

CSM Plenary Statements on CFS Evaluation, 12 October, 2017

(2nd Intervention)

Intervention of Alberto Broch - COPROFAM

Positions on specific topics of the Evaluation and the Consultation report:

- We can agree with the Consultation report as presented, although we see many weaknesses in it.
 - The proposal of having a **strategic MYPOW** is a good compromise which takes into account the fact that the CFS is not an organization, but a platform.
 - The **budget issue** is not solved in our view, this remains as an urgent challenge to solve next year. We would like to reaffirm that the budget is not a financial but a political issue.
 - On other issues like **Plenary, OEWGs, Chair and Secretariat**, specific follow-up steps are agreed for next year.
 - 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”. These most affected by food insecurity are the constituencies of the CSM, according to the CFS Reform Document.
 - Regarding the specific consideration of the evaluation on the **PSM: we agree with the CFS 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 primarily the private and profit-oriented interests of the corporate sector, transnational companies and international business organizations.
- a) **Regarding WFO: we agree with the evaluation report that their argument is not valid.** Farmers have been already participating in the CFS, and the WFO has usually participated through the PSM. CSM facilitates the participation of more than 330 million family farmers and food producers to the CFS through the CSM.
- Any organization that wants to join the CFS as participant needs to first define to which category it belongs, and the define through which mechanism they can collaborate. WFO needs to take a decision to either participate through the CSM or the PSM to the CFS.
- No special treatment is possible. If a special treatment is allowed for the WFO, each of the CSM constituencies will claim the same right: one special seat for Indigenous Peoples, one for Smallholder and Family farmers, one for pastoralists, one for agricultural and food workers, one for fisherfolks, one for consumers, one for the landless, one for women, one for youth, one for urban food insecure, one for NGOs.

(3rd Intervention)

Other issues of importance that should be tackled in the Follow-up to the CFS evaluation report:

- As agreed yesterday, Gender equality, women’s rights and women’s empowerment should be mainstreamed throughout the CFS. The discussion on the evaluation provide an appropriate space for this.
- One topic that should be particularly discussed is the challenge for a better use, application and monitoring of CFS Policy Outcomes: How can we better use at home what was agreed in

Rome? This discussion has been significantly pushed by the CSM in 2017, together with some governments.

- How to make the CFS a truly responsive place to the global challenges of today and tomorrow? This question refers to global urgencies such as the famines and severe food crises as well as to global challenges with huge implications, such as the debate on megamergers in the agribusiness sector.
- Last but not least: the role of the Rome-based Agencies in strengthening the CFS:

The engagement of RBAs with the CFS should be assessed on the different levels of their involvement:

- they are part of the Joint Secretariat;
- they are part of the funding structure; they are part of the policy process, through the OEWG and the Advisory Group;
- they can link their own priorities, policies and programs with CFS processes;
- their role in the dissemination, use and application of CFS policy outcomes is absolutely key; and
- their role in contributing to the CFS monitoring exercise is essential.

On all these levels, the involvement of RBAs needs to be revisited and strengthened. The case of the roles of RBAs regarding the VGGT can show the achievements and shortcomings in this respect, and also the potentials and needs for change in the future.