important things is the global concept, the idea that all networks were connected as an



international network. IFSN would be known for progress with food security and right to food, and also the composition for civil society organisations and empowerment of small scale farmers, something people can see in IFSN work. It's a network of networks.

For global recognition the role of CSOs should be focused on, and connecting local and global issues. There should be branding and co-branding at the international level. IFSN should be known for being pro-small farmers, for promoting the right to food, nutrition, and agroecology.

Who would its members be? Would it be a multi-sectoral network (i.e. network of networks?)

It is very strategic work to ensure all the networks are coordinated, on each topic and policies in the future. There must be committees for representation; in all operational work, there should be gender and ethnic representation. In the regional level, there should be focus on women, and peasants. IFSN should build alliances with different organisations working on food rights and other issues such as public policy issues. All members can be represented in their capacity to defend poor farmers.

How will it function? Coordination and fees - keep three dimensions in mind when answering: national, regional and international.

There can be two types of membership. There should be a fee based on consultation. There should be regular as well as event-based contribution. This would ensure ownership of particular organisations. Contribution might be coming in-kind. Social media can be used for fundraising.

Q&A

Impact of the training can remain within one family, but solidarity work, campaign work can save hundreds or thousands of lives. Global secretariat is there to keep a more reliable number.

Yilma pointed out that indicators are there as a target. These issues might happen at regional and global levels as the objective might not reach at first. The overall objective in the first year is to know when to monitor the data. Most indicators are for immediate outputs, so specific and overall objectives might be useful.

Aftab Alam said there is very good capacity in different regions on indicators and monitors. One possibility is whoever wants to work with Hillol on qualitative indicators can do so, giving more and more internal mechanisms. If the colleagues want to start this, that would be the best way. When ActionAid was finalising the proposal, it needed to be convincing and show that the project was thought through properly. That's why there are those numbers, but there is a basis for them: there are at least 6 regional positions. (In each approximation it is "at least".)

Shahidur Rahman pointed out that with 1100 organisations in the network, 1 million is a moderate estimation. There should be at least 1000 stakeholders for each. The 4 million figure assumes that each person targeted is in a family of four. Figures in the proposal are the least, the absolute minimum that the network can cover; if not, it will be losing a lot of ground.

Angelica Castenada supported the idea to integrate qualitative indicators. They are important to express the process, especially at the international level. Quantitative doesn't take into account all of the work



you have to do before the final result. Alejandro mentioned that there are some models and templates for qualitative indicators that can be used.

VII. IDENTIFYING MAJOR REGIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR NEXT YEAR TILL MARCH 2015

In this session regional partners together determined some key dates and targets in each of their regions. As this is the first phase, this plan is not finalised, but the session introduced the chronogram used by the EC and the methodology expected to be used for planning main activities.

Each region filled out their chronogram, reflecting global and regional engagement. With these in mind the regions can have some funds and facilities to organise activities during the dates given in their calendars. However this is not to be imposed without taking in the region's perspectives and after holding meetings relevant to the regions.

This exercise was indicative, and in the coming weeks and months the plans will become more comprehensive. Alberta Guerra reminded the partners that the chronogram is a living document, and its plans must tie with the proposal and the timeline.

Shahidur Rahman clarified that all networks must be present at each of the regional inception meetings planned in order to decide on governance structure of the regions. New networks must have a governance system in place so that regional networks are in place and it is clear how the secretariat is actually communicating with national networks and structure.

The national networks will help regional secretariats make a regional plan: regional networks must not distribute funds to each nation and leave to them to choose what action follows. Instead, in advisement with the national networks the regional secretariat should choose the best organisations for particular activities. National networks must know how the money is moving.

Global secretariat must have advocacy plans placed with them alongside an identified budget. The proposal suggests the fourth month as the best time for the regional meetings, which is July. Therefore, by July, the regional secretariats need to establish all MoUs with the organisations, clear contracts, and have plans approved and ready. The plans must cover the nine months; a planning meeting prior to approval can be any time before July, while it is up to the region's convenience as to when their regional inception meeting takes place.



Next steps for IFSN
III Inception May - At

Africa

- June 21 meeting in Burkina Faso
- June 2013 to November 2013: Consultation on rice.
- PSO report launch by June.



- Senegal, Niger, Benin will have a meeting.



Regional Planning
AFSN May-August As

Asia

The 13th ASEAN Food Conference in September in Singapore will cover food demands and sustainability in Asia. This is a crucial meeting for ASEAN countries and the Asian network.

There will be work to mark the International Day of Rural Women as well.



Next steps for IFSN Next steps for IFSN
III Inception May - At III Inception May - At

ASASAN / REDCASSAN

ASASAN participants presented the tentative plan for the Indian region and Paraguay with a mix of activities already planned in the past, and others that have to do with international meetings. There is an upcoming meeting in July in Colombia on human rights and access to food, that ASASAN wants to take advantage of. There will possibly be one woman representative from CSO.

Next year is the year of family agriculture in the world. In this context, ASASAN will have a meeting in October to approach this subject in particular. The meeting will bring together the Indian communities of the region to discuss agriculture, peasant agriculture, the role women play in the production of food. In November, investigations will start so that in March 2014 when the first year finishes, ASASAN will have five different researches that will have a gendered focus on the family approach to food.

There will also be another meeting of the Andean states (Colombia, Ecuador, Bolivia, Peru) and Paraguay to present a conceptual work to CFS that has to do with food sovereignty, the right to food security, within the five countries.

There is a regional FAO meeting in Chile that will happen in February next year, where the Andes region countries and Paraguay want to present different research works that have been done in the regional FAO institutions. Different offices in Bolivia, Paraguay, and the other nations will work to consolidate a document on activities done until that date. There are seven different kinds of activities that ASASAN has contemplated in the Andes region and in Paraguay.

There will be a meeting in June in Latin America for the alliance for food security that ASASAN will participate in. In the same month they will also have CSM participation. ASASAN and REDCASSAN also have been working within a high level expert group since last year, and this year will produce a final report. From July to September, with FAO they will be forming the platform of leaders on food security.



Next week ASASAN will have the first meeting for regional planning in Guatemala. REDCASSAN and ASASAN may plan events for World Food Day, and for that the two associations will have a regional meeting. There are two sessions in the UN forum on human rights in the region that are high priority. Honduras and Guatemala have had not enough representation, but as a regional network there are possibilities, together with FIAN.

REDCASSAN, ASASAN have participation with system integration in Latin America. Central America has a system where food security will be discussed. It is important for the REDCASSAN network to be in this space. All actors of CSM will be involved in September 2013, either in Brazil or Argentina. In May 2014, the regional meeting of Latin America by FAO, will bring together analysis. Both associations have been participating in this for few years. REDCASSAN and FIAN plan to encounter, tentatively. There will probably more to discuss in the regional encounter next week.



Next steps for IFSN
III Inception May - At

REDSAN – CPLP

CPLP chose to summarise big events, rather than some specific activities. The first is the regional inception meeting and setting up with CSM. This will be held in Lisbon during the last three days of September.

The Hunger Free Africa initiative will be launched in July or September, and it will produce a paper on the best practices in CPLP, namely the institutional set up of governance, with civil society participation.

CPLP will participate in the three-day meeting in Brazil in November that REDCASSAN and ASASAN will also attend.

There will be a meeting of CPLP heads of state in East Timor in July, and a regional meeting in Cape Verde. There will be a parallel event with regional representatives.

CPLP also plans to attend the FAO regional conference for Africa, Latin America, and the regional conference in Asia, as CPLP represents different continents.

VIII. MAJOR WORK FOR NEXT 3.5 MONTHS

- Establish overall governance structure
- Regional secretariat finalisation (modality of work, governance structure)
- Regional Staff Recruitment
- Finalisation of MoUs
- Finalisation of M&E frameworks
- Regional workshops and plans
- Pre-regional workshop preparation
- Inception workshop report
- Workshop communiqué



- Supporting to IDs for regional staff
- Regional budget

IX.REGIONAL DRAFT PLANS

ASIA



Regional Planning
AFSN May-August As

There will be rotation of leadership every two years; regional staff recruitment can be completed by May 31st with the support of global secretariat. The regional workshop agendas will be set before June 15.

The regional budget will be put forward on July 10, 2013.

The regional workshop plan should be from 24 to 26 June, 2013.

Asia secretariat will also have preparatory work for the ASEAN Food Conference and the International Day for Rural Women (October 15).

The region will decide how much is needed based on participation. Other activities outlined at this workshop will be discussed at the regional meeting.

CPLP



Next steps for IFSN
III Inception May - Au

National networks will liaise prior to regional workshops and plans; monitoring and evaluation meeting on August 9, 2013 will precede regional inception meeting at Lisbon in September.

REDCASSAN



Next steps for IFSN
III Inception May - Au

Because of the characteristics of the networks in the region, the national network is supported by a national organisation, or a minister's fund, so each will choose the best person for dealing with finances. Tentatively these people should be chosen by June 30, 2013.

ASASAN



Next steps for IFSN
III Inception May - At

The 8-12 July, 2013 regional meeting will be in El Salvador where the regional coordination is located. Responsible person is Luis Moran. The national coordinators, Ayuda Accion and FIAN International will participate as well as the global secretariat. ASASAN's regional network will send plans to global secretariat for approval.

In terms of staff recruitment, there is no need for new staff; this network has the necessary personnel. They will need to rethink the Terms of Reference for the July meeting.

AFRICA



Next steps for IFSN
III Inception May - At

Regional budget will be sent to Miranda Davies and Shahidur Rahman after 11 May 2013 (after returning from the global inception workshop.) Other plans will follow after the June meetings mentioned in the chronogram take place.

X. WORKSHOP EVALUATION, KEY FOLLOW UP DATES & FINAL COMMENTS

The materials (documents, worksheets, presentations) from the Global Inception Workshop were shared with the partners.

A workshop communiqué will reach everyone on May 15.

The workshop report will be sent by May 25

A management meeting between FIAN, ActionAid, and the American regions will take place before the end of August.

Global secretariat will share the full organogram of IFSN one week after receiving all HR information.

The workshop evaluation sheet garnered several "excellent"/ "good", and many "fair" checks. One participant wrote that there is a need for better planning, and inclusion of more regions.

Workshop evaluation details are available in **Annex 6**.

ActionAid will work on soon providing French, Spanish and Portuguese translations of ActionAid's easy guide to general conditions so as to facilitate understanding on European Commission rules and Grant Management Guidelines. Each partner needs to check the legal implications of existing procedures with ActionAid.

The workshop concluded with a round of thanks from all of the participants; Elia Henriques appreciated



everyone's warmth and the feeling of comfort she had during the week; Alzira Menete, Celso Garrido and several others thanked the organisers especially with regard to the efforts to bridge the language gap. Shahidur Rahman expressed pleasure at everyone getting to know each other, and promised to be on standby for any contract management questions. Yilma Muluken praised the planning of the workshop, and thanked Aquiles Davalos for all his longstanding work, as well as Aftab Alam and the rest of the workshop organisers. Alberta Guerra noted that active participation and interest from colleagues and partners made this week a success, and thanked external guests Buba Khan, Indra Lubis, and Francisco Sarmiento for their contributions.

Byomkesh Lal also expressed appreciation for the enthusiasm of bringing in external players, which brought a perspective for partners to learn from, and recommended continuing these kinds of efforts. Aftab Alam reminded everyone that while the meeting is finished, all must now start the work. Aquiles Davalos said he should have taken a pill for the pain he felt at parting; even the day before, he felt so well in the companionship that it did not matter that his walking stick was missing all day long. Although it took two days to get to Bangkok, but it was worth it to meet all the participants, and he ended by thanking the global secretariat for bringing everyone together.

Annex I: Group Exercises

1st Exercise: Find relevant conditions/rules and match to subject (Workshop I Part II: EC Grant Management Guidelines)

1. Co-financing: [When splitting up costs, e.g. IFSN could cover 70% other partner covers remaining.]

- EC doesn't cover the entire costs of the action (1.2 page 3)
- Other EC grants cannot be used for co-financing (GC 14.5)
- Specific budgeting (GC 14.5?6?)
- Proof of co-financing could be like funds from other donors, contribution from partners, etc
- Funding from other donors
- It is always a %, not an amount, and EC contribution is set to maximum (GC 14.5)
- Based on EC cost NORM
- Approval proposal fund
- Flat rate is respected. No need to provide supporting documents. (GC 14.4)
- Ineligible cost cannot
- Overhead cost max 7 to 8% of direct costs (GC 14.4)
- Cost incurred according to accounting principle (GC 14.4)
-

2. Contribution in kind: [Steve Rusk: Non-monetary contribution that doesn't involve monetary engagement]

- Should not be considered as co-financing
- Can be used for the action and report as *added value* to the project but not as actual expenditure (GC 14.5)
- Contributions in kind of do not represent actual expenditure and are not eligible costs. (expenditure verification is not possible)
- May not be treated as co-financing (GC 14.5)
- Contribution in kind do not represent actual expenditure and are neither eligible costs or



treated as co-financing

- It can be reported as added value to the project

3. Eligible costs: [Steve Rusk: Costs incurred to execute, implement the agreed and approved activities in this project]

- Project-approved costs incurred during the project period, which are verifiable, recordable, and financial management compliant
(Please refer to Annex III, the project budget)
- Must be verifiable and recorded in the accounting records
- Must be verifiable and recorded in the accounting records
- Necessary for the implementation of the project
- Reasonable and comply with the sound financial management (GC 14.1)
- Human resources assigned to action

4. Ineligible costs: Not allowed in the project. E.g. taxis, costs that are not allowed in the expenditure.

- GC 14.6: Over-expenditure of more than 15% above main budget heads
- Currency exchange losses
- Debts (14.6)
- Purchase of land or buildings (except when approved and necessary for the action) GC 14.6
- Interests owned
- Expenditure that doesn't respect procurement rules (Annex IV) (GC 14.6)
- It will be deducted from the final payment

5. Contingency reserve:

- NA
- EC should be notified before using
- No more than 5% of direct costs (GC 14.3)
- Cannot be used for correcting mistakes in project design (GC 14.3)
- Should be able to absorb any reasonable unforeseen overrun of eligible costs
- Can only be used with prior written approval of EC (GC 14.3)
- Cannot be more than 5% of direct costs and can be used to absorb reasonable unforeseen over expenditure of eligible costs. Correcting mistakes in project design is not allowed.
- Prior written authorisation of EC is A MUST

6. Administrative costs: [Steve Rusk: Necessary amount for the implementation of programme]

- Based on EC costs – NORM.
Approval proposal fund (7%)
- Flat rate is respected. No need to provide supporting documents to the EC. (GC 14.4)
- Ineligible cost cannot be included. (GC 14.4)
- Overhead cost max 7 to 8% of direct cost (GC 14.4)



- Cost incurred according to accounting principle (GC 14.4)

7. Accounting records: [Steve Rusk: What everyone needs to show EC financial proof that you're doing what you're supposed to be doing.]

- Easily verifiable and identifiable
- You must keep accurate and regular accounting records
- Accounting system should be compliant with country policies and rules (GC 16.1, 15.9)
- Expenditures must be easily verifiable and identifiable (GC 16.1, 15.9)
- You don't need to open a second bank account unless the interest earned can be calculated and traced back to individual projects (GC 16.1, 15.9)
- The interests must be reported in the financial reports (GC 16.1, 15.9)

8. Interests:

- Interests earned on EC income must always be reported in the final report (GC 16.1, 15.9)
- Expenditures must be verifiable and identifiable (GC 16.1, 15.9)
- Interest earned on pre-financing payment equal or below EUR 250,000 can be used for project action (GC 16.1, 15.9)
- Don't need to open separate bank account in case of interests
- You can earn interest

9. Exchange rates: [Steve Rusk: Volatile issue in financial management; it varies, so have to refer current rate]

- Financial reports are made in the currency in which local expenses are made
- GC 15.9: Exchange rates and losses and gains due to fluctuation, in case of exceptional cases EC can be consulted to restructure the project.
- Expenditure is converted to Euros at the ex rate published by Info Euro website:
<http://ec/budget>
- You are responsible for losses and gains
- You may use several different currencies in the report (GC 15.9)

10. Audit requirements: [Steve Rusk: The necessary financial and essential EC legal documentation to reclaim the eligible expenditures of the project. Time bound docs, visibility guidelines, proof the expense has incurred.]

- GC 15.6: Audit report (expenditure verification) has to be attached to:
All interim and final report in case of grants of more than EUR 750,000
- Must be submitted on EC template by the auditors (GC 15.6)
- 1 per year
- Done by the lead agency (ActionAid UK)
- Audits are necessary to clear the next payments
- Change of auditor must be done through written notification to the EC (GC 15.6)
- Final report in the case of grant more than EUR 100,000 (GC 15.6)



2nd Exercise: Groups define and discuss 2 subjects each

Group A

Accounting: Partners must keep accurate and regular accounting record. Accounting system should be compliant with country's rules.

Interests: Interest earned on EC income must be reported in the financial reports. Interests earned on pre-financing payment equal or below 250,000€ can be used for action. Interests earned on pre-financing payment of more than 250,000€ should be used for the action but will be deducted from the next payment .

Each branch has its budget. You get the 7 percent on top of it; does not have to be justified or given documentation. Only those costs of the programme plus 7 percent of the costs will be given. It is the same with FIAN and other examples.

Group B

Co-financing: Co-financing is 7 percent of eligible cost spent. It's 7 percent of what you actually spent. The EC doesn't ask to prove where the rest comes from, but it shouldn't be from another EC funding. How to justify the 7 percent of administrative cost? It is justified by EC regulations; partners are entitled to claim this much for indirect costs (admin staff who don't appear on the budget, organisational overhead, etc) when preparing the budget.

Group C

Contingency reserve: This can't be more than 5 percent of the direct cost. It cannot be used to correct the planning mistakes.

Prior approval of the EC is a must; this will come through ActionAid finance. It is better to avoid the contingency reserve as it is included (also in Syria, Jordan, Lebanon, where the situation on the ground is uncertain) only when unsure of how project will be administered.

Contributions in kind: This category does not represent actual expenditure and can't be treated as co-financing. It can be reported as added value to the project, but can't be reported as the ministry's activities. It can refer to local offices, partners' offices, where in order to find 25 percent co-financing, they use the office value. If it's not listed in the agreed budget the partner can't do that. This can refer to staff cost, unless they do not appear in budget; sometimes may refer to food given. Unless these are specified, they cannot be included.

Group D

Ineligible costs:

Taxes and VAT: For every EC contract, there are a variety of rules regarding VAT. For this contract, VAT can be eligible providing the official partner shows proof that they have written to the relevant tax authority requesting exemption. Therefore the partner can show the letter from the tax authority, saying 'no', and that makes them eligible for the full expenditure with the VAT. EC guidelines should have reference to VAT, as an eligible expenditure. Not all local



organisations need to collect this letter; each official implementing partners mentioned in the contract needs to show a letter stating whether they are exempt from VAT or not. This is also applicable for other service taxes if they cannot be reclaimed.

Concerns:

- This information will be disseminated from workshop to the organisations back home. Budget issues are being discussed without the finance people present: How can they get the message out of that? A lot of the complications occur because of lack of communication between the people in the workshop and the finance people. How to guarantee this link?
- Challenges of the regional coordination and management, for other partners as well, including coordination, financial management; participants have to come up with ways to bridge those gaps.

Audit requirements: Annual requirement. The requirement for documentation flows down to the partner. There have been past problems with expenditure without supporting documents.

Unless ActionAid receives all documentation, the audit is not for ActionAid UK, but for all partners. Each partner has to know what is the document required for the audit, and must produce it at the end of the year.

Group E

Eligible Costs: These are project approved costs incurred during the project period. These costs are covered by the agreed budget. The audit and external evaluation can happen after the project.

Exchange Rates: Financial reports are made in the local currency. Expenditure is converted to Euros. EC will not compensate for losses or gains. Exchange rates are complicated; fixed annual exchange rate is calculated later.

3rd exercise: Linking documents to relevant subject

Travel/Meetings: Local and international travel can be charged differently; costs can be moved around 100%; travel. Main headings give flexibility, but big amounts of money should not be removed out of small budgets, especially in travel. These have to be reported on.

- Attendance sheets
- Field visit reports
- Boarding passes
- Transport tickets

Procurement

- Required documents (receipts, quotation, proof of supply, received procurement)
All docs must be kept for 7 years. An air ticket alone isn't enough, also need boarding card
- Tendering documents
- Asset register
- Donation certificates

Equipment/Supplies



- Certificate of origin (should be one of the eligible countries) needed at the point of purchase.
- Contracts with suppliers. Need a valid contract.

Staff Costs

- Employment contracts
- Time sheets - important for staff not 100% assigned to the project. Part-time staff need ToR showing the percentage of your time, and time sheets that show week/month how much time they have spent.
- Documents relating to national tax/social security contributions
- Salary slips

Cost of Vehicles

- Invoices for fuel/spare parts: have to show all to administrative back ups; you have budget lines to account for it, make sure you have all documentation.
- Logbooks: keep them, all journeys must be recorded

Many activities are co-financed by other projects; in this case the partner must send a verified copy of the contract with mention of the details such as contract number.

Annex 2

Workshop I Expectations:

- Clear advocacy strategy
- Clearly define regional responsibility
- Clear plan and steps for next year, and vision for next 4 years
- Clarity on EC-IFSN protocols and regulations
- Have clear work plan and commitment from all partners
- Clear understanding on finance & reporting protocols/guidelines
- Clarify all the issues related to project management
- Clarity on everyone's roles and responsibility
- Have clarity of budget vs results
- Perfect clarity on financial and technical issues for IFSN III execution
- How to activate national networks
- Regional and national network linkages
- Regional structure and management
- To understand better budget distribution between networks
- Regional coordination
- Collectively develop broad contours for intra-inter regional functioning and coordination
- To understand the general regional management procedures for IFSN III
- Management of regional action plan and budget
- To have useful information for management of IFSN III
- To have common understanding of IFSN III management at regional level



- Financial management and reporting
- ToRs of project activation at Phase III
- MoU for members
- Better understanding and knowledge of the way forward
- Hope the functioning of institutions involved in the project improve
- Hope it will be possible to have Portuguese translation
- To know how to improve visibility and communications

Annex 3

Group Work: Possible regional coordination challenges & solutions

ASIA

<p>Regional Coordination Challenges</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Might have coordination gap between countries and secretariat (e.g. Bangladesh and Cambodia) 2. Preparing regional plans 3. Monitoring and evaluation 4. Following EC branding guidelines 	<p>Solutions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identification of country focal point. Face-to-face meetings 2. Formation of regional committee 3. Develop M&E framework 4. Capacity building (M&E, operational plan, EC guidelines) Support and sharing with global secretariat and final approval
<p>Communications Challenges</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Quality and timely reporting 2. Conducting regular meetings for updates 3. Maintaining EC branding in publication 	<p>Solutions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Create reporting template 2. Skype conferences 3. Follow EC guidelines
<p>Finance/budget</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clarifying national partners' budget 2. How to develop finance flow system with accountability? 3. Develop MoU between whom? 	<p>Solutions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Budget in accordance with regional plan 2. Develop financial flow system 3. Regional finance person will oversee the budget with support from global secretariat

WEST AFRICA

<p>Regional Structure Regional Secretariat will rotate between SOS Sahel and CMCR every two years.</p>	<p>Communications Addressing challenges of 2 French-speaking (Burkina Faso, Senegal) and 2 English-speaking (Gambia, Ghana nations)</p>	<p>Budgeting Addressing the challenge of transferring funds from the international to national via regional</p>
---	--	--



EAST AFRICA

Regional Structure	Challenges	Solutions
Hosting country: Ethiopia Partner: CCRDA Focal person: AAS Includes 3 nations: - Ethiopia - Malawi - Uganda	Responsiveness of the networks Financial management - new partner - new modality	Develop minimum work overlap with other ActionAid intervention Link with regional structure Commitment for focal person from ActionAid and external

SOUTH/CENTRAL AMERICA

Structure of Central America <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General committees formed by delegates from different national networks, led by steering committee • Regional committee in El Salvador: Regional coordination performed by a political team with four members from the national network • Nicaragua, Honduras, Guatemala have individual organizations responsible 	Structure of South America <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A continental geography of 5 nations (Bolivia, Paraguay, Ecuador, Colombia, Peru) • Bolivia is in charge; Ayuda Accion present in each nation • 5 networks in each country specialize in capacitation provided by FIAN International
Challenges <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Communication difficulties exist because of how vast the area is, coordinating South America with Central America. - Role of Ayuda Accion: Some of the challenges are common. It's important to have increased articulation between the two networks, as they have similar experience. 	
FIAN International <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote shared learning experience; coordination with FIAN and Regional Network to accomplish the international agenda. Establish communication and visibility; this needs to improve. In case there is a problem in fund disbursement this can also be discussed. <p>Clarify role of FIAN International: Capacity building activities is stated role, but there is more beyond that. All of FIAN's work at international level is case work and lobby activities. That role covers Rome, Geneva, Brussels, in the last 27 years.</p>	



REDSAN/CPLP

National Coordinators:

- Angola - Belarmino Jelembi
- Cape Verde - Aguinaldo David
- Guinea Bissau - Sambu Seck
- Mozambique - Paulo Rangel
- Sao Tome & Principe - Celso Pontes

Regional Coordination Structure:

- Coordinator: Joao Pinto
- Focal Person: Unnamed
- Finance: Unnamed
- Comms: Elia Henriques

Regional management challenges:

- Partners in the south are not yet fully capable of taking over the secretariat functions; there are some logistic problems

In the past there was a specific Portuguese-speaking network, partners in the south had difficulties.

- Focal point responsibilities have so far been taken up by the same organisation. In this specific situation, the network does not see how to shift the responsibilities

Communication challenges:

- One of the big challenges is the partners do not speak English; information coming from the global coordination being in English is a problem.

- Need to make one person in each country responsible for the visibility and communications of the national network to make the newsletters and improve regional website

Finance challenges:

- Problems with receipts from other countries in Portuguese finance system. Cash flow into southern countries.

- Budget overall not been discussed yet, insufficient information

The specificity of the Portuguese network is quite different; countries are spaced out; face-to-face meetings are once a year. In Angola, in some places there is no internet for a week. There are problems of a specific kind that are not applicable to other networks.

A lot of documents are not available; REDSAN-CPLP would like facility in budget to do more in translations.

Annex 4: Workshop 2 Expectations

- Focus of regional advocacy
- To find out what is IFSN about beside admin



- The support role of global secretariat to regional secretariat
- Find out common and important issues for small scale farmers at global level
- To debate for a common regional understanding
- Mechanism of establishing national and regional coordination process
- How to continue the national works as the IFSN III has main focus at the regional/global level
- What are CFS's structures in Latin America?
- Plan of action for all the regions for 2013-2014
- Issues/ways in working regionally
- The governance structure of the new phase
- Understanding on which issues and processes we will work on
- Build coherent and consistent plans in the future
- Harmonise priorities of engagement in Africa agriculture development
- Know how each region is facing the realisation of R2F
- Identify synergies on Africa Advocacy with IFSN and CAADP
- Enhance structures and strengthen linkages with other networks in the African continent with IFSN
- Prioritise challenges in regional and national levels
- To know more about experiences of other regional networks
- IFSN's added value to global fight for food security
- Overall plan / action plan on policy advocacy

Annex 5: Suggested changes for criteria / role of Steering Committee

1. Celso Garrido: **How would it be possible to have representative link with the Portuguese group / CPLP in the process / and in steering committee?**
2. Ruchi Tripathi: **We must build connections of regional networks and the steering committee.** Members in last phase are representative of national networks. Now how will they link with regional networks? Complexity is between the regional network and the steering committee. It is the steering committee will remain once the project ends. Question of how regions can play vital role in the steering committee.
3. Miranda Davies: The steering committee shouldn't be a shell, it should be functioning, reporting, not wait till after four years. **How will the committee sustain after the funding ends? You can't go out for funding unless the system in place;** US won't give money to an organisation that doesn't have the capacity to move the funds. How will the steering committee ensure this? There are things that could be done to ensure these systems are put in place.
4. Aftab Alam: **Regional partners' role is important, and the responsibility and accountability should be reflected in the steering committee.** Sustainability has 3 angles. One, building profile of IFSN and how to build an enhanced profile of the network. That can help in fundraising. Second, it will be very difficult if we don't have the IFSN systems in place, such as the M&E systems, financial systems, communications and organisation systems. Third, political guidance, keeping the existing and future contacts in mind. The thematic context, in this framework, is how to be prepared, and the way the network is prepared to take other issues. These elements should be considered when talking about the steering committee.



5. Yilma Muluken Akalu: IFSN is a network of many institutions, of research, analysis, etc. **There is a need for greater membership of IFSN. If we bring more members, we make opportunities.** Outside consultancy could be a good idea.
6. Buba Khan: It's a good beginning, good process. We might not be able to agree on all points now, so consultation should go on beyond, so we can agree on what they need in this framework. It is good that we are starting to discuss this. **We can consider an outside consultancy?**
7. Miranda Davies: **It is better to discuss in-house before bringing in an outside consultant. As for taking in new members, membership would also be good for income.** There should be open dialogue.
8. Shahidul Islam: **As the steering committee's role is to give advice, would they consider an outside food security expert to advise them?**
9. Ahmed Borhan: **We must revisit IFSN vision and mission, which have been developed in the new phase.**
10. Francisco Sarmiento: **A chairman from outside can often be able to build bridges with members, donors, governments. Someone in the committee belonging to a particular region within the IFSN might be considered to lack objectivity in comparison to an outside chair.**
11. Rosa Angelica Castaneda Flores: **Consider how to elect regional representatives.**
It could be important for the committee to bear in mind that in Latin America, there are some networks that ended up being part of IFSN by default. Previous to implementation of the project, they were part of others.
There are some big players who have a strong role in global processes. Sometimes they have different mechanisms to elect representatives. It depends if the network is interested in maintaining the legitimacy in the regional and national networks. If that representation is based on organisational or personal grounds, an issue to be addressed; this is noticeable in Latin America.
12. Byamkesh Lal: **Members of the steering committee should not be from IFSN day to day management.**
What it can do more effectively is be more outward looking, build links with similar networks, so our issues get more traction. Gender consideration when choosing members?
13. Zakaria Sambakhe: **Is it a good idea to have working groups again?** In Phase I, II, we had working groups with different thematics.
14. Aftab Alam: **The steering committee's connection with sustainability is very important.** While sustainability is important, the project is demanding, very busy in day to day efforts, diff to step out and think of sustainability.
15. To bring in **Working Groups for regional committees.**

Annex 6: Evaluation Results

Sl	Question	Total	In number				% analysis			
			Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
1	Rate the usefulness of the content?	23	14	8	1	0	61	35	4	-
2	Rate the individual activities?	23	10	12	1	0	43	52	4	-
3	Rate the group work?	23	9	13	1	0	39	57	4	-
4	Rate the presentations?	23	7	13	3	0	30	57	13	-
5	Rate the facilitation?	23	9	11	3	0	39	48	13	-
6	Rate the time keeping of the sessions?	23	9	8	6	0	39	35	26	-
7a	Level of comfort/services	23	16	7	0	0	-	30	-	-
7b	Location	23	16	6	1	0	70	26	4	-
7c	Food and refreshments	23	17	6	0	0	74	26	-	-
8	How would you rate this workshop	23	11	11	1	0	48	48	4	-

Annex 7 - List of participants:

Sl	Name	Designation	Organization, network	Nationality
1	Shahidur Rahman	Global Coordinator	IFSN GC	Bangladeshi
2	Hillol Sobhan	Communications Advisor	IFSN GC	Bangladeshi
3	Amal Bahadur Chhetry	Admin officer	IFSN GC	Bangladeshi
4	Alberta Guerra	Food Policy Officer	IFSN GC	Italian
5	Miranda Davies	Finance Officer	IFSN GC	British
6	Aftab Alam	International Coordinator Food Security and Livelihoods	Actionaid International	Pakistani
7	Stephen Rusk	Asia IPD Coordinator	Actionaid International	British



8	Buba Khan	Africa Advocacy officer, Africa	Actionaid International	Gambian
9	Ruchi Tripathi	Senior Programme Manager, Resilient Livelihoods	Actionaid International	British
10	Dávalos Saravia Gualberto Aquiles	Executive Director	AIPE	Bolivian
11	Peñaranda Suarez Marco Esteban	Administrative Manager	AIPE	Bolivian
12	Manuel Salvador Díaz Medina		REDCASSAN	Nicaraguan
13	Leuba Cécile Marie Isabelle	Food sovereignty advocacy officer	PSO	French
14	Rosa Angelica Castañeda Flores	Latin America Program coordinator	FIAN International	Peruvian
15	Martin Kurt Gerdemann	Finance Coordinator	FIAN International	Peruvian
16	Alejandro Serrano Martínez	Project Manager	AeA	Spanish
17	Elia (Peixoto De Oliveira Henriques, Élia Marília)	REDSAN-CPLP/ACTUAR officer	Actuar	Portuguese
18	Garrido de Sousa Pontes Celso Carlos	Engenheiro Agronomo	RESCSAN- STP	São - Tomense
19	Alzira Menete	STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBER	PSO	Mozambiqian
20	Zakaria Nanan	IFSN-Burkina Faso. ROSSAD National Focal Point	WAFSN	Burkina Faso
21	Zakaria Sambakhe	IFSN Senegal coordinator and IFSN CHAIRPERSON	WASFN	Senegalese
22	Marius Dia	Coordinateur national CAT	CNCR	Sénégalaise
23	Yilma Muluken Akalu	Programme Officer- Resilience	AAI	Ethiopian
24	Thanh Pham Van	Deputy Director	CCRD	Vietnamese
25	Md. Shohel Rana	Manager	Actionaid Bangladesh	Bangladeshi
26	Md. Shahidul Islam	Program Coordinator	UD	Bangladeshi



27	Ahmed Borhan	Coordinator , AFSN	AFSN	Bangladeshi
28	Byomkesh Lal	Program Manager	AA India	Indian
29	Saito Basumatary	National Coordinator	sSTEP	Indian
30	Francisco Manuel Bendrau Campos Sarmiento		CES - Center of Social Studies, University of Coimbra	Portuguese
31	Indra Lubis	International Secretariat	La Via Campesina	Indonesian