

The Advisory Group, by its **multiactorial and inclusive nature**, is one of the elements that better reflect the **multi-stakeholder approach of CFS**. By its mandate, through its **dialogue** with the Bureau, AG contributes to design the **political** decisions of the Bureau and the political vision of the Committee<sup>1</sup>.

AG's mandate is indeed essential in providing the Bureau with the respective **constituencies' orientations and knowledge** on the latest developments in FSN. To ensure that this function is performed at its best, we need a **renewed composition based on representativeness, accountability and inclusiveness**.

In light of the positive results achieved by PSM and CSM in bringing the multiple voices of their constituencies into the AG, we believe that the **mechanism-based system** represents an effective example that should be **extended** to two other categories that compose the Advisory Group: the International Agricultural Research Institutions and the International Financial and Trade Institutions. The mechanisms represent their constituencies in the best accountable way. As far as the Financial Institutions are concerned, it could be of paramount importance for the effectiveness of the AG having, for instance, the perspective of Regional Development Banks; as far as the research is concerned, additional expertise to the one provided by CGIAR (and notably IFPRI) could better address the various aspects of FSN. This would be, moreover, **in the spirit of the Reform Document**<sup>2</sup>.

**Specific actions** to encourage the creation of new mechanisms **should be envisaged towards the current members** (CGIAR and World Bank) **of the above mentioned categories**.

*In practice, on the basis of the Reform Document and the five existing categories, we believe that a suitable and effective **composition** of the AG may be designed as follows:*

*6 seats for UN Bodies (FAO, WFP, IFAD, Special rapporteur on the RtF, WHO and UNSCN<sup>3</sup>)*

*4 seats for Civil Society Mechanism*

*3 seats for Private Sector/Philantopic Organisations (1 for PSM- 1 for Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation - 1 for Agricultural entrepreneurs/farmers)*

*1 seat for the Research Mechanism*

*1 seat for the Financial Mechanism*

A strengthened role of the AG in addressing concrete FSN issues will, in general, contribute to make the **joint** Bureau and Advisory Group meetings more meaningful in addressing strategic orientations of the

---

<sup>1</sup> **para 23 Reform Doc.:** "It is crucial that the work of the CFS is based on the **reality on the ground**. It will be fundamental for the CFS, through its Bureau and Advisory Group, to nurture and maintain linkages with different actors at regional, sub regional and local levels to ensure on going, **two way exchange** of information among these stakeholders during intersessional periods."

<sup>2</sup> **para 17 Reform Doc.:** "Private sector associations, private philanthropic organizations and other CFS stakeholders active in areas related to food security, nutrition, and the right to food **are encouraged to autonomously establish and maintain a permanent coordination mechanism for participation in the CFS** and for actions derived from that participation at global, regional and national levels. They are invited to communicate a proposal to that effect to the CFS Bureau."

<sup>3</sup> For this biennium the simultaneous presence of WHO and UNSCN seems appropriate given the importance of the Nutrition workstream. For future biennium, the two seats could be incorporated in one UN-rotating seat to be occupied by a UN body depending on the issue on the agenda (UNSCN, UN Women, UNICEF, etc).

IT proposal Advisory Group – CFS Evaluation follow-up

Committee, in particular when it comes to the Bureau's decision on the selection of topics to be included in the MYPoW.