

Joint Proposal by Iceland and Egypt on Recommendation 4 (Comments by Afghanistan)

Afghanistan maintains the view that the CFS Bureau needs to sharpen its procedure for obtaining the precise knowledge and experience of the organizations which are members of the Advisory Group. So far, the Bureau has not been successful in making good use of AG members in the performance of its duties. It has been said many times by many members that the initiative of improving the procedures rests with the Bureau. The processes and structure of the AG is a different issue.

Afghanistan is not in favour of any change in the role of the Advisory Group as stated in the Reform document; namely the AG provides inputs to the Bureau to enable it to perform its duties as assigned to it by the Plenary. The term “inputs” refers to knowledge, memory, practical experience and the quality of technical and policy advice at the request of the Bureau. For this purpose, greater attention is required by the Bureau in preparing the agenda of the Bur/AG meetings.

The AG is neither a policy forum nor an arbiter of resolving technical issues related to FSN. It has a facilitating function within limits defined by the Bureau. Each member of the AG is expected to bring the knowledge and experience of its constituency to help the Bureau perform its tasks appropriately, efficiently and effectively.

Afghanistan does not expect any involvement of the AG in the identification or formulation of emerging issues, defining focal areas and innovative processes related to FSN. In the Reform document, this area of work has been assigned to HLPE. Paragraph 37 of the Reform document says that HLPE will “identify emerging issues, and help members prioritize future actions and attention on key focal areas”.

The first sentence of **Objective** of the joint proposal by Iceland and Egypt is the function of the Plenary and not of the AG. Paragraph 20 of the Reform document states that “The Plenary is the central body for decision-making, debate, coordination, lesson learning and convergence by all stakeholders at global level on issues pertaining to food security and nutrition and on the implementation of the Voluntary Guidelines to Support the Progressive Realization of the Right to Adequate Food in the Context of National Food Security”. AG cannot be a central place because members of CFS are not part of it.

Afghanistan does not favour an extended AG (point 1 of the proposal). Point 2 of the proposal is already in practice. Afghanistan does not favour point 3 of the proposal, namely, the admission of 2 observers from AG in the Bureau with the right to speak. The Bureau sets the agenda of the Plenary, makes other decisions, especially the financing of CFS, selecting the AG members and has a role in identifying and

selecting the members of the HLPE. This is the privilege of CFS members and not of any other entity. Afghanistan would not like to see that this role be eroded in any way.