CSIPM Women and Gender Diversities Working Group's intervention
Friends of the Chair meeting, 8 February 2023.

Some questions:

1.- Where do these proposals come from? Do they come from evidence? From discussions with experts? With groups of women to identify their needs? CSIPM proposed a methodology based on open sessions and now we have this table, so what are the criteria for it?

2.- About agreed language. We still lack clarity on the coherence and meaning about agreed language within this process. ‘Peasants’ is agreed language, we have it in different documents of the CFS without footnotes, and now it seems that it’s different. And through what means can we identify positive participation of men and boys? Is it agreed language anywhere?

3.- About gender transformative approaches. Our concern is how can we reflect what we want to transform, if we cannot use “patriarchal systems, patriarchal structures and norms”. The objective of the CFS is to address the root causes of malnutrition, how will we do that without using the right words?

4.- The chair mentions that the order does not reflect the priorities, and this is to identify better the focus of the Guidelines. We think that Care and Food are totally linked, so why care and elimination of all form of violence go now to the final part of the document? After all efforts and work made within this process, we thought that it was clear and agreed that it has to be a priority. We think that this change does not help.

5.- The last one. How much margin will this process ahead have to negotiate?

From our side, we are open to continue this process as long as it doesn´t stay as a simplified exchange of words (as Germany said). We need to see where those words will take us and whether the final text will diminish our rights. As you said before, Chair, we want NO STEP BACK.