

# **Do we need to categorize it? Reflections on constituencies and quotas as tools for negotiating difference in the global food sovereignty convergence space.**

**Claeys, P. & Duncan, J.**

**Published PDF deposited in Coventry University's Repository**

**Original citation:**

Claeys, P & Duncan, J 2018, 'Do we need to categorize it? Reflections on constituencies and quotas as tools for negotiating difference in the global food sovereignty convergence space.' *Journal of Peasant Studies*.

<https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2018.1512489>

DOI 10.1080/03066150.2018.1512489

ISSN 0306-6150

ESSN 1743-9361

Publisher: Taylor & Francis

**This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way.**

**Copyright © and Moral Rights are retained by the author(s) and/ or other copyright owners. A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge. This item cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder(s). The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.**



# Do we need to categorize it? Reflections on constituencies and quotas as tools for negotiating difference in the global food sovereignty convergence space

Priscilla Claeys & Jessica Duncan

To cite this article: Priscilla Claeys & Jessica Duncan (2018): Do we need to categorize it? Reflections on constituencies and quotas as tools for negotiating difference in the global food sovereignty convergence space, The Journal of Peasant Studies, DOI: [10.1080/03066150.2018.1512489](https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2018.1512489)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2018.1512489>



© 2018 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group



Published online: 05 Oct 2018.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 202



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

# Do we need to categorize it? Reflections on constituencies and quotas as tools for negotiating difference in the global food sovereignty convergence space

Priscilla Claeys<sup>a\*</sup> and Jessica Duncan<sup>b\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Centre for Agroecology, Water and Resilience, Coventry University, Coventry, UK; <sup>b</sup>Rural Sociology Group, Wageningen University, Wageningen, The Netherlands

## ABSTRACT

Convergence – as an objective and as a process – designates the coming together of different social actors across strategic, political, ideological, sectoral and geographic divides. In this paper, we analyze the global food sovereignty movement (GFSM) as a convergence space, with a focus on constituencies and quotas as tools to maintain diversity while facilitating convergence. We show how the use of constituencies and quotas has supported two objectives of the GFSM: alliances building and effective direct representation in global policy-making spaces. We conclude by pointing to some convergence challenges the GFSM faces as it expands beyond its agrarian origins.

## KEYWORDS

Alliance building; constituencies; convergence space; food sovereignty; global governance; quotas; representation

## Introduction

Convergence – as an objective and as a process – designates the coming together (so as to eventually converge) of different social actors (both within a movement and from different movements) across strategic, political, ideological, sectoral and geographical divides. The convergence of struggles plays an important role in the lives and discourses of food sovereignty activists (European Coordination Via Campesina 2016), as is reflected in numerous references to convergence in the literature on food sovereignty movements (see for example Allen 2014; Alonso-Fradejas et al. 2015; Amin 2011; Brent, Schiavoni, and Alonso-Fradejas 2015; Desmarais, Rivera-Ferre, and Gasco 2014; Edelman and Borrás 2016; McKay 2017; Mills 2018; Rosset and Martínez-Torres 2014; Tramel 2018). Scholars have analyzed food sovereignty, as a concept and movement, as a ‘convergence of demands’ (Pinheiro Machado Brochner 2014, 261), and the transnational agrarian movement La Via Campesina (LVC) as a convergence of social movements characterized by ‘unity in diversity’ (Desmarais 2007, 39). Rosset and Martínez-Torres (2014, 143) suggest that LVC is the result of ‘a grand process’ of convergence which led to the ‘emergence of food sovereignty as a common framework that would allow diversity and to take the

**CONTACT** Priscilla Claeys  priscilla.claeys@coventry.ac.uk  Centre for Agroecology, Water and Resilience (CAWR), Coventry University, Ryton Gardens, Ryton on Dunsmore, Coventry CV8 3LG, UK

\*Both authors have equally contributed to this article.

© 2018 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way.

specificity of each different place into account'. For Amin (2011), such diversity has to be accepted; the goal being to overcome fragmentation, respect each other's struggles and build 'convergence in diversity'. Yet, little has been written about the actual processes, mechanisms and strategies that social actors have developed to maintain diversity while facilitating convergence within the global food sovereignty movement.

In what represents one of the most in-depth studies of convergence, Routledge (2009) describes 'convergence spaces' as responding to a number of key characteristics. First, convergence spaces act as associations of actors and resources that work to make political actions durable through time and mobile across space (Routledge 2009, 1894). Second, convergence spaces articulate a 'collective vision' which serves to establish common ground and generate a 'politics of solidarity' (Harvey 1996). When entering transnational coalitions, 'movements need to develop a politics of solidarity capable of reaching across space, without abandoning their militant particularist base(s)' (Routledge 2003; citing Harvey 1996, 400). Third, convergence spaces facilitate multi-scalar political action across a range of operational logics that exist across the movement, including more horizontal (decentered, non-hierarchical) and more vertical (centralized) operational logics. Fourth, convergence spaces actively shape political identities around common concerns and bonds of trust. Finally, convergence spaces are sites of contested relations insofar as they are comprised by a diversity of groups with, at times, conflicting<sup>1</sup> goals, ideologies, and strategies. They are often dominated by certain actors who control key political, economic or technological resources (Dicken et al. 2001), but also symbolic power, resulting in unequal discursive and material power relations. In practice, these contested relations, associated with representation, but also mobility and cultural difference, create the need for strategies capable of at once building solidarity and cohesion, while also simultaneously negotiating and respecting difference (Routledge 2003).

In this paper, we look at the Global Food Sovereignty Movement (GFSM) as a convergence space, and map out the mechanisms that actors within the GFSM have deployed over the last 20 years to maintain diversity while facilitating convergence. We have organized our examination around benchmarks: the key moments our interviewees identified as milestones in the history of convergence. We employ the concept of a/the GFSM as shorthand to encompass the expansive networks of interactions between a plurality of individuals, groups and/or organizations, engaged in political or cultural struggles towards food sovereignty. It is therefore best conceptualized as a 'movement of movements' that is widespread, diverse, creative and politically amorphous (Edelman and Borras 2016; Holt-Giménez 2011). In our analysis of the GFSM, we explore the last two characteristics of convergence spaces described by Routledge (2009): as sites where political identities are shaped around common concerns and trust, and as sites comprised of a diversity of groups with, at times, conflicting goals and experiences and differing access to resources. We contend that the GFSM has, over the last two decades, created and in different ways enforced, systems of categorization to build unity while negotiating and maintaining difference. Towards this end, actors in the GFSM have made particular use of two tools. They have used constituency categories (e.g. pastoralists, fishers, Indigenous

---

<sup>1</sup>These differences arguably exist within all social movements but they are more striking in transnational networks because they maintain less everyday interactions between participants, and greater diversity of contesting views and issues, than specific social movements (Routledge 2003).

Peoples, agricultural workers or small-scale farmers) to identify, protect, foster and guarantee the autonomy of different groups of people with distinct identities and lived realities (but also distinct interests, roles and responsibilities, and social positions). They have also used quotas (e.g. gender, age, constituency and/or geography) to protect diversity, prevent the consolidation of power, and ensure the prioritized participation of affected or marginalized groups. The use of constituencies and quotas has further supported two distinct but related objectives of the GFSM: alliances building and effective direct representation<sup>2</sup> in global policy-making spaces.

While agrarian movements historically made alliances mostly with political parties and workers' organizations (Borras, Edelman, and Kay 2008b, 28), the rise of 'identity politics' has led them to endorse new strategies,<sup>3</sup> including building alliances with other rural sectors or with peasants of varying socioeconomic status (Borras, Edelman, and Kay 2008b, 29). These various sectors (and identities) are now well represented within the global food sovereignty movement (GFSM), with under-explored implications for convergence work. Indeed, social movements scholars have expressed concern that a focus on identity politics may weaken social movements and reduce their effectiveness, as it leads to their increased fragmentation and specialization (Gitlin 1995; Harvey 1996; Tarrow 1998; Taylor and Whittier 1999). The impulse towards creating separate organizations around specific social positions, such as women, or youth for example, has been described as potentially balkanizing (Weldon 2006, 111). However, other authors have argued that the creation of separate spaces can be critical to empowering and engaging marginalized groups in political life. These scholars argue that movements in which subgroups are organized around separate identity-based caucuses can be more inclusive and influential in policy discussions (Weldon 2006, 113).

Our study of the GFSM shows that protecting a diversity of identities and perspectives, and guaranteeing their autonomous expression within the convergence space, has not fragmented the movement but rather enabled it to come together, grow, and speak as one. Yet, as the GFSM continues to expand beyond its agrarian origins, it faces new convergence challenges, notably when it comes to integrating new actors that may not necessarily fit the constituency logic. We discuss these challenges in the conclusion and point to future directions for research. This paper is informed by document analysis and key informant semi-structured interviews ( $N = 43$ , including 5 follow-up interviews) conducted in English, Spanish and French between October 2016 and April 2018. Interviews were transcribed and translated into English by the authors. Informants include GFSM activists, NGO representatives and researchers, selected on the basis of the key roles they played in facilitating the convergence of different actors in the GFSM over the last twenty years. We also draw on our experiences as scholar-activists participating in and

---

<sup>2</sup>Effective representation of the social base's interests within their movements should not be assumed to be automatic or permanent or unproblematic (Borras, Edelman, and Kay 2008b, 13). Issues of representation are important to critically analyse because movements and networks justify the demands they make (and their issue framing and the urgency and importance of their cause) from their claims to represent a group or specific groups (the oppressed or people of the land or rural people in this case) (Borras, Edelman, and Kay 2008b, 14). Representation is always limited geographically or by sector – it is always 'partial' or better seen as a matter of degree – and it is constantly renegotiated with movements and organizations (Borras, Edelman, and Kay 2008b, 15). Issues of representation also underlie tensions between social movements and NGOs (McKeon 2009).

<sup>3</sup>Global campaigns and global days of struggle (such as the 17th of April, the International Day of Peasant Struggle or 16th of October, World Food (Sovereignty) Day) and the elaboration of shared positions for a diversity of local and sectorial struggles have proven useful tools to build alliances (Mesini and Thivet 2014).

observing the GFSM, in various self-organized forums and UN policy spaces over the last decade, including the UN Committee on World Food Security (CFS), the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and the Human Rights Council (HRC).

## **Origins and evolution of constituency categories and quotas**

Constituencies are broadly defined as groups of people with shared interests (Oxford English Dictionary 2017). In the GFSM, constituencies typically designate distinct groups of food producers, such as pastoralists, fishers, Indigenous Peoples, agricultural workers or small-scale farmers, but also other actors such as NGOs, or women's and youth organizations. These categories, however, only emerged gradually over time, reflecting the decreasing influence of NGOs in global governance spaces (Borras, Edelman, and Kay 2008b; McKeon and Kalafatic 2009). In what follows we map out the evolution of these categories to illustrate how the GFSM has sought to protect difference in the convergence space.

### ***The Parallel NGO Forum to the World Food Summit (1996)***

When the FAO hosted the World Food Summit (WFS) in 1996, a parallel NGO Forum was attended by an estimated 1,200 NGO representatives from 80 countries (FAO 1999b). This parallel NGO Forum was organized by the International Steering Committee for Planning the participation of civil society to the 1996 NGO Forum, which acted as political body, with the support of the Italian Committee for the NGO Forum on Food Security. The parallel NGO Forum was divided into two phases. The first was limited to 600 delegates with voting rights. Quotas were introduced to ensure that 50% of those with voting rights came from the Global South and represented local or national organizations of peasants, women and Indigenous Peoples. The second phase was open to all interested organizations, and was attended by an additional 700–1000 observers (Comitato Italiano Promotore 1997). As one interviewee (Interview 13) who was involved in the organization of this Forum recalls, the FAO agreed to the idea of a parallel NGO forum only after having received reassurance that there would be no violent protest.

In preparation, the organizers aimed to facilitate an 'autonomous consultation' (Interview 13) on food security, and to break away from the logic of 'who has money, attends' (Interview 23). Towards this end, they used regional quotas to allocate the budget provided by FAO and donors to enable the participation of voting participants. The FAO provided them with the names of all the organizations it had worked with over the years, and they compiled a database, adding contacts from the international networks and members of the International Steering Committee. On the basis of this list, they sent out invitations. As a result of this selective outreach, the Forum included participation of numerous NGOs from the Global South, including 270 from across Africa (Comitato Italiano Promotore 1997). Although the idea of constituencies or sectors was not formally established at this stage, participants in the Forum agreed that farmers, women's, Indigenous Peoples' organizations, artisanal fishermen and consumers must be considered as central actors of any food security strategy (Comitato Italiano Promotore 1997, 11). At this time, however, food producers, notably peasant movements, were at the initial stages of their efforts to organize at the global level, and the domination of northern NGOs in global governance spaces was strong.

The Parallel NGO Forum to the World Food Summit is notable insofar as it is the site where food sovereignty is said to have clearly emerged into the international food security space. In terms of building convergence around food sovereignty, the Forum was instrumental as it was the first time quotas were used to ensure more equitable regional participation between actors from the Global North and Global South. Our interviews (13, 15, 21, 23) suggest that the Forum marked a key moment of reflection around the necessity to let certain voices, that is those from food insecure contexts, emerge. Towards this end, organizers defended the need for autonomous consultation, used funding to push for more equitable representation, and blocked the access of non-voting participants to certain meetings. As one of our interviewees commented: ‘this was the only way to let peasants speak’ (Interview 23). The NGO Forum produced a final statement ‘Profit for a few and Food for all’ that was read at the World Food Summit and in which ‘the diverse voices of civil society’ decided to ‘speak as one’. The statement brought ‘the message of the more than one billion hungry and malnourished people of the world, most of them children and women’. Yet, despite this emphasis on diversity, the statement made no reference to specific categories of food producers or other constituencies.

### ***The FAO Policy and Strategy (1999)***

Following the WFS, the FAO (1999a) moved forward with the development of a Policy and Strategy for Cooperation with Non-Governmental and Civil Society Organizations (CSOs). The document outlined the ‘Major categories of CSOs to which FAO relates’, which were:

- (1) Rural and urban people’s organizations,
- (2) Southern national and regional development NGOs,
- (3) Northern development NGOs,
- (4) Humanitarian NGOs,
- (5) Advocacy NGOs,
- (6) International NGOs and NGO networks,
- (7) Professional associations and academic/research institutions,
- (8) Agricultural trade unions,
- (9) Private sector associations.

To a large extent, the FAO Policy and Strategy took up, and formalized, categories established in the civil society sphere, at a time where the Major Groups<sup>4</sup> were the most common framework for governing UN engagement with sectors of society. In its list, the FAO Policy and Strategy gave symbolic priority to rural and urban people’s organizations (over NGOs) and to Southern NGOs (over Northern ones), although it did not identify women and youth organizations as specific sectors to consult. Whilst the list did not formally establish priority categories, the FAO did note that in relation to limited resources, it would first relate to technically competent service NGOs, and membership organizations

---

<sup>4</sup>It should be noted that this practice of identifying sectors of society with which UN institutions should engage with in priority builds on the outcomes of the 1992 Earth Summit. More specifically, Agenda 21 formally recognized nine Major Groups, whose active participation was deemed essential in UN activities related to sustainable development: Women, children and youth, Indigenous Peoples, Non-Governmental Organizations, local authorities, workers and trade unions, business and industry, scientific and technological community, and farmers.



that represent important FAO constituencies, such as farmers and consumers. At the time, the FAO identified two main challenges with regard to articulating effective and equitable civil society participation. First, a wide variety of conflicting views and interests are represented across civil society, and there are differences with regard to resources, power and levels of legitimacy amongst various CSOs and social movements. Second, the institutional framework and procedures of the UN system are not easily adapted to non-state actors. As we show below, the Civil Society Mechanism (CSM) to the UN Committee on World Food Security (CFS), established in 2009, addresses these challenges, although not in direct relation to the FAO. The CSM uses a complex governance mechanism grounded in constituencies and quotas to accommodate CSOs with different levels of engagement and legitimacy and internally negotiate conflict, thus providing a single civil society actor for the CFS to interact with.

### ***The NGO/CSO Forum for Food Sovereignty (2002)***

In 2002, the FAO hosted the World Food Summit: five years later (WFS:fyl). In the lead up to this summit, the International Steering Committee for Planning the Participation of Civil Society to the 1996 NGO Forum came together with a view to organize the NGO/CSO Forum for Food Sovereignty. The introduction of the NGO/CSO distinction points to advancements in thinking around representation, with CSOs (and social movements) being clearly distinguished from NGOs (McKeon 2009). After this Forum, the International Steering Committee changed its name to the International Planning Committee (IPC) for Food Sovereignty (Interview 23). At this time, the IPC reflected a broad coalition and included actors who would today not be considered legitimate members (e.g. the International Federation of Agricultural Producers). That said, it included many organizations who had a shared history of organizing or participating in the 1996 NGO Forum and other 'anti-neoliberal mobilizations' between 1996 and 2002, including Seattle, Cancun and Geneva (Colombo and Onorati 2013). These international events, and others such as the 2001 World Forum on Food Sovereignty in Cuba, simultaneously contributed to the elaboration of the food sovereignty framework and to the testing and further elaboration of the emergent constituency approach (Interview 10).

The 2002 NGO/CSO Forum was attended by some 600 participants 'nominated by the regional and constituency focal points according to a quota system designed to ensure balanced representation by regions, types of organizations and gender' (IPC 2002). At this point, the politics of diversity, and the importance of identifying categories of participants was clearly developing in the selection criteria for participation. Regional focal points were identified for Africa, Asia-Pacific, Near East, European Union and Eastern and Central European countries, Latin America and North America. There were also constituency focal points for farmers, Indigenous Peoples, sustainable agriculture/food security NGOs, trade unions, international NGOs and youth organizations (NGLS 2002). In turn, this forum can be distinguished by the fact that it was explicitly a food sovereignty forum (Interview 21), and thus a concrete convergence space. Importantly, however, this convergence space was built on the basis of an explicit recognition of diversity, which was not seen at the 1996 forum. Participants attending the 2002 Forum issued a joint political statement entitled 'Food Sovereignty: A Right For All', which, contrary



to the 1996 statement, was endorsed by LVC.<sup>5</sup> The statement described ‘the unifying concept of Food Sovereignty as the umbrella’ under which participants decided to ‘outline the actions and strategies that are needed to truly end hunger’ (NGO/CSO Forum for Food Sovereignty 2002). It also listed the various constituencies involved in its elaboration: ‘The social movements, farmer, fisherfolk, pastoralists’, Indigenous Peoples’, environmentalist, women’s organizations, trade unions, and NGOs’. As such, we see here that the use of categories and quotas enabling a diversity of sectors to be explicitly recognized and valued as distinct constituencies, helped the emerging GFSM effectively advance efforts at convergence around food sovereignty. The use of quotas to ensure equal female participation at the NGO/CSO Forum is also worth highlighting. Such quotas were not part of the 1996 forum and echo efforts undertaken within LVC to guarantee structural and process-based gender equity as well as emphasize equal participation of women and men in determining the strategies and positions of the movement. As early as 1996, the Second International Conference of LVC in Tlaxcala created a Women’s Working Group – which would become the Women’s Commission – to promote the participation and representation of women in LVC (Desmarais 2007). In 2000, LVC decided to guarantee equal participation of women and men in the leadership of the movement by ensuring that its International Coordinating Committee be composed of at least one female member (of two members in total), from each region.<sup>6</sup> A few years later, LVC also established quotas to ensure at least 30% participation of youth in its meetings and assemblies.<sup>7</sup> As we show below, the adoption of quotas to ensure the participation of the youth across all constituencies would also be later adopted by the GFSM, though not consistently.

### ***The formalization of IPC-FAO relations (2003)***

Following the WFS:fyf, the IPC co-signed an Exchange of Letters with the FAO in 2003, outlining the principles governing FAO-IPC relations as well as a program of work. The key principles governing the IPC engagement with FAO were those of autonomy<sup>8</sup> and self-representation, meaning that the members of the IPC would internally decide how to organize and structure themselves, with no interference from FAO. The IPC structure was designed to avoid centralization, and facilitate ‘the emergence of social representation without directly representing any organization or specific social sector’ (NGO/CSO Forum for Food Sovereignty 2002, 68; Colombo and Onorati 2013). As we outline below, these principles have remained at the heart of the IPC’s work to this day, and

<sup>5</sup>LVC, who introduced the concept of food sovereignty at the 1996 Parallel NGO Forum to the World Food Summit, refused to sign the final statement of that Forum, despite two references to food sovereignty, on the basis that ‘it did not address sufficiently the concerns and interests of peasant families’ (Desmarais 2002, 104).

<sup>6</sup>In addition to quotas, LVC has set up ‘autonomous spaces’ for women and youth within the movement to meet and discuss their own issues and priorities, for example in the form of women’s assemblies (since 2000) and youth assemblies (since 2004), prior to its International Conferences.

<sup>7</sup>This is not reflected in the composition of the ICC, which would have financial and logistical implications. The issue has been raised by the youth within the movement for a number of years, including at the latest international conference in the Basque country in July 2017.

<sup>8</sup>The IPC aims to operate in a way that protects the autonomy of its member organizations:

All the positions or joint policy initiatives must be signed by the individual organizations, and each participant can only speak on behalf of its own organization, and not as a representative of a sector, geographic area or representing the network as a whole (IPC 2016).

have also served as the key organizing principles for the establishment of the Civil Society Mechanism in 2009.<sup>9</sup>

The formalization of the IPC marks an important moment in the convergence of the GFSM. As noted by one of our interviewees, 'the concept and practice of "constituencies" evolved over time' (Interview 15). Within the IPC, constituencies developed as a double reaction to the Major Groups approach, and to the historic domination of NGOs within FAO related civil society spaces (Interviews 10 and 13). The process of formation of constituencies within/through the IPC departed from the Major Group approach in a number of important ways (McKeon 2009, 56–57). First, Major Groups were predefined by an intergovernmental forum whereas the IPC emerged from a process of self-definition. Second, the Major Groups consultation processes were led by global focal points whereas the IPC process was rooted in regional and local consultation. Third, the Major Groups included business and industry whereas the IPC excluded the private sector.<sup>10</sup> Finally, the Major Groups approach assumed broad categories like 'farmers' would be able to come with consensus positions on issues where the different types of producers within the category often had widely different interests. The failure of the Major Groups to distinguish between actors within the Groups effectively restricted possibilities to address questions of power and representation, two issues that were fundamental for rural movements and at the core of convergence around food sovereignty.

The process of forming constituencies within/through the IPC further enabled the IPC to prioritize movements representing food producers, and ensure that their voices were predominant vis-à-vis the voices of NGOs (Interviews 9, 14, 22). Within the IPC, NGOs were always considered to be of a 'different nature' (Interview 14), and those involved, 'particularly Western NGOs, accepted and acknowledged that they were supporting entities for the food producing organizations' (Interview 22). While NGOs facilitated food producers' access to food and agriculture global governance arenas (e.g. with funding, and technical and logistical support), the construction of alliances between food producer movements also became a strong focus of the IPC (Interview 12), and this work relied on identifying and distinguishing different rural constituencies. This alliance building was key to enhancing the convergence of the GFSM, and responded to the need expressed by rural producers' movements to go beyond 'abstract solidarity' and 'transform the right to food sovereignty into an articulated platform for struggle for a diverse variety of social organizations' (Colombo and Onorati 2013, 69). As such, the IPC asserted itself with a dual identity, as a network that would facilitate and coordinate policy engagement with the FAO, while strengthening alliances within the GFSM. It emerged as an important component of the GFSM convergence space.

### ***Land, Territory and Dignity: Parallel Forum to ICAARD***

In 2006, the IPC came to an agreement with the FAO to organize a Parallel Forum to the International Conference on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development (ICARRD), in Porto Alegre,

---

<sup>9</sup>By 2009 for example, the IPC membership had come to include 'constituency focal points (organizations representing small farmers, fisher folk, pastoralists, indigenous peoples, agricultural workers); regional focal points (peoples' movements or NGO networks responsible for diffusion of information and consultation in specific regions); and thematic focal points (networks with particular expertise on priority issues) (McKeon and Kalafatic 2009, 17). The CSM is structured along similar lines, with constituency and sub-regional focal points on the Coordination Committee, and thematic/policy working groups cutting across constituencies and regions.

<sup>10</sup>The IPC also excluded researchers and local authorities, both of which were on the Major Groups' list.

Brazil. In order to guarantee participation of different constituencies and regions in the 'Land, Territory and Dignity' Forum, a political steering committee agreed upon quotas for regions, constituencies and gender (IPC 2006). It is here that we see for the first time a clear enforcement of quotas and constituencies to ensure adequate diversity and representation. On the basis of quotas, 25% of participants needed to come from Asia, 20% from Africa, 30% from Latin America, 10% from Europe, five percent from North America with an additional five percent of participation from Indigenous Peoples, and 5% from West and Central Asia and North Africa (WESCAN).<sup>11</sup> Five constituencies were identified and assigned separate quotas for participation. Farmers and Landless were to make up 60% of participations; Indigenous Peoples 15%; Fisherfolk 15%; Agricultural workers 5%; and NGOs 5%. On the basis of these quotas, IPC Focal Points were asked to prepare a list of participants from their regions and constituencies. Overall participation needed to be gender balanced but we were unable to find evidence of specific quotas towards this end or enforcement.

Alongside these regional and constituency quotas, a further quota of 10% of the total number of participants financed by the Forum was set aside for self-financed participants (e.g. NGOs). Self-financed participants were asked to finance on a one-to-one basis persons from the rural social movements. Another 10% quota was also fixed for 'guests' including academics, NGOs, and journalists who also had to cover their own costs. The overall objective of the quota system was to organize participation in a way that was 'representative and balanced based on geography and sector, and not based on who can afford to pay' (IPC 2006). Underlying this objective was the goal to connect and build alliances between all food producers, and ensure that the Forum would not be 'only about LVC' (Interview 14). Retrospectively, the CSO Forum was a turning point for the multi-constituencies approach (Interview 13). It is certainly the case that the use of constituencies and quotas (in the form of percentages) was made more systematic in the preparation of this Forum, as a way to balance the participation of different regions and social groups and therefore avoid the consolidation of power, ensure female participation and limit the participation of self-funded participants.

### ***Nyéléni Forum for Food Sovereignty (2007)***

The following year, in February 2007, the Nyéleléni Forum for Food Sovereignty was held in Sélingué, Mali. At this meeting, the constituency approach – or what was then called sectors – was more broadly endorsed or, in the words of one activist, 'sanctified' (Interview 13). The primary objective of the Nyéleléni Forum was bringing together different groups to build a larger global movement for food sovereignty, through alliances. This shift in focus from the Porto Alegre CSO Forum to the Nyéleléni Forum is noteworthy in so far as the former was organized in parallel to/in reaction to a UN summit, whereas the latter had convergence as a goal. The Nyéleléni Forum was launched largely at the initiative of La Via Campesina but its organization was facilitated by the IPC (Interview 14, 21). The impetus for organizing the Nyéleléni Forum and the process that was put in place by the facilitating committee for convening participants, were largely informed by what were perceived as limitations of the World Social Forum (WSF) process (the first WSF took place in 2001) (Interview 18). Numerous LVC activists had participated with enthusiasm in the WSF but the evaluation conducted by LVC was

---

<sup>11</sup>WESCAN is now referred to as West Asia/ Middle East (WAME).

that the outcome of the WSF was too neutral, and that there was a need for something more radical, and more oriented towards shared strategies and action plans (Interview 18). In a clear effort to build convergence around a GFSM, it was decided to extend invitations to attend the Nyéléni Forum only to 'organizations already committed to food sovereignty'. As was explained to us:

It was a precondition to agree on the principle of food sovereignty (...) Therefore it wasn't an open invitation as such, but it was an invitation directed to the organizations [and not individuals]. And where the facilitating group of Nyéléni assured through its own finance that those organizations and people who should be there, were there. (Interview 18)

Participants who 'should be there' were identified 'on the basis of regional, sectoral and gender balance' (Nyéléni 2007a). In total, six sectors were identified:

- (1) Farmers/peasants,
- (2) Fisherfolk,
- (3) Pastoralists,
- (4) Indigenous Peoples,
- (5) Workers & Migrants,
- (6) Consumers & Urban Movements.

This list built on the IPC constituencies – small farmers, fisher folk, pastoralists, Indigenous Peoples, agricultural workers – with the addition of consumers and urban movements, as well as migrants. The explicit reference to peasants in the first sector points to the influence of La Via Campesina and its shaping of a strong political identity of small-scale food producers as peasants (Desmarais 2008). Efforts to extend alliance building to other actors of the food system (beyond rural/food producer constituencies), mark a significant turn in the expansion of the GFSM, and point to the increased popularity of food sovereignty as alternative vision not just for the countryside but for the whole of society (Claeys 2014; Wittman and Nicholson 2009). At the Forum, delegates were given time to meet as sectoral groups, and to comment and make proposals for a joint action agenda (Nyéléni 2007b). The Forum also provided for the opportunity to discuss issues of representation, and potential conflicts between constituencies such as peasants and pastoralists, or peasants and different users of water, for example (Interview 13). At the same time, it was decided that NGOs would not be considered a sector. Instead, they were referred to as allies within the final report<sup>12</sup> (Nyéléni 2007c). As we discuss below, this distinction between sectors made up of social movements on the one hand, and allied NGOs on the other, would later lead to two diverging understandings of constituencies: One limited to affected constituencies, and the other including affected constituencies and allies or support constituencies. In terms of gender balance, the organizing committee decided that there were to be an equal number of male and female delegates. Further, a Woman's Assembly was organized for the day before the Forum. Here the women decided that they would not act as a separate sector with meetings parallel to the official program, but rather they would integrate women's perspectives throughout the Forum (Nyéléni 2007c).

---

<sup>12</sup>Also identified were three interest groups: Women, Youth, and Environment.

In retrospect, it can be said that the processes and mechanisms put in place for inviting participants and facilitating interactions during the Nyéléni Forum proved successful as they significantly contributed to establishing a shared vision for the diversifying constituencies of the GFSM. The Nyéléni Declaration and Action Plan (La Via Campesina 2007) articulated six pillars of food sovereignty and provided a synthetic definition of food sovereignty, both of which are largely used as legitimate and widely accepted references to this day.

### ***The Civil Society Mechanism to the Committee on World Food Security (2009)***

In October 2009, the UN's Committee on World Food Security (CFS) reformed with a vision of constituting 'the foremost inclusive international and intergovernmental platform for a broad range of committed stakeholders' to work together towards ensuring food security and nutrition for all (CFS 2009, para. 4). The key reforms, which were hard and long fought for by civil society organizations, led to changes not only to the composition of the Committee but also to modalities of civil society participation. By way of reform, the Committee reorganized its composition to 'ensure that the voices of all relevant stakeholders – particularly those most affected by food insecurity – are heard' (CFS 2009, para. 7). This achievement points to the political success of food sovereignty actors, and others, to formalize their political ambitions with regard to participation. Particularly relevant is the list of categories of people to receive particular attention, which was formalized as constituencies through the proposal for an International Food Security and Nutrition Civil Society Mechanism for Relations with the CFS (CSM). The CSM proposal, which was acknowledged by the Committee in October 2010, was prepared by ActionAid International, the Governance Working Group of the International Planning Committee for Food Sovereignty (IPC) and Oxfam. It is directly inspired by the ways of working of the IPC which, as we have shown, reflect years of trial and testing around how to build solidarity and convergence while negotiating and maintaining diversity.

The CSM founding document commits to 'give clear priority to organizations of the people most affected by hunger, recognizing that victims of hunger are also the bearers of solutions' (CFS 2010, para. 14). It also includes a commitment to 'respect pluralism, autonomy and self-organization' and to 'ensure a balance of gender, regions and constituencies and sectors' (CFS 2010, para. 11). Towards this end, constituencies and quotas are used to make up the executive body of the CSM: The Coordination Committee. Members of the Coordination Committee are elected by autonomous processes developed in the 11 constituencies (i.e. smallholder farmers, fisherfolk, pastoralists, Indigenous Peoples, agriculture and food workers, landless, women, youth, consumers, urban food insecure and NGOs) and 17 sub-regions (5 sub-regions in Africa, 4 sub-regions in the Americas, six sub-regions in Asia and 2 sub-regions in Europe). Each sub-region has one seat on the Coordination Committee. Each constituency has two seats on the Coordination Committee, except the smallholder farmers' constituency which has four seats. Priority for farmers is rationalized because 'small-scale farmers represent 80% of the hungry people in the world and produce the largest proportion of the food in the world' (CSM 2009). The Coordination Committee is tasked with ensuring that 50% of members are women. This has proven relatively easy for constituencies, where one man and one woman can be elected, but has been more difficult for the regions (Interview 6). The result has been an over-representation of male regional focal points.

While International NGOs are recognized as a constituency, the CSM makes a clear distinction between NGOs and social movements, and is structured in ways that prioritize social movements' voices. For example, CSM thematic Working Groups, which are at the heart of the CSM (Interview 6), are systematically led by social movement representatives and supported by technical facilitators from trusted or allied NGOs. Thus, while NGOs formally have the right to express their own interests in the CSM, they overwhelmingly see their role as one of support rather than advocacy (Interviews 6, 14, 17, 25, 29, 32, 34). As one interviewee clarified: 'yes, we are formally part of the NGO constituency but we do not follow the interests of our constituency' (Interview 14). Moreover, discussions at the CSM are 'so dominated by social movements that NGOs don't have a chance [to push their own agenda]' (Interview 14).

The governance structure of the CSM has provided civil society actors with clear, transparent and reliable processes to self-organize. It has enabled CSM participants to speak with one voice, through thematic Working Groups which facilitate convergence around key issues, and sub-regional and constituency focal points that give space, recognition and visibility to key aspects of identity. Constituencies and quotas have thus played an important role in making the CSM a 'balanced space' (Interview 18), that is as open and inclusive as possible. As one of our interviewees explained:

... we have to assure not only for La Via Campesina, which probably is the more powerful voice, but for all the voices to be present and we have to make sure that the pastoralists are there, that the fisherfolk are there, that the whole reality of food producers are present there. And for that we have to obviously confront the more powerful administratively, or bureaucratically or institutionally powerful, sometimes allies, sometimes friends, sometimes not so much allies, who are competing with us for our space. (Interview 18)

Preserving diversity through inclusiveness is an important challenge for the CSM, as highlighted by another interviewee who participates in the CSM:

When we are in one space we try to keep our spaces also. It's in a way ... we don't want more people to debate and discuss and to finally vote and to lose our spaces. (...) We are trying to get more spaces in different ways possible and to keep our own existing space. It's also a civil society politics I would say. It's a reality. (Interview 36)

In addition, the CSM has managed to formalize the principles of autonomy and self-organization within the UN Committee on World Food Security. It has succeeded in convincing other CFS actors (including the FAO, but also country delegates) of the importance of enabling the organizations representing the most affected to speak for themselves. It has also secured funds for its operations (mainly through governments, development agencies and NGOs) (CSM 2017), enabling it to employ a dedicated secretariat of three people and to finance the travel of people to come to Rome to speak on their own behalf (Interview 6).

### ***People's Food Sovereignty Now! The Parallel Forum to the World Summit on Food Security (2009)***

In November 2009, directly following the reform of the Committee on World Food Security, the FAO hosted the World Summit on Food Security (WSFS). CSOs organized a Parallel Forum entitled People's Food Sovereignty Now! When the FAO summit was first

announced, dialogue began between CSOs and the FAO about a parallel summit (IPC 2009a). At this time, the FAO contradicted its commitments, dating back to 2001, to recognize the principles of self-organization and autonomy of civil society, and proposed instead to organize the CSO forum. The proposal was rejected by civil society and as a result of strong opposition, the FAO withdrew its proposal (IPC 2009b). Funding was eventually secured from the Mayor of Rome, IFAD, and the governments of Norway, Catalunya and Switzerland, as well as Oxfam, Norad, and ActionAid among other NGOs (IPC 2009b, 59). This example serves to illustrate how civil society actors have had to continuously fight to maintain their right to self-organization and autonomy.

To organize the CSO parallel forum, an International Steering Committee (ISC) was set up, composed of diverse organizations representing different constituencies and sought to be balanced in terms of regions and gender (IPC 2009b). The ISC then agreed on selecting participants from the following nine constituencies: farmers, Indigenous Peoples, fisherfolk, youth, women, agricultural workers, pastoralists, urban poor and NGOs. Further, it established quotas for choosing delegates. Based on these quotas, a decentralized process coordinated among the regions and the constituencies led to the identification of candidates. From this list, the ISC chose the final delegates. In addition, there was a target balance of 60% women to 40% men. According to our understanding, there was no target quota aimed at ensuring generational parity or youth participation although there was a Youth Caucus that did produce a final declaration. Others who wanted to attend could apply as observers. The breakdown of quotas for region and constituency is presented in Tables 1 and 2. The tables illustrate the complex and politically-sensitive mechanisms that were advanced to ensure balanced participation of a diversity of voices of the expanding GFSM.

These figures provide insights into the ability of the Parallel Forum to meet the quotas it had established for itself. The gender parity quota was nearly met, with women representing 53% of the total 646 participants (208 delegates and 277 observers). Farmers and NGOs both over-met their respective quota (with each group attending with double the amount of allowed participants), while organizations representing Indigenous Peoples, the urban poor, women (feminists) and youth all attended in the anticipated numbers. Fisherfolk participation, however, barely reached half of its allotted quota, and there was a serious deficit in the participation of agricultural workers. A variety of reasons may serve to explain these variations, ranging from funding and visa issues to disparities in the capacity of the different constituencies to organize at the transnational level, affecting their ability to send delegates. In addition, these figures may reflect uneven achievements in the process of building alliances across constituencies. For example, the lack of active participation of agricultural workers' organizations points to a well-documented deficit in the GFSM's ability to build strong links with this constituency, resulting in an inadequate focus on labor rights issues (Borras, Edelman, and Kay 2008a). While difficult to document, it is likely that representation of these 'less full' constituencies would have been even weaker in the absence of deliberate efforts to engage with them and prioritize their voices.

When the draft final statement of the Parallel Forum was presented to the plenary, observers who had been allowed to participate in working group discussions at the discretion of the Chairs, were not allowed to comment on the text, or ratify the declaration. Here we see the importance of the quota system for ensuring that a diversity of 'legitimate'



**Table 1.** Regional quotas for delegates.

	Regional quotas for delegates					
	South East Asia & Pacific	South Asia	Africa	Americas	Europe	WESCANA
Quota	20%	15%	25%	20%	10%	10%

Source: (IPC 2009b).

**Table 2.** Delegation quotas for constituencies and actual number of delegates in attendance.

	Delegation quotas for constituencies								
	Farmers	Indigenous Peoples	Fisherfolk	Youth	Women	Agricultural workers	Pastoralists	Urban poor	NGOs
Quota	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	10%	5%	5%	5%
In attendance	28%	13%	7%	17%	13%	0.48%	4%	4%	10%
	(N = 59)	(N = 27)	(N = 15)	(N = 35)	(N = 28)	N = 1 (migrant worker)	(N = 9)	(N = 8)	(N = 21)

Source: (IPC 2009b).

views are represented in the development of collective statements. The final statement opens with:

We, 642 persons coming from 93 countries and representing 450 organizations of peasant and family farmers, small scale fisher folk, pastoralists, indigenous peoples, youth, women, the urban people, agricultural workers, local and international NGOs, and other social actors. (IPC 2009b, 50)

Compared with the 2002 statement, we note the inclusion of youth, agricultural workers and urban people. The explicit reference to urban people reaffirms their inclusion in the GFSM and points to the rapid development of Community-Supported Agriculture and urban food movements in that decade. Having attended this forum, we also remember a clearly communicated process in relation to the rights of delegates versus observers. This points to one of the important functions of constituencies and quotas: tools for ensuring that particular voices are represented and heard, while others are silenced or at least downplayed.

### ***The FAO Guidelines for Ensuring Balanced Representation of Civil Society (2013)***

In 2013, the FAO (2013) issued its Guidelines for Ensuring Balanced Representation of Civil Society, which describe constituencies as one of four main ways to ensure balanced representativeness, according to geography, gender and groups (referring to the types of constituencies).<sup>13</sup> Noting that constituencies seek to 'ensure that the different voices are listened to with equal weight', the Guidelines identify twelve constituencies.<sup>14</sup> Echoing the language of the IPC and CFS, the 2013 Guidelines are grounded in the principles of autonomy and self-representation of civil society actors. Towards that end, quotas outlined in the Guidelines function to ensure minimum levels of participation of different groups or regions at relevant FAO events. For example, 75% of the constituencies should be represented by at least one organization during FAO activities/processes at all levels (national, regional and global). In the case of regional meetings, 75% of the countries in the region need to be represented and, 75% of geographical areas, as determined by the type of event/process, should be represented by at least one civil society organization. The Guidelines also state that *ideally* 50% of the representatives from civil society should be women, and at least one third youth. This is the first instance we found where youth are formally ascribed a quota.

Comparing the FAO Guidelines (2013) with the older FAO Policy and Strategy (1999a), it is striking that the FAO approach to civil society participation has been substantially influenced by the constituencies approach conceptualized and developed by the GFSM. It is also interesting to note that the Guidelines adopt the political arguments of the GFSM (and others) when they note the relevance of bottom-up solutions developed by the hungry and poor themselves as a rationale for prioritizing certain voices.

### ***Reform of the IPC (2013)***

Around the time that the FAO was defining its new Guidelines, the IPC was undergoing a reform. The IPC had played a key role in the development of the CSM but there was a

---

<sup>13</sup>While the FAO has developed very clear guidelines for representation of CSOs, little has been done when it comes to distinguishing difference amongst private sector actors who remain categorised as a unitary group.

<sup>14</sup>The 12 identified constituencies are: Small farmers, landless, agricultural workers, fishers and fish workers, pastoralists and herders, forest dwellers, ethnic minorities and Indigenous Peoples, urban poor, consumers, NGOs, women and youth.

sense, according to some of the people interviewed (Interview 14, 35, 36), that the CSM in many ways overtook the IPC in transparency, reliance on clear rules, ability to build a plural and inclusive space, and operational capacity linked to its quasi-institutional status and thereby ability to attract funding. In short, following the creation of the CSM, the IPC decided to change its ways of working while reaffirming its role along two main axes: building alliances for food sovereignty, and facilitating interactions with FAO (and potentially other UN arenas).

Central to the reform of the IPC was the establishment of collective leadership, with a facilitating group made of representatives from social movements (NGOs were explicitly excluded). Regional focal points were removed as they were perceived as gatekeepers and none of them were representing food producers (Interview 14). Thematic Working Groups became the main structuring mechanism of the IPC. Each Thematic Working Group is coordinated by two social movements, supported by an NGO (Interviews 12 and 14). Through the reform, the IPC has come to recognize NGOs as having a supporting role only.<sup>15</sup> This development points to the consolidation of two-tier approach to constituencies, which not only distinguishes constituencies from social movements representing affected groups from other secondary, or non-affected constituencies, but distinguishes political roles for the former, from support roles for the latter.

At the same time, the organizational reform of the IPC towards Thematic Working Groups points to a further evolution in the processes of categorization within the GFSM, away from constituencies altogether. As one interviewee explained, a key rationale behind the IPC reform was seeking a more horizontal structure that reflects the fact that social movements are dynamic in ways that extend beyond the clean categories of constituencies (Interview 12). Indeed, many of the participating organizations of the IPC, but also the GFSM more broadly, are comprised of people who cut across multiple constituencies (e.g. women, Indigenous, youth, fishers) (Interviews 4, 12, 15, 16), and therefore maintain multiple and hybrid identities (e.g. women farmer, Indigenous pastoralist) (Interviews 19, 37). This poses an important challenge to the consolidating logic of a constituency approach that warrants further research.

## Conclusion

In this paper we explored developments of the GFSM as a convergence space from 1996 to 2017. Our analysis focused particularly on two characteristics of convergence spaces: as sites where shared political identities are shaped, and as sites of contested relations. Our historical overview of categorization efforts within the GFSM highlighted the evolution and application of constituencies and quotas as key convergence tools that have, in turn, supported two distinct but related objectives of the GFSM: alliances building, and effective representation in global policy-making. With regard to alliances building, constituencies and quotas have provided a way for the GFSM to come together, expand, and converge around a shared collective/political identity – grounded in food sovereignty–, while protecting a diversity of distinct identities and perspectives. In this respect, the use of

---

<sup>15</sup>We note that in practice, the IPC works in a more fluid way, and closely collaborates with trusted individuals from supportive NGOs such as FIAN International, Friends of the Earth International, Centro Internazionale Crocevia, and the International Collective in Support of Fishworkers (IPC 2016).

constituencies and quotas in the GFSM provides novel insights into the wider study of social movements.

According to Tilly (1986, 546), internal diversity is a feature of a preliminary stage of a movement's formation that is doomed to disappear as group unity and greater conformity come to replace disparate and changing coalitions. When it comes to the GFSM, we see the contrary, with a deliberate effort to foster autonomy and diversity at the heart of the GFSM's convergence strategy. Our analysis is thus aligned with that of Houtart (2009), a key figure of the alter-globalization movement, who argued that maintaining diversity in convergence – what he calls the 'possibility of diversity' – is key to building a strong resistance in the face of globalized capital. In his view, this not only requires identifying shared objectives and creating strong networks of actors, but also not losing identities<sup>16</sup> (Houtart 2009, 123). It also reinforces Edelman and Borras (2016, 40), who warn against over-privileging unity in movements at the expense of diversity. Our analysis of the GFSM showed that constituencies and quotas have worked as effective tools to protect the possibility of diversity while facilitating convergence, enabling GFSM actors to identify, foster, and protect a diversity of identities, and guarantee their autonomous expression within the convergence space. The GFSM has thus separated to unite.

At the same time, it is worth highlighting that the GFSM has 'only' made active efforts so far to protect certain forms of diversity (sectoral, geographical, gender, age), leaving unaddressed other identities (and potential grounds of discrimination) such as religion, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation and/or gender identity. This could be problematic for the GFSM as a convergence space, because the absence of specific constituencies based on particular (especially marginalized) identities can make people feel alienated from the movement (Gutmann 2003). As already noted by other scholars (see for example Cousins and Scoones 2010; Park and White 2015), the focus in food sovereignty discourse on the convergence of interests of those who live on the land means that other divisions among the rural poor, for example, tend to be ignored or downplayed.

With regard to effective direct representation of GFSM actors in global policy spaces, constituencies and quotas have helped the GFSM to self-organize, 'levelling' the participation of women, youth, social movements and Global South participants, and 'unlevelling' the participation of NGOs in an effort to create a more balanced space. As such, constituencies and quotas have played a key role in helping the GFSM meet internal and external legitimacy requirements in terms of the diversity of views, interests, perspectives and groups it represents. They have also imposed a requirement of inclusiveness on the GFSM, forcing social actors to engage in cross-sectoral and cross-regional dialogue, and ensuring each constituency has 'adequate' relative weight, thereby limiting the consolidation of power. For example, at the CFS, the use of constituencies and quotas within the CSM has supported the prioritization of the voices of the most affected (Duncan 2015; Duncan and Barling 2012),<sup>17</sup> effectively limiting the representation power/influence of

---

<sup>16</sup>A similar point was made by Pleyers (2010) who demonstrated how the World Social Forums (WSFs) embodied a 'model of convergence' based on the valorization of diversity and the 'articulation of differences', which activists saw as a way to counter homogenization and hegemonic thinking.

<sup>17</sup>This was made very explicit, for example, at the 2016 meeting of the Committee on World Food Security where social movement actors protested the inclusion of the World Farmers Organization as participant category, arguing that they do not represent those most affected by food insecurity.

NGOs. As a result, several NGOs within the CSM have come to play technical or facilitation roles, in fact (re-)positioning themselves as ‘support constituencies’. This trend towards a two-tier approach to constituencies points to an interesting tension around the ability of allied NGOs to continue pursuing their own goals and aims, while supporting social movements struggles. As one interviewee put it:

There is also this debate, certainly within civil society organizations like ours as to what degree do we exist to support social movements, and to what degree do we exist to achieve goals which may include as part, the support of social movement ... Or turning it around the other way, when can we be critics of social movements? (Interview 17)

Finally, constituencies and quotas have helped channel resources to the organizations representing those most affected.<sup>18</sup> The GFSM, and the IPC in particular, have been particularly successful in this regard, for example in achieving commitment to allocate funding in priority to producer organizations by way of the FAO’s (2013) Guidelines. The CSM has also been successful in securing funds to reinforce this model of participation.

Our analysis further shows that convergence efforts have entailed a dynamic process of categorization in which GFSM actors constantly reassess which categories are legitimate, in which context and for which purposes. At the same time, the codification of the use of constituencies and quotas within various UN global governance arenas presents challenges for the future. Indeed, both the FAO and the CFS have endorsed and largely adopted this approach to civil society participation. This institutionalization could limit the scope of adaptation and adjustment that is certain to be necessary to ensure inclusion of those who may feel unrepresented (Weldon 2012, 158), or who aspire to join the movement. Will the evolving GFSM succeed in continuing to use constituencies and quotas in a flexible and dynamic way to ensure that legitimate voices are heard? As has been noted, power relations can become embedded in organizational arrangements, in turn making it easier for some actors to consolidate power due to their categorization (Davis et al. 2005). As one of our interviewees noted:

Do we have to categorize it? (...) I do not know if it is the final solution, I do not know if it is the final solution in the sense that if you standardize ... I think it is clear, that once you give a qualification to a movement then you seem to generate a power base and that is what we have to avoid I think (...) You give a qualification or recognition to a group and suddenly that group tries to make sure that nobody else comes in. (Interview 18)

As the GFSM expands beyond the agrarian context in which it was originally conceived and starts to include an even broader set of actors, calls for convergence have increasingly been put forward as a strategy for building political power (Brent, Schiavoni, and Alonso-Fradejas 2015). Yet, the use of constituencies and quotas as ‘convergence in diversity’ tools is likely to become increasingly complex, and possibly contested, as new actors join. The growing recognition of local governments (Trauger 2017), food policy councils (Harper et al. 2009), CSAs and urban movements (Alkon and Mares 2012), and scholar activists (Borras 2016) as key actors in the struggle for food sovereignty has already led some

---

<sup>18</sup>The recognition that people directly affected by political policy-making or ‘affected publics’ (Brem-Wilson 2016, 2017) should get priority voice in global governance arenas like the CFS, points to a significant achievement of the GFSM in pushing the limits of the multi-stakeholder model, which places a diversity of ‘stakeholders’ (McKeon 2017) on the same footing.

GFSM actors to question the constituencies approach. As one of our interviewees explained:

For me it started to crack down [the constituency logic] when you got the food policy councils ... Territorially-based movements that were just not following the logic of one constituency pursuing its agenda and making alliances with other constituencies. (Interview 15)

As this quote indicates, the expansion of the GFSM does not only call for integrating more and more constituencies in alliance building and global governance processes, it may require exploring other mechanisms that respond to the need to engage with actors who do not necessarily fit well within the constituency logic. Combined with the above-mentioned trend toward a two-tier approach to constituencies – one that would make an even clearer distinction between ‘affected’ and ‘support’ constituencies – and the fact that many actors in the GFSM maintain multiple and hybrid identities that cut across constituencies, it is hard to anticipate how the GFSM will govern its convergence in the future.

## Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank all those who participated in and supported this research. We would also like to acknowledge the three anonymous reviewers, as well as Josh Brem-Wilson, Jahi Chappell, Annette Desmarais, Emily Mattheisen, Patrick Mulvany, and Michel Pimbert for their constructive feedback.

## Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

## Notes on contributors

*Priscilla Claeys* is a Senior Research Fellow in Food Sovereignty, Human Rights and Resilience at the Centre for Agroecology, Water and Resilience (CAWR) of Coventry University (UK). She received her PhD in Political and Social Sciences from the University of Louvain (UCL) in 2013. While doing research on legal mobilizations within the transnational agrarian movement La Via Campesina, she worked as a Special Advisor to the UN Special Rapporteur on the right to food, Olivier De Schutter, from 2008 to 2014. Her research areas include: the right to food and food sovereignty, agrarian movements, global food governance and human rights. She has done research on the creation of new human rights – right to land, biodiversity and seeds – by transnational peasant movements and has been involved in the negotiations of a new UN Declaration on the Rights of Peasants and Other People Working in Rural Areas. Email: priscilla.claeys@coventry.ac.uk.

*Jessica Duncan* is an Assistant Professor in Rural Sociology at Wageningen University (The Netherlands). She holds a PhD in Food Policy from City University London (2014). Her research areas include: food policy; food security; global governance; environmental policy; and participation. She researches relationships between global governance mechanisms, food provisioning, the environment, and the actors that interact across these spaces. More specifically, she is interested in better understanding ways in which non-state actors participate in supra-national policy making processes, and analysing how the resulting policies are implemented, shaped, challenged and resisted in localized settings. She sits on the editorial board for the journal *Sociologia Ruralis* and works as an associate editor for the journal *Food Security*. She also acts as an advisor and researcher with Traditional Cultures Project (USA) Email: jessica.duncan@wur.nl.

## References

- Alkon, Alison Hope, and Teresa Marie Mares. 2012. "Food Sovereignty in US Food Movements: Radical Visions and Neoliberal Constraints." *Agriculture and Human Values* 29 (3): 347–359. doi:10.1007/s10460-012-9356-z.
- Allen, Patricia. 2014. "Divergence and Convergence in Alternative Agrifood Movements: Seeking a Path Forward." In *Alternative Agrifood Movements: Patterns of Convergence and Divergence*, 49–68. Bingley: Emerald Group.
- Alonso-Fradejas, Alberto, Saturnino M. Borrás, Jr., Todd Holmes, Eric Holt-Giménez, and Martha Jane Robbins. 2015. "Food Sovereignty: Convergence and Contradictions, Conditions and Challenges." *Third World Quarterly* 36 (3): 431–448. doi:10.1080/01436597.2015.1023567.
- Amin, Samir. 2011. "Food Sovereignty: A Struggle for Convergence in Diversity." In *Food Movements Unite! Strategies to Transform Our Food Systems*, xi–xviii. Oakland, CA: Food First Books.
- Borrás, Saturnino M., Jr. 2016. *Land Politics, Agrarian Movements and Scholar-activism*. <http://hdl.handle.net/1765/93021>.
- Borrás, Saturnino M., Jr., Marc Edelman, and Cristóbal Kay. 2008a. "Transnational Agrarian Movements: Origins and Politics, Campaigns and Impact." In *Transnational Agrarian Movements Confronting Globalization*, edited by Saturnino M. Borrás, Jr., Marc Edelman, and Cristóbal Kay, 1–36. West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Borrás, Saturnino M., Jr., Marc Edelman, and Cristóbal Kay. 2008b. *Transnational Agrarian Movements Confronting Globalization*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Brem-Wilson, Josh. 2016. "La Vía Campesina and the UN Committee on World Food Security: Affected Publics and Institutional Dynamics in the Nascent Transnational Public Sphere." *Review of International Studies*, 1–28. doi:10.1017/S0260210516000309.
- Brem-Wilson, Josh. 2017. "La Vía Campesina and the UN Committee on World Food Security: Affected Publics and Institutional Dynamics in the Nascent Transnational Public Sphere." *Review of International Studies* 43 (2): 302–329. doi:10.1017/S0260210516000309.
- Brent, Zoe W., Christina M. Schiavoni, and Alberto Alonso-Fradejas. 2015. "Contextualising Food Sovereignty: The Politics of Convergence among Movements in the USA." *Third World Quarterly* 36 (3): 618–635. doi:10.1080/01436597.2015.1023570.
- CFS. 2009. *Reform of the Committee on World Food Security Final Version*. Rome: FAO. [http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/cfs/Docs0910/ReformDoc/CFS\\_2009\\_2\\_Rev\\_2\\_E\\_K7197.pdf](http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/cfs/Docs0910/ReformDoc/CFS_2009_2_Rev_2_E_K7197.pdf).
- CFS. 2010. *International Food Security and Nutrition Civil Society Mechanism for Relations with CFS*. Rome. <http://www.csm4cfs.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/Proposal-for-an-international-civil-society-mechanism.pdf>.
- Claeys, Priscilla. 2014. "Food Sovereignty and the Recognition of New Rights for Peasants at the UN: A Critical Overview of La Vía Campesina's Rights Claims Over the Last 20 Years." *Globalizations*, 1–14. doi:10.1080/14747731.2014.957929.
- Colombo, Luca, and Antonio Onorati. 2013. *Food. Riots and Rights*. London: IIED.
- Comitato Italiano Promotore. 1997. *Rapporto Finale: NGO Forum on Food Security*. Rome: Comitato Italiano Promotore Del Forum ONG Sulla Sicurezza Alimentare.
- Cousins, Ben, and Ian Scoones. 2010. "Contested Paradigms of 'Viability' in Redistributive Land Reform: Perspectives from Southern Africa." *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 37 (1): 31–66. doi:10.1080/03066150903498739.
- CSM. 2009. *DRAFT Terms of Reference for the Coordination Committee*. Rome. [http://www.csm4cfs.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/cc\\_draft\\_terms\\_of\\_reference\\_en.pdf](http://www.csm4cfs.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/cc_draft_terms_of_reference_en.pdf).
- CSM. 2017. *Annual Report 2016–2017*. Rome. <http://www.csm4cfs.org/csm-annual-report-20162017/>.
- Davis, Gerald, Doug McAdam, W. Richard Scott, and Mayer N. Zald. 2005. *Social Movements and Organizations*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Desmarais, Annette Aurélie. 2002. "PEASANTS SPEAK – The Vía Campesina: Consolidating an International Peasant and Farm Movement." *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 29 (2): 91–124. doi:10.1080/714003943.
- Desmarais, Annette Aurélie. 2007. *La Vía Campesina: Globalization and the Power of Peasants*. Halifax: Fernwood.



- Desmarais, Annette Aurélie. 2008. "The Power of Peasants: Reflections on the Meanings of La Vía Campesina." *Journal of Rural Studies* 24 (2): 138–149. doi:10.1016/j.jrurstud.2007.12.002.
- Desmarais, Annette Aurélie, Marta G. Rivera-Ferre, and Beatriz Gasco. 2014. "Alternative Agrifood Movements: Patterns of Convergence and Divergence." In *Research in Rural Sociology and Development*, edited by Douglas H. Constance, Marie-Christine Renard, and Marta G. Rivera-Ferre, 89–110. Bingley: Emerald Group. doi:10.1108/S1057-1922201421.
- Dicken, Peter, Philip F. Kelly, Kris Olds, and Henry Wai-Chung Yeung. 2001. "Chains and Networks, Territories and Scales: Towards a Relational Framework for Analysing the Global Economy." *Global Networks* 1: 89–112.
- Duncan, Jessica. 2015. *Global Food Security Governance: Civil Society Engagement in the Reformed Committee on World Food Security*. London: Routledge.
- Duncan, Jessica, and David Barling. 2012. "Renewal Through Participation in Global Food Security Governance: Implementing the International Food Security and Nutrition Civil Society Mechanism to the Committee on World Food Security." *International Journal of Sociology of Agriculture and Food* 19: 143–161.
- Edelman, Marc, and Saturnino M. Borras, Jr. 2016. *Political Dynamics of Transnational Agrarian Movements*. Rugby: Practical Action Publishing and Fernwood.
- European Coordination Via Campesina. 2016. "Food Sovereignty Day: Celebrating the Convergence of Struggles to Take Back Our Rights and Food Systems." *European Coordination Via Campesina*. October. <http://www.eurovia.org/food-sovereignty-day-celebrating-the-convergence-of-struggles-to-take-back-our-rights-and-food-systems/>.
- FAO. 1999a. *FAO Policy and Strategy for Cooperation with Non-Governmental and Civil Society Organizations*. Rome: FAO.
- FAO. 1999b. *The World Food Summit and Its Follow Up*. Rome: FAO. [http://www.fao.org/docrep/X2051e/X2051e00.htm#P176\\_18923](http://www.fao.org/docrep/X2051e/X2051e00.htm#P176_18923).
- FAO. 2013. *Guidelines for Ensuring Balanced Representation of Civil Society in FAO Meetings and Processes*. Rome: FAO. <http://www.fao.org/3/a-au892e.pdf>.
- Gitlin, Todd. 1995. *The Twilight of Common Dreams: Why America Is Wracked by Culture Wars*. New York: Metropolitan Books.
- Gutmann, Amy. 2003. *Identity in Democracy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Harper, Alethea, Annie Shattuck, Eric Holt-Giménez, Alison Alkon, and Frances Lambrick. 2009. *Alethea Harper, Annie Shattuck, Eric Holt-Giménez, Alison Alkon and Frances Lambrick*. Oakland. [https://s3.amazonaws.com/academia.edu.documents/41217093/FOOD\\_POLICY\\_COUNCILS\\_LESSONS\\_LEARNED20160113-22193-s71mp9.pdf20160115-19908-1qnvu2r.pdf?AWSAccessKeyId=AKIAIWOWYYGZ2Y53UL3A&Expires=1513960659&Signature=p8Xxd5Stf0gvizAF1F3s63fHlc%3D&response-content-type=application/pdf](https://s3.amazonaws.com/academia.edu.documents/41217093/FOOD_POLICY_COUNCILS_LESSONS_LEARNED20160113-22193-s71mp9.pdf20160115-19908-1qnvu2r.pdf?AWSAccessKeyId=AKIAIWOWYYGZ2Y53UL3A&Expires=1513960659&Signature=p8Xxd5Stf0gvizAF1F3s63fHlc%3D&response-content-type=application/pdf).
- Harvey, David. 1996. *Justice, Nature and the Geography of Difference*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Holt-Giménez, Eric. 2011. *Food Movements Unite!: Strategies to Transform Our Food System*. Edited by Eric Holt-Gimenez. Oakland, CA: Food First Books.
- Houtart, François. 2009. *El Camino a La Utopía Desde Un Mundo de Incertidumbre*. Buenos Aires: CLACSO.
- IPC. 2002. *2002 Rome NGO Forum for Food Sovereignty Call for Action*. Rome. <http://www.ukabc.org/callforaction.pdf>.
- IPC. 2006. *Call to Participate in the 'Land, Territory and Dignity' Forum*. Friends of the MST. <http://www.mstbrazil.org/news/call-participate-land-territory-dignity-forum>.
- IPC. 2009a. *Call to Participate in the Social Movements/ NGOs/CSOs Parallel Forum to the World Summit on Food Security 2009*. Rome. [http://www.csa-be.org/IMG/pdf\\_Call\\_To\\_Participate\\_In\\_People\\_s\\_Forum\\_Food\\_Sovereignty\\_2009\\_-\\_EN.pdf](http://www.csa-be.org/IMG/pdf_Call_To_Participate_In_People_s_Forum_Food_Sovereignty_2009_-_EN.pdf).
- IPC. 2009b. *People's Food Sovereignty Forum: Civil Societies Organizations Forum*. Rome. [https://cso4cfs.files.wordpress.com/2010/10/final\\_report\\_pfs\\_forum\\_2009.pdf](https://cso4cfs.files.wordpress.com/2010/10/final_report_pfs_forum_2009.pdf).
- IPC. 2016. "Who We Are." <http://www.foodsovereignty.org/about-us/>.
- La Via Campesina. 2007. "Declaration of Nyéléni: Declaration of the Forum for Food Sovereignty." Nyéléni 2007. <http://nyeleni.org/spip.php?article290>.
- McKay, Ben M. 2017. "The Politics of Convergence in Bolivia: Social Movements and the State." *Third World Quarterly* 25: 1–23. doi:10.1080/01436597.2017.1399056.

- McKeon, Nora. 2009. *The United Nations and Civil Society: Legitimating Global Governance – Whose Voice? Interface: A Journal for and about Social Movements*. Vol. 1. London: Zed Books.
- McKeon, Nora. 2017. "Are Equity and Sustainability a Likely Outcome When Foxes and Chickens Share the Same Coop? Critiquing the Concept of Multistakeholder Governance of Food Security." *Globalizations* 14 (3): 379–398. doi:10.1080/14747731.2017.1286168.
- McKeon, Nora, and Carol Kalafatic. 2009. *Strengthening Dialogue. UN Experience with Small Farmer Organizations and Indigenous Peoples*. New York: UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs.
- Mesini, Béatrice, and Delphine Thivet. 2014. "Dynamiques des luttes paysannes et rurales dans les forums sociaux 2000–2010: vers une troisième génération de droits-devoirs envers la « Terre commune »." *Territoire en mouvement Revue de géographie et aménagement. Territory in Movement Journal of Geography and Planning* 22: 98–111. doi:10.4000/tem.2461.
- Mills, Elyse N. 2018. "Implicating 'Fisheries Justice' Movements in Food and Climate Politics." *Third World Quarterly* 43: 1–20. doi:10.1080/01436597.2017.1416288.
- NGLS. 2002. *NGOs Prepare for the World Food Summit: Five Years Later (NGLS Roundup 86)*. Geneva. <https://www.un-ngls.org/orf/documents/text/roundup/86wfs.htm>.
- NGO/CSO Forum for Food Sovereignty. 2002. "Food Sovereignty: A Right For All. Political Statement of the NGO/CSO Forum for Food Sovereignty (Rome, Italy)".
- Nyéleni. 2007a. "Invited Delegates Only." <https://nyeleni.org/IMG/pdf/invitedonlyengl.pdf>.
- Nyéleni. 2007b. *Nyéleni 2007: Forum for Food Sovereignty*. Sélingué. [https://nyeleni.org/DOWNLOADS/Nyeleni\\_EN.pdf](https://nyeleni.org/DOWNLOADS/Nyeleni_EN.pdf).
- Nyéleni. 2007c. *Synthesis Report*. Selingué. <https://nyeleni.org/spip.php?article334>.
- Oxford English Dictionary. 2017. *Constituency*. Oxford. <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/constituency>.
- Park, Clara Mi Young, and Ben White. 2015. "We Are Not All the Same: Taking Gender Seriously in Food Sovereignty Discourse." *Third World Quarterly* 36 (3): 584–599. doi:10.1080/01436597.2015.1002988.
- Pinheiro Machado Brochner, Gabriela. 2014. "Peasant Women in Latin America: Transnational Networking for Food Sovereignty as an Empowerment Tool." *Latin American Policy* 5 (2): 251–264. doi:10.1111/lamp.12054.
- Pleyers, Geoffrey. 2010. *Alter-Globalization. Becoming Actors in the Global Age*. Oxford: Polity Press.
- Rosset, Peter M., and María Elena Martínez-Torres. 2014. "Food Sovereignty and Agroecology in the Convergence of Rural Social Movements." In *Alternative Agrifood Movements: Patterns of Convergence and Divergence*, 137–158. Bingley: Emerald Group.
- Routledge, Paul. 2003. "Convergence Space: Process Geographies of Grassroots Globalization Networks." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 28 (3): 333–349. doi:10.1111/1475-5661.00096.
- Routledge, Paul. 2009. "Transnational Resistance: Global Justice Networks and Spaces of Convergence." *Geography Compass* 3 (5): 1881–1901. doi:10.1111/j.1749-8198.2009.00261.x.
- Tarrow, Sidney. 1998. *Power in Movement*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Taylor, Verta, and Nancy Whittier. 1999. "Collective Identity in Social Movement Communities." In *Waves of Protest*, edited by Jo Freeman and Victoria Johnson, 104–129. New York: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Tilly, Charles. 1986. *La France Conteste: De 1600 À Nos Jours*. Paris: Fayard.
- Tramel, Salena. 2018. "Convergence as Political Strategy: Social Justice Movements, Natural Resources and Climate Change." *Third World Quarterly* 6597: 1–18. doi:10.1080/01436597.2018.1460196.
- Trauger, Amy. 2017. *We Want Land to Live: Making Political Space for Food Sovereignty*. Athens: University of Georgia Press.
- Weldon, S. Laurel. 2006. "Women's Movements, Identity Politics, and Policy Impacts: A Study of Policies on Violence Against Women in the 50 United States." *Political Research Quarterly* 59 (1): 111–122. doi:10.1177/106591290605900110.
- Weldon, S. Laurel. 2012. *When Protest Makes Policy. How Social Movements Represent Disadvantaged Groups*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Wittman, Hannah, and Paul Nicholson. 2009. "Interview: Paul Nicholson, La Via Campesina." *Journal of Peasant Studies* 36 (3): 676–682.