

Draft remarks for CFS Evaluation meeting 26 Sept

Agenda item 1: Debate on recommendations 8 and 9

- We understand that the proposed discussion is mainly on recommendation 8 (role of the Chairperson) and touches Recommendation 9 (role of the Secretariat) only on one specific point: in the way how the Secretariat relates and supports the Chairperson. This can be done today. But an in-depth discussion about the CFS Secretariat, its structure and functioning, is still needed in the further discussions on the CFS evaluation.
- We support the idea that the Chairperson of the CFS does not only chair the CFS Bureau and Advisory Group meetings but also as representative of the CFS and ambassador of the spirit of the CFS outside Rome.
- We agree with the proposal of the Evaluation that there should be a protocol for the reporting of the Secretary. However, this reporting and accountability structure should not only be with the Chair and FAO, but also with the other two RBAs, as the CFS Secretariat is a joint secretariat of the three RBA. The protocol should be drafted by the CFS Chair and the responsible directors of the three RBAs.

Agenda item 2: Debate on recommendation 4

- The **composition of the Advisory Group** should reflect the **principle on participation** established in the CFS Reform Document, paragraph 7: “the composition will ensure that the voices of all relevant stakeholders - **particularly the most affected by food insecurity** – are heard”. The CFS reform elaborates further who are these constituencies of those that should be particularly heard, and these constituencies are the constituencies that formed the CSM.
- Regarding the specific consideration of the evaluation on the **PSM: we agree with the evaluation report that the parity of seats demand is not justified**. The legitimacy of the CSM, representing more than 380 million organized people from all civil society sectors, including farmers, fishers, indigenous peoples, pastoralists, consumers, landless, women, youth, urban food insecure and public-interest NGOs, is not comparable with the PSM, representing primordially the private and profit-oriented interests of the corporate sector, transnational companies and international business organizations. We do not think that an additional seat is needed for the PSM. They have been able to intervene as often as they wanted in the Advisory Group, being present mostly through their secretariat only.
- **Regarding the WFO: we agree with the evaluation report that their argument is not convincing** as farmers are already present in the CFS. Far more than 330 million family farmers and food producers already participate to the CFS through the CSM. Groups of commercial farmers already participate in the PSM. WFO needs to take a decision to either participate through the CSM or the PSM to the CFS.
- **Regarding the CSM itself: we accept the suggestion of the CFS evaluation to provide a comprehensive proposal to motivate the need for additional space, if this meeting supports the suggestion of the CFS evaluation report.**
- With regards to the **constituency of the private philanthropic foundations**: it cannot be accepted that one single philanthropic foundation occupies the seat in the Advisory Group for 7 years, without reaching out to other philanthropic foundations working on food security and nutrition. The Gates foundation has failed to build this constituency, a change in this position is certainly needed.
- The **Bureau cannot be simply flexible in appointing the CFS Advisory group**. It has to closely follow the guidance given by the CFS Reform. Any significant change should have the mandate from the CFS plenary.