

Briefing from the Bureau Working Group on the CFS Advisory Group – for decision

Introduction

1. Following CFS46, the CFS Bureau has been tasked with making decisions on the makeup of the CFS Advisory Group for 2020-21.
2. Discussions of the CFS Bureau Working Group over three meetings have highlighted that, *inter alia*: underlying everything related to the CFS Advisory Group is the CFS principle of inclusiveness; the Advisory Group needs to have relevant expertise and this needs to be utilised effectively by the Bureau to assist in delivery of the MYPOW; and that the appointment of the Advisory Group needs to fit within the boundaries of the CFS Rules of Procedure and any legal advice provided by the FAO Legal Counsel.
3. Positively, given the CFS has agreed to an ambitious and challenging MYPOW for the period 2020-2023, there has been significant interest to participate in the Advisory Group to support the CFS in successfully delivering this work. There are more interested parties than there are seats available.
4. Usefully, within the CFS rules, the Bureau has the flexibility to utilise more than one tool in order to maximise the inclusiveness of the process, and to utilise the range of expertise being offered. As stated in the CFS Evaluation, the Chair's power to invite *ad hoc* members allows for flexibility, and noted that this approach could be better utilised.
5. The significant increase in interest in advising the CFS Bureau increases the onus on the Bureau to carefully examine the arrangements for the Advisory Group in light of the findings and recommendations outlined in Annex H of the Implementation of the Response to the Evaluation. This paper proposes an approach to implement a number of these recommendations, including:
 - Developing more strategic agendas of Bureau meetings to make better use of the Advisory Group, recognizing the Bureau's decision-making role, and taking into account the workload.

- Developing clear requests to the Advisory Group, as needed, to provide more substantive inputs during joint Bureau and Advisory Group meetings.
- Encouraging the provision of relevant expertise in alignment with the approved CFS MYPOW.
- Taking into account the provision for *ad hoc* participation, giving consideration to making the best use of existing provisions to enhance participation and inclusiveness.

Working Group process and methodology for analysis of applications

6. At the CFS Bureau meeting of 28 October 2019 the CFS Chair established a Working Group to undertake analysis of applications for the CFS Advisory Group for the term 2020-21.
7. The Working Group met three times on 11 November 2019, 16 January 2020 and 20 February 2020. This paper outlines the Working Group recommendations for the CFS Bureau's consideration on 19 March 2020.
8. To set the parameters for the analysis and decisions on the Advisory Group composition, Bureau members were invited to submit questions to the FAO Legal Counsel team. The resulting questions and answers are attached in Annex 1.
9. The CFS Bureau requested interested groups and organizations to submit a formal expression of interest and then more detailed information through a questionnaire. The questionnaire was based on the points made in Recommendation 4, paragraph 20 of the document "CFS Evaluation: Plan of Action", endorsed by the Committee at CFS45.
10. Information derived from the responses to the questionnaire, and the Working Group analysis of each applicant is included in the table attached in Annex 2 – which analyses:
 - Fit with current CFS categories – (if applicable);
 - Level of representation (global, regional, national);
 - Resourcing and likely ability to contribute (attendance at meetings, support for work programmes); and
 - Unique expertise and value addition to CFS work programme.
11. The parameters for decision making on the Advisory Group seats are derived from the CFS Rules of Procedure, the CFS Reform document and advice received from the FAO Legal Counsel team.
12. Usefully, Rule IV (5) of the CFS Rules of Procedure outlines that the "*CFS Chair, after consulting with the Bureau, may decide to appoint ad hoc Participants whose mandate*

would be limited to a particular topic, a specific activity and a limited period of time”.

This power to invite *ad hoc* participants is wide ranging and offers significant flexibility to utilise knowledge from a range of interest groups at different levels – with the Chair having ultimate decision making power to approve participation.

13. In order to better utilise this power for the benefit of the CFS Bureau, the Working Group indicated that a clearer agreed process for *ad hoc* participation is needed going forward.

Options to better utilise the Advisory Group/Bureau meetings

14. Currently agendas of the Advisory Group and Bureau meetings are largely process and administration focused, rather than framed around the MYPOW work streams and current priority issues of concern to CFS. In the light of the CFS Evaluation recommendations, a reshaping of the agenda of Bureau meetings is warranted, to enable more substantive inputs from AG members and *ad hoc* participants.
15. There is an opportunity to set the agendas to provide a hook for a wider range of interested parties to add value to Bureau discussions and better enable the CFS to deliver its objectives.
16. Some potential topics for discussion in the remainder of 2020 include:
 - The impact of COVID 19 on food systems
 - Food Systems/Nutrition and Agroecological and other innovative approaches – advice on specific difficult issues in development of guidelines
17. The Secretariat will also examine options to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the meetings to enable sufficient time for the Advisory Group to advise on both policy and process.

Operational principles for ad hoc participation

18. As raised in the CFS Evaluation process, the option for *ad hoc* participation, following the approval of the Chair, provides greater flexibility to enable wider groups to advise the Bureau and provide their expertise for specific topics and for specific periods of time. Given the wide degree of interest, and the limited number of Advisory Group seats available, the *ad hoc* approach is expected to play a more prominent role in the coming period than previously.

19. The Bureau and CFS Chair may wish to agree on the following operational principles for *ad hoc* participation:
- a maximum number of four *ad hoc* participants will be allowed for a given meeting;
 - *ad hoc* participants will be chosen by the Chair, in consultation with the Bureau, based on their expertise and likely contribution to the meeting's agenda;
 - when there are a large number of interested parties for a meeting, the Bureau and the CFS Chair will consider such factors as their relative expertise for the meeting's agenda, the number of times they have attended previous meetings relative to other interested parties, and the quality of any previous contributions.

Analysis of working group discussions

20. Following an analysis of applicant's submissions by the Chair of the Working Group, members systematically commented on each applicant on the basis of the table in Annex 2. During all discussions, the Working Group agreed that **the immediate past Advisory Group members should continue to hold their seats unchanged**, although Members discussed and questioned the **number of seats** held by individual members, including whether these could be redistributed or reduced in order to allow new members to gain seats.
21. Following the analysis of the "new" applicants, there was no clear recommendation for the allocation of a seat to a new member, with the preference to utilise the *ad hoc* mechanism in the short-medium term, and/or to invite "new" applicants to participate through the CFS Open Ended Working Groups, regional consultations (as applicable) and potentially as observers to the CFS Plenary. As such, there appears to be no impediment **to re-allocate the seats (unchanged) to the immediate past Advisory Group as recommended below**.

World Farmers Organization (WFO)

22. In its application, the WFO expressed a strong preference to create a "*farmers' seat, cluster or mechanism according to the definition that better answers to the CFS Bureau will, where all farmers and farmers' organisations could be represented*". Additional feedback to the Chair of the Working Group indicated an unwillingness of WFO to continue to participate as an *ad hoc* member, and a strong preference against joining the PSM or CSM, where the WFO considers its ability to advocate on behalf of farmers would be compromised.

23. The Working Group discussed the options to accommodate the WFO in the Advisory Group. There was an acknowledgement that farmers' voices need to be strongly represented in Advisory Group discussions. Some indicated a preference for the WFO to either join the CSM or PSM, while others supported further investigation of a new farmers' seat in the Advisory Group – subject to further analysis of how this seat would fit with existing farmers' representatives in the CSM and PSM.

24. Options for the Bureau to consider are therefore:

1. To seek the agreement of the CFS Plenary to create a new “farmers mechanism” through amendments to paragraph 11 of the CFS Reform document.
2. To create a new farmers mechanism seat under the Private Sector category.
3. To request the WFO to join the CSM or PSM.

25. Annex 1 to this document outlines some of the key procedural considerations to consider for the option of creating a new farmers mechanism in Option 1 above.

Youth Council for Zero Hunger

26. The Youth Council has requested the Bureau to *“create a space for a youth representative in the Advisory Group. This representative would ideally be from our constituency of youth, who would be responsible for consulting with our internal and other external youth networks”*.

27. In recent CFS meetings, there has been a strong contingent of youth representatives who have aligned themselves with the PSM and CSM respectively. The Chair of the Working Group has engaged with the PSM, who has indicated support for the proposed Youth Council seat. The Working Group Chair understands that the Youth Council is currently discussing the proposed Youth Council seat with the CSM – who have a number of questions.

28. The Working Group has consistently expressed support for a stronger youth voice in Advisory Group discussions, however there are further discussions and information required before a decision on a full seat is possible (e.g. relationship with the CSM and PSM, resourcing, governance, representativeness). Additionally, given the Youth Council does not fit within any of the categories outlined in the CFS Reform document, the **creation of a new Youth seat would require an amendment to the Reform document by the CFS Plenary**. This decision will therefore need careful consideration once the Youth Council has completed its discussions and provided further information to the Bureau.

United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues – UNPFII

29. The UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues has requested to have a representative of the UNPFII in the Advisory Group to allow, on a rotating basis, the sixteen representatives elected from governments and indigenous leaders of the seven sociocultural regions who make up the Permanent Forum, to participate and contribute to the discussions of the Advisory Group and bring the perspectives of indigenous peoples.
30. As for the Youth Council situation, the CSM has indigenous groups represented in its membership, and these groups are represented by *the Indigenous Peoples of Africa Coordinating Committee* and the *International Indian Treaty Council*.
31. The UNPFII offers a globally representative, dedicated and credible indigenous perspective to the CFS that is distinct from the existing CSM indigenous representatives who are focused on civil society perspectives within the broad mandate of the CSM. In light of this, and to ensure a strong indigenous voice in the work of the CFS, CSM has indicated that it would be supportive of the Bureau creating a seat for the UNPFII under the UN Agencies and Bodies category of the CFS Reform document.

Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights – UN-OHCHR

32. The Working Group considered the expression of interest from the UN-OHCHR for an Advisory Group seat, with a specific focus on examining the relationships and interlinkages with the UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food. While recognising the relevance of the UN OHCHR's mandate relative to CFS, and the distinctions with the UN Special Rapporteur, some members questioned whether there was a strong enough justification for a separate seat.

Recommendations:

The Bureau:

1. **Note** that following the decision at CFS46, the FAO, IFAD and WFP are permanent ex-officio members of the CFS Advisory Group, and in accordance with the legal advice provided by the FAO Legal Counsel, these can be considered extra-quota for the purpose of counting the number of available Advisory Group seats.

2. **Note** that the maximum number of Advisory Group seats that can be appointed by the CFS Bureau is 14, in accordance with Rule IV and Rule XIII of the CFS Rules of Procedure, and with Paragraph 12 of the CFS 36 Final Report.
3. **Agree** to approve the following organisations/groups as CFS Advisory Group members for the 2020-2021 period:
 - Category 1: UN Agencies and bodies
 - WHO – 1 Seat
 - UNSCN – 1 Seat
 - UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food – 1 Seat
 - UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues – 1 Seat
 - Category 2: Civil society and non-governmental organizations
 - Civil Society Mechanism (CSM) – 4 Seats
 - Category 3: International agriculture research systems
 - CGIAR – 1 Seat
 - Category 4: International and regional Financial Institutions
 - World Bank – 1 Seat.
 - Category 5: Private sector and private philanthropic foundations
 - Private Sector Mechanism (PSM) – 1 Seat
 - Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation – 1 Seat
4. **Agree** to remind all Advisory Group members that their continued Advisory Group membership is dependent on regular attendance at Bureau and Advisory Group meetings, and the level and quality of technical advice they provide to the Bureau, and their membership will be regularly reviewed including through their annual reporting to the Bureau.
5. **Agree in principle** to increase the representation of farmers in the CFS Advisory Group through one of the following options:
 - i. To seek the agreement of the CFS Plenary to create a new farmers mechanism through an amendment to paragraph 11 of the CFS Reform document.
 - ii. Create a new farmers mechanism open to all farmers under the Private Sector category
 - iii. WFO to fully enter the PSM or CSM as a member (noting WFO and PSM or CSM agreement to this arrangement would need to be formally sought).
6. **Agree** to consider all new applicants who fit within a current CFS category as potential ad hoc members. This would include:
 - Global Alliance for the Future of Food and the Agroecology Fund
 - WTO

- World Resources Institute
- Youth Council for Zero Hunger
- UNEP
- UN - OHCHR

7. **Agree** on the following operational procedures for *ad hoc* participation:

- a maximum number of four *ad hoc* participants will be allowed for a given meeting;
- *ad hoc* participants will be chosen by the Chair, in consultation with the Bureau, based on their expertise and likely contribution to the meeting's agenda;
- when there are a large number of interested parties for a meeting, the Bureau and the CFS Chair will consider such factors as their relative expertise for the meeting's agenda, the number of times they have attended previous meetings relative to other interested parties, and the quality of any previous contributions.

8. **Agree** to encourage the participation of the following organizations and groups in the MYPOW process through the CFS Open Ended Working Groups, regional consultations (as applicable) and potentially as an observer to the CFS Plenary:

- Agricultural Parliament of Costa Rica
- Frente Parlamentario Contre el Hambre
- CARE – in addition encourage communication with the CSM to identify potential collaboration
- Future Agro – in addition encourage communication with the CSM to identify potential collaboration
- International Development Law Organization (IDLO)
- Sistema de la Integracion Centroamericana (SISCA)
- OECD
- Global Agriculture and Food Security Programme (GAFSP).

Annex 1 - Farmer's mechanism in the CFS Advisory Group

1. This note briefly outlines some key procedural considerations to assist CFS Bureau discussions on determining the composition of the present Advisory Group, in line with the 2017 CFS Evaluation recommendations, including a proposal for the creation of a "farmer's mechanism" to ensure a dedicated farmers voice within the CFS Advisory Group.

Status of the proposed seat/cluster/mechanism

2. In order to encourage broad representation from a wide range of international farmers' organisations that might contribute as participants to the CFS through a new farmer's mechanism, paragraph 11 of the CFS Reform document would need to be amended to include farmers/farmers' organisations within the categories of organizations and entities. This option would encourage the widest representation of farmers groups by not limiting the mechanism to farmers who align themselves only to either the private sector or civil society mechanisms.
3. Another option is for the Bureau to create a farmer's mechanism that is open to all farmer groups under the private sector, although the potential implications on the level of farmer representation would need to be assessed further for this option.

Membership

4. In order for CFS to hear from a more representative group of farmers (of various types, sizes, regions etc.) to better inform its work, the farmers mechanism would be open to all farmers' organisations to join. A farmer's mechanism would be able to draw upon effective and successful existing international precedents such as: the Farmers' Major Group (FMG) at the ECOSOC HLPF; IFAD's Farmers' Forum; the Steering Committee for the Decade of Family Farming; the farmer's constituency in the UNFCCC processes and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction. The governance arrangements would be developed and agreed collectively by its membership in accordance to its member preferences and in the specific CFS context in order to ensure fair and transparent coordination and consultation processes. Governance arrangements to be defined may include inter alia: the criteria for assigning representative farmers organisations for the mechanism, and their respective roles; processes for new and continued membership; processes for participating and speaking at meetings; organisation of the mechanism's work and approach to coordination; approach to decision making; leadership and financing of the mechanism.
5. The proposed approach of creating a new farmers mechanism recognises that farmers speak from a range of perspectives- including but not limited to youth, agribusiness, and civil society perspectives. The farmer's mechanism would therefore not exclude its

members from participating in other Advisory Group seats at the same time. For example, if agreed by all parties, farmers could choose to input their expertise through the farmer's mechanism alongside their membership in the CSM or PSM.

6. This approach has precedent in other international meetings such as the UNFCCC COP and in UN meetings in New York¹, and would be applied consistently across all Advisory Group members to increase collaboration and synergies between Advisory Group members, e.g. in addition to farmers it could be applied to youth and indigenous representatives.

Next steps

7. If the Bureau agrees in principle to a farmer's mechanism, the CFS Chair could reach out to farmers' organisations participating in the Steering Group of the UN Decade of Family Farming and/or IFAD Farmer's forum to initiate a process of engaging with farming organisations regionally and internationally on the proposal for the farmer's mechanism. The Chair could request these organisations to engage with their farming networks internationally and regionally to develop a more detailed proposal based on some of the governance arrangements outlined in paragraph four and in accordance with the elements in paragraph 20 of the CFS Evaluation to enable a more detailed proposal for a farmer's mechanism to be considered at CFS47.

¹ For example at the UNFCCC COP young farmers (members of the farmers' constituency) also join the Youth constituency. Worldvision is represented in New York through the NGO constituency, however as they have a department on agriculture they also participate in the Farmers' Major Group consultation and discussion.

Annex 2 – FAO Legal Counsel Q&A

- 1) **As you observed during the meeting it was not clear for many of us on what number we are talking – as ceiling for the Advisory Group - : 11, 13, 14 or 17? We would be grateful if the Legal Office could provide us with the concrete answer and explain us why the term "ex-officio members" is treated as "ex-quota members".**

In line with Rule IV, paragraph 1 of CFS RoP and the Committee's decision (CFS 36 refers), in LEG's view, the upper limit of members of the Advisory group appointed for a term of two years is 14 members for the following reasons.

Rule XXXIII of the GROs states: *"the Bureau shall be assisted by an Advisory Group which shall be established in accordance with the Rules of Procedures."*

Rule VI of the CFS Rules of Procedures (CFS RoPs)², as amended by the CFS, reads as follows:

"The Bureau shall establish an Advisory Group from among representatives of organizations allowed to participate in the proceedings of the Committee under paragraph 11 of the CFS Reform Document and paragraph 3 of Rule XXXIII of the General Rules of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Representatives of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the World Food Programme, and the International Fund for Agricultural Development take part in the Advisory Group ex-officio. The members of the Advisory group shall be appointed for a term of two years. The number of members of the Advisory Group shall not exceed that of the members of the Bureau including the Chairperson, unless otherwise decided by the Committee"

Regarding the membership of the Advisory Group, LEG considers that the term "members" refers to appointed members and any member added following a decision of the Committee. Accordingly, the number of members is limited to 13 members (the Chair + 12 members) unless the Committee decided otherwise. In 2010, at its 36th session, the Committee, in line with the foregoing rule of procedure, agreed to add a member to the Advisory Group namely the United Nations Standing Committee on Nutrition (UNSCN). It did not prescribe the term of the mandate.

- Accordingly, in LEG's view, the Committee decided to add one member to the Advisory Group and the total number of members of the Advisory group is 14 and FAO, IFAD and WFP representatives taking part as ex-officio, are not considered "appointed members" and hence, in LEG's view, three appointed members' seats have been vacated.

- 2) **The Legal Office advised: "However, the rules provide that the Committee may decide to add a member, which, per se, may not fit in one of the categories." We would be grateful for clarifications - what is a rule (or rules) in question?**

The question arose in the context of question 4, which read as follows : According to the extract above, can the Bureau invite to join the AG an organization/association which does not clearly fit into one of the five categories under paragraph 11 of the CFS Reform Document?

² Basic Texts, Volume II, Section L Rules of Procedures of the Committee on World Food Security,

Pursuant to Rule XXXIII, paragraph 3, implemented by Rule IV, paragraphs 1 and 5 of CFS RoP and the categories listed in paragraph 11 of the CFS Reform document,

- The Bureau “shall establish from among representatives of organizations allowed to participate in the proceedings of the Committee under paragraph 11 of the CFS Reform Document and paragraph 3 of Rule XXXIII of the General Rules of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.” ;
- The Chair of the CFS, after consulting the Bureau, may decide to appoint *ad hoc* Participants; The latter term in the context of the CFS bears the meaning set out in Section III, C of the Reform Document, entitled “*Participants*” . This Section III, C includes paragraphs 11 and 12. Paragraph 11 reads : “*The Committee shall be open to **participants** from the following categories of organizations and entities: [...]*” .
- In accordance with the CFS Rules of Procedures and the CFS Reform Document, the Bureau and the Chair of the CFS, when establishing the Advisory Group, should invite organizations and entities falling within the five categories of organizations and entities listed in Paragraph 11 of the Reform Document.

However, Rule IV, paragraph 1, of the CFS RoPs provide that the Committee may decide to add a member (“*unless otherwise decided by the Committee*”). In the spirit of the General Rule XXXIII, paragraph 3, the CFS RoPs and CFS Reform Document, it would be appropriate for the Committee to decide to add a member from the categories of organizations or entities referred to in Paragraph 11 of the CFS Document. However, it cannot be excluded in the future that the Committee may decide to add a member, which does not clearly fit into one of the categories.

Foreword

In this context, LEG considers that, in particular, the following rules provide guidance:

- GRO XXXIII, paragraphs 1, 3 & 4
- CFS RoP, Rule I³, IV, para.1 and 5
- The Reform Document, paragraph 4 (Vision)⁴, and paragraphs 7 to 15.

In general, the current CFS legal framework allows CSOs, NGOs and private sector associations to request to participate in CFS meetings as Participants either through the coordinating mechanisms or in their individual capacity. A proposal to limit Participants status to those working through the

³ Basic Texts, Volume II, Section L, CFS RoPs Rule I - Composition and participation
Membership of the Committee and participation in its proceedings shall be in accordance with paragraphs 7 to 15 of the CFS Reform Document and with Rule XXXIII, paragraphs 1 to 5 of the General Rules of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

⁴ Basic Texts, Volume II, paragraph 7, *The CFS is and remains an intergovernmental Committee. It will be composed of members, participants and observers and will seek to achieve a balance between inclusiveness and effectiveness. Its composition will ensure that the voices of all relevant stakeholders – particularly those most affected by food insecurity - are heard. It shall further take into account the fact that the overall CFS includes not only an annual global meeting, but also a series of intersessional activities at various levels.*

coordinating mechanisms may be in conflict with the principle of inclusiveness that represents one of the guiding principles of the reform of the CFS.

- 3) Does the Civil Society Mechanism have a monopoly of CFS participants under paragraph 11 (ii) of the Reform Document? In other words, can an entity, or a cluster of two or more entities, of 11 (ii) participants partake in the CFS while not belonging to the CSM?**

NO, Paragraph 11, ii) does not provide that the Civil Society Mechanism has a monopoly of CFS participants under paragraph 11 (ii). In other words, **YES**, an entity, or a cluster of two or more entities, of 11 (ii) participants could be allowed to participate in the CFS while not belonging to the CSM.

- 4) Can a civil society organization that does not belong to the Civil Society Mechanism become a member of the Advisory Group? Can a cluster of two or more civil society organizations that do not belong to the Civil Society Mechanism become a member of the Advisory Group?**

YES, in principle a civil society organization that does not belong to the Civil Society Mechanism can become a member of the Advisory Group. **YES**, in principle a cluster of two or more civil society organizations that do not belong to the Civil Society Mechanism could become a member of the Advisory Group if the Bureau so appoints.

- 5) Does the Private Sector Mechanism have a monopoly of CFS participants under paragraph 11 (v) of the Reform Document? In other words, can an entity, or a cluster of two or more entities, of 11 (v) participants partake in the CFS while not belonging to the PSM?**

No, paragraph 11 (v) does not provide that the Private Sector Mechanism has a monopoly of CFS participants under paragraph 11 (v) of the Reform Document.

- 6) Can a private sector organization that does not belong to the Private Sector Mechanism become a member of the Advisory Group? Can a cluster of two or more private sector organizations that do not belong to the Private Sector Mechanism become a member of the Advisory Group?**

This question has to be looked into in the context of paragraph 17 of the CFS Reform Document whereby *“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.”*

- 7) Is the number of CFS mechanisms limited to two under the Reform Document and any other applicable rule? In other words, can there be a third, fourth, fifth, sixth (...) CFS mechanism?**

NO, the number of CFS mechanisms is not limited to two under the Reform Document and any other applicable rule.

- 8) When the reform document refers to mechanisms as “autonomously established”, does that mean that mechanisms operate as if they were sovereign States under the United Nations Charter? Is there any kind of limit to their autonomy? Can member States oversee the mechanisms in any way (for instance to verify that they comply with their own bylaws, or even access information as to the**

actual existence and the content of any internal rules)? Are the mechanisms subjected to the rules that govern the behavior of member States, or do they enjoy a degree of sovereignty above and beyond that of member States?

In the context of the CFS, the mechanisms are subject to Rule XXXIII, in particular Rule XXXIII, paragraphs 3 and 4 of the GROS, CFS Rules of Procedures and the principles set out in the CFS Reform Document. The CFS is and remains an intergovernmental Committee.⁵ The GRO XXXIII makes it very clear that “*voting and decision-making shall remain the exclusive prerogative*” of the CFS Members i.e. Members of FAO, WFP and IFAD , or non-member States of the Organization that are Members of the United Nations or any of its Specialized Agencies.

On this basis, it is considered that mechanisms do not enjoy a degree of sovereignty above and beyond that of member States.

9) Can a mechanism refuse to accept entities? Can a mechanism expel entities? Is there any recourse that refused or expelled entities may pursue?

There are no rules in the Basic Texts regarding the establishment and the functioning of mechanisms.

10) Is there a mandatory/binding rule for allocating more than one seat to any member of the Advisory Group?

NO there is no a mandatory/binding rule for allocating more than one seat to any member of the Advisory Group.

⁵ CFS Reform Document, Section III Composition, modalities of participation, and consultation/coordination mechanisms, Sub-section A Composition and modalities of participation, paragraph 7.

Annex 3 – Analysis table

	Name	Fit with current CFS categories – (if applicable)	Level of representation (global, regional, national)	Resourcing and likely ability to contribute (attendance at meetings, support for work programmes)	Unique expertise and value addition to CFS work programme? <i>[Value addition can include inter alia expertise and level of influence to promote CFS products]</i>	Suggested mode of CFS involvement?			
						<i>Advisory Group (including option to merge into existing structures?)</i>	<i>Ad-hoc Participant - Issues to cover in MYPOW? Which AG sessions?</i>	<i>Observer</i>	<i>Standard CFS engagement (consultation, OEWG's)</i>
1	CSM	Civil Society	Global – CSM is based on 11 Constituencies: Smallholders Farmers, Pastoralists/Herders, Fisherfolks, Indigenous Peoples, Consumers, Urban Food Insecure, Agricultural and Food Workers, Women, Youth, Landless, NGOs.	Rome representation – attended every meeting (11) since Nov 2017.		AG Member – 4 Seats			
2	PSM	Private Sector	Global - The PSM is an open platform providing a permanent seat for private enterprises right across the agri-food value chain, from farmers, to input providers, cooperatives, processors, SMEs and food companies	Rome representation – attended every meeting (11) since Nov 2017.		AG Member – 1 Seat			

	Name	Fit with current CFS categories – (if applicable)	Level of representation (global, regional, national)	Resourcing and likely ability to contribute (attendance at meetings, support for work programmes)	Unique expertise and value addition to CFS work programme? <i>[Value addition can include inter alia expertise and level of influence to promote CFS products]</i>	Suggested mode of CFS involvement?			
						<i>Advisory Group (including option to merge into existing structures?)</i>	<i>Ad-hoc Participant - Issues to cover in MYPOW? Which AG sessions?</i>	<i>Observer</i>	<i>Standard CFS engagement (consultation, OEWG's)</i>
3	WHO	UN Agency/Body	Global	Geneva based - Attended 8 of 11 meetings since Nov 2017.		AG Member – 1 Seat			
4	UNSCN	UN Agency/Body	Global	Rome representation – attended every meeting (11) since Nov 2017.		AG Member – 1 Seat			
5	UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food	UN Agency/Body	Global	Rome representation – attended 6 of 11 meetings since Nov 2017.		AG Member – 1 Seat			
6	CGIAR	International Agricultural Research Institutions	Global	Attended 5 of 11 meetings since Nov 2017.		AG Member – 1 Seat			
7	B&M Gates Foundation	Private Sector/ Foundations	Global	Rome representation – attended 9 of 11 meetings since Nov 2017.		AG Member – 1 Seat			
8	World Bank	International Financial and Trade Institutions	Global	Washington DC representation - Attended 3 of 11 meetings since Nov 2017.		AG Member – 1 Seat			

	Name	Fit with current CFS categories – (if applicable)	Level of representation (global, regional, national)	Resourcing and likely ability to contribute (attendance at meetings, support for work programmes)	Unique expertise and value addition to CFS work programme? [Value addition can include inter alia expertise and level of influence to promote CFS products]	Suggested mode of CFS involvement?			
						Advisory Group (including option to merge into existing structures?)	Ad-hoc Participant - Issues to cover in MYPOW? Which AG sessions?	Observer	Standard CFS engagement (consultation, OEWG's)
9	World Farmers Organisation	Private Sector	Global - International Organisation of Farmers for Farmers, which aims to bring together all the national producer and farm cooperative organisations. WFO constituencies provide direct inputs to WFO position papers vis a vis the CFS workstreams. WFO is also equipped with a Food Security working group, which is coordinated by a Facilitator using a bottom up approach. The working group is composed of two WFO members per each constituency or geographical region (2 for LAC, 2 for North America, 2 from Africa, 2 for Oceania, 2 for Asia, and 2 for Europe).	Rome representation – attended 7 of 11 meetings as an ad hoc member since Nov 2017.	Broader farmer's representation and contribution to the works of the CFS, adding their voice to those of the farmers already represented within the PSM and the CSM. Allowing the widest farmers' presence possible in the AG, to bring their needs as well as unique expertise, made of traditional wisdom, will to innovate, pragmatic solutions, social commitment, into the discussion on the different workstreams. Seeking a specific farmer's seat or cluster where farmers groups could be represented.	Agreement that the WFO should be involved in the AG, but unclear on the best approach. Integration into CSM and PSM has been unsuccessful. Other options are to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create a farmers category in which WFO and other farmers groups can participate in the AG; • Create a specific seat for WFO under the Private Sector category; 			

	Name	Fit with current CFS categories – (if applicable)	Level of representation (global, regional, national)	Resourcing and likely ability to contribute (attendance at meetings, support for work programmes)	Unique expertise and value addition to CFS work programme? <i>[Value addition can include inter alia expertise and level of influence to promote CFS products]</i>	Suggested mode of CFS involvement?			
						<i>Advisory Group (including option to merge into existing structures?)</i>	<i>Ad-hoc Participant - Issues to cover in MYPOW? Which AG sessions?</i>	<i>Observer</i>	<i>Standard CFS engagement (consultation, OEWG's)</i>
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue as an ad hoc member long term 			
10	WTO	International Financial and Trade Institutions. [Note reference to WTO in the CFS Reform document].	Global - The WTO is the only global international organization dealing with the rules of trade between nations. It has a total of 164 member governments.	Geneva based- Participation of the WTO Secretariat will be funded through the budget of the WTO Agricultural and Commodities Division	Trade expertise as it relates to global food systems, trade barriers, rules and settings. Can help shape the narrative on the role of international trade in food security, and to positioning international trade as a vital pillar of climate adaptation. It would provide information on, and enhance the understanding of the CFS, on the role of international trade in ensuring food security, adapting to climate change, alleviating poverty, reducing inequality, and contributing to the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda.		Suggest WTO can be considered as an ad hoc Participant on a meeting-by-meeting basis when trade matters arise.		

	Name	Fit with current CFS categories – (if applicable)	Level of representation (global, regional, national)	Resourcing and likely ability to contribute (attendance at meetings, support for work programmes)	Unique expertise and value addition to CFS work programme? <i>[Value addition can include inter alia expertise and level of influence to promote CFS products]</i>	Suggested mode of CFS involvement?			
						<i>Advisory Group (including option to merge into existing structures?)</i>	<i>Ad-hoc Participant - Issues to cover in MYPOW? Which AG sessions?</i>	<i>Observer</i>	<i>Standard CFS engagement (consultation, OEWG's)</i>
					<p>In the run up to CFS47, it would contribute in particular to the Voluntary Guidelines on Food Systems and Nutrition. These guidelines intersect with a wide set of WTO rules, that go beyond the WTO Agreement on Agriculture, and into matters related to the Agreement on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS) and the Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT). The role of trade, working alongside the WTO, is central to the proposed Hand in Hand Initiative.</p> <p>Note - WTO has indicated it could participate as an ad hoc member when trade-related matters arise.</p>				

	Name	Fit with current CFS categories – (if applicable)	Level of representation (global, regional, national)	Resourcing and likely ability to contribute (attendance at meetings, support for work programmes)	Unique expertise and value addition to CFS work programme? <i>[Value addition can include inter alia expertise and level of influence to promote CFS products]</i>	Suggested mode of CFS involvement?			
						<i>Advisory Group (including option to merge into existing structures?)</i>	<i>Ad-hoc Participant - Issues to cover in MYPOW? Which AG sessions?</i>	<i>Observer</i>	<i>Standard CFS engagement (consultation, OEWG's)</i>
11	Agricultural Parliament of Costa Rica	Not a current category	National	Costa Rica based	Advice on the social, cultural, environmental and economic context of CFS MYPOW issues in the Costa Rica context. Assumed that increased involvement would result in increased visibility and implementation of CFS products in Costa Rica context. No clear indication of the value addition of Advisory Group involvement at the global level.				Is not a global entity or current category so cannot be considered for the AG or as an ad hoc Participant. Suggest to encourage participation through the OEWG process.
12	Frente Parlamentario Contre el Hambre	Not a current category	Regional – Latin America and the Caribbean	TBC	Parliamentarians from a range of Latin American and Caribbean countries. No detailed response to questionnaire but assumed can provide expertise and advise on food security issues and initiatives from a regional perspective.				Is not a global entity or current category so cannot be considered for the AG or as an ad hoc Participant. Suggest to encourage participation through the OEWG process.
13	Global Alliance for the	Private Sector/ Foundations	Global - Global Alliance is a strategic alliance of 26	US-based	“The Global Alliance and the AgroEcology Fund have extensive		Focus is on the Food Systems/Nutrition		

	Name	Fit with current CFS categories – (if applicable)	Level of representation (global, regional, national)	Resourcing and likely ability to contribute (attendance at meetings, support for work programmes)	Unique expertise and value addition to CFS work programme? <i>[Value addition can include inter alia expertise and level of influence to promote CFS products]</i>	Suggested mode of CFS involvement?			
						<i>Advisory Group (including option to merge into existing structures?)</i>	<i>Ad-hoc Participant - Issues to cover in MYPOW? Which AG sessions?</i>	<i>Observer</i>	<i>Standard CFS engagement (consultation, OEWG's)</i>
	Future of Food and the Agroecology Fund		philanthropic foundations. Agroecology Fund is a multi-donor fund supporting agro-ecological practices and policies.		networks to link into CFS deliberations, and we regularly support relevant research and stakeholder convenings that could contribute to the CFS workstreams”. The niche could be in connecting a diverse network of philanthropies in to the CFS platform and discussions and strengthening representation of philanthropies within the PSM. Food systems and agroecological and other innovative approaches are the most obvious workstreams given specific mandate. Potential for improved resource mobilization in implementing the guidelines if the		and agroecology and innovation work streams only so suggest ad hoc Participant status rather than full AG.		

	Name	Fit with current CFS categories – (if applicable)	Level of representation (global, regional, national)	Resourcing and likely ability to contribute (attendance at meetings, support for work programmes)	Unique expertise and value addition to CFS work programme? <i>[Value addition can include inter alia expertise and level of influence to promote CFS products]</i>	Suggested mode of CFS involvement?			
						<i>Advisory Group (including option to merge into existing structures?)</i>	<i>Ad-hoc Participant - Issues to cover in MYPOW? Which AG sessions?</i>	<i>Observer</i>	<i>Standard CFS engagement (consultation, OEWG's)</i>
					Alliance is involved more closely?				
14	CARE	Civil Society	Global - CARE works in more than 90 countries, reaching over 50 million people through over 950 poverty-fighting development and humanitarian aid programs.	US-based	Expertise in inequalities, gender issues, youth through the perspective of its humanitarian work. Unclear what sort of issues will they advise on and added value relative to other AG members? (WFP for example). Proposed an option of deepening links to the CFS through the CSM.	Propose to take up their offer of deepening links through the CSM rather than creating a new seat.			Is not a global entity or current category so cannot be considered for the AG or as an ad hoc Participant. Suggest to encourage participation through the OEWG process.
15	Future Agro	Not a current category – Independent grassroots organisation run by entrepreneurs	Global - Aims to make a global impact by bringing together agro innovators, entrepreneurs, farmers, investors and stakeholders to address national policies and challenges.	Greece-based	Membership covers many important stakeholders relevant to MYPOW workstreams, however further information is needed on any additional expertise Future Agro would bring relative to networks in the CSM and PSM.				Is not a global entity so cannot be considered for the AG or as an ad hoc Participant. Suggest to encourage participation through the OEWG process.

	Name	Fit with current CFS categories – (if applicable)	Level of representation (global, regional, national)	Resourcing and likely ability to contribute (attendance at meetings, support for work programmes)	Unique expertise and value addition to CFS work programme? <i>[Value addition can include inter alia expertise and level of influence to promote CFS products]</i>	Suggested mode of CFS involvement?			
						<i>Advisory Group (including option to merge into existing structures?)</i>	<i>Ad-hoc Participant - Issues to cover in MYPOW? Which AG sessions?</i>	<i>Observer</i>	<i>Standard CFS engagement (consultation, OEWG's)</i>
					Could suggest participation through CSM.				
16	International Development Law Organization (IDLO)	Not a current category Intergovernmental Organization	Global	Rome-based representation	Have CFS observer status and experience and expertise in rule of law and access to justice. The only intergovernmental organization devoted to advancing the rule of law as it relates to sustainable development. Legal issues are a critical element of many CFS issues. Expertise and niche is crosscutting across CFS workstreams – including inequalities, gender, food systems, governance.				Is not a current category so cannot be considered for the AG or as an ad hoc Participant. Suggest to encourage participation through the OEWG process and continue as an observer.

	Name	Fit with current CFS categories – (if applicable)	Level of representation (global, regional, national)	Resourcing and likely ability to contribute (attendance at meetings, support for work programmes)	Unique expertise and value addition to CFS work programme? <i>[Value addition can include inter alia expertise and level of influence to promote CFS products]</i>	Suggested mode of CFS involvement?			
						<i>Advisory Group (including option to merge into existing structures?)</i>	<i>Ad-hoc Participant - Issues to cover in MYPOW? Which AG sessions?</i>	<i>Observer</i>	<i>Standard CFS engagement (consultation, OEWG's)</i>
17	Sistema de la Integración Centroamericana (SISCA)	Not a current category	Regional - Fosters cooperation between the 10 countries that are part of Mesoamerica. Working in the areas of public health, food security, housing, are social fields in the context of FAO's implementation of the Mesoamerican Hunger Program.	Panama - based	Expertise of issues and context on FSN in Mesoamerica region. Assumed to most concerned with MYPOW workstreams on inequalities, youth, gender, and food systems.				Is not a global entity or current category so cannot be considered for the AG or as an ad hoc Participant. Suggest to encourage participation through the OEWG process.
18	UN Commissioner on Human Rights (OHCHR)	UN Agency/Body	Global – The principal United Nations office mandated to promote and protect human rights for all, OHCHR leads global human rights efforts speaks out objectively in the face of human rights violations worldwide.	Geneva-based-OHCHR participation in the Advisory Group will be covered by its regular and extra-budgetary resources. The focal point on the right to food in the Human Rights and Economic and Social Issues Section will dedicate necessary staff	Provides assistance to Governments, such as expertise and technical trainings in the areas of administration of justice, legislative reform, and electoral process, to help implement international human rights standards on the ground. Also assist other entities with responsibility to protect human rights to fulfil their obligations and	Suggest dialogue to determine potential collaboration with the Special rapporteur on the Right to Food as an AG member	Very relevant expertise to CFS workstreams so suggest ad hoc membership for all workstreams – Bureau to analyse each request before consideration by the Chair.		

	Name	Fit with current CFS categories – (if applicable)	Level of representation (global, regional, national)	Resourcing and likely ability to contribute (attendance at meetings, support for work programmes)	Unique expertise and value addition to CFS work programme? <i>[Value addition can include inter alia expertise and level of influence to promote CFS products]</i>	Suggested mode of CFS involvement?			
						<i>Advisory Group (including option to merge into existing structures?)</i>	<i>Ad-hoc Participant - Issues to cover in MYPOW? Which AG sessions?</i>	<i>Observer</i>	<i>Standard CFS engagement (consultation, OEWG's)</i>
				time to contribute to the work of the Advisory Group and will travel to Rome for its meetings as necessary.	<p>individuals to realize their rights.</p> <p>Support the work of special procedures – including special rapporteurs, independent experts, and working groups-- appointed by the Council to monitor human rights in different countries or in relation to specific issues. OHCHR has often served as a bridge between the CFS efforts on food security and the human rights mechanisms in Geneva.</p> <p>Value across all workstreams but with particular value for offering guidance on policy coherence in the areas of gender and inequalities.</p>				

	Name	Fit with current CFS categories – (if applicable)	Level of representation (global, regional, national)	Resourcing and likely ability to contribute (attendance at meetings, support for work programmes)	Unique expertise and value addition to CFS work programme? <i>[Value addition can include inter alia expertise and level of influence to promote CFS products]</i>	Suggested mode of CFS involvement?			
						<i>Advisory Group (including option to merge into existing structures?)</i>	<i>Ad-hoc Participant - Issues to cover in MYPOW? Which AG sessions?</i>	<i>Observer</i>	<i>Standard CFS engagement (consultation, OEWG's)</i>
19	UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues	UN Agency/Body	<p>Global – high- level advisory body to the Economic and Social Council.</p> <p>Proposal to have a representative of the UNPFII in the CFS Advisory Group on a rotating basis, allow the sixteen representatives elected from governments and indigenous leaders of the seven sociocultural regions, who make up the Permanent Forum, to participate and bring the perspectives of indigenous peoples.</p>	Coordinated from New York - The UNPFII is funded by the UN Voluntary Fund for Indigenous Peoples.	<p>Expertise on the perspectives of indigenous people as it relates to agriculture, food security, food systems, agricultural production, governance.</p> <p>Relationship and representation relative to the CSM indigenous representatives to be clarified. UNPFII has said “UNPFIII would like to strengthen the dialogue with the Civil Society and Indigenous Peoples' Mechanism to <i>explore possible collaboration that could increase the participation of indigenous peoples' organizations</i>, many of whom have been following the discussion at the UN Permanent forum on</p>	Potential future AG seat given relevance across all MYPOW workstreams. Further dialogue with CSM is necessary as the first step.	Ad hoc Participant status offered for all workstreams as a pre-cursor to potential future AG membership.		

	Name	Fit with current CFS categories – (if applicable)	Level of representation (global, regional, national)	Resourcing and likely ability to contribute (attendance at meetings, support for work programmes)	Unique expertise and value addition to CFS work programme? [Value addition can include inter alia expertise and level of influence to promote CFS products]	Suggested mode of CFS involvement?			
						Advisory Group (including option to merge into existing structures?)	Ad-hoc Participant - Issues to cover in MYPOW? Which AG sessions?	Observer	Standard CFS engagement (consultation, OEWG's)
					Indigenous Issues for several years”. Forum is wider and more inclusive than the CSM Indigenous members as it represents seven sociocultural regions.				
20	World Resources Institute	International Research Institutions (not solely agriculture – but resources more generally). WRI work covers: climate, energy, food, forests, water, cities and the ocean.	Global - Research organization that spans more than 60 countries. More than 1,000 experts and staff work closely with leaders within governments, the UN, the World Bank, NGOs, global corporates (likely many existing member countries and most recent AG members).	US-based - Participation on the AG would be of Dr Esben Lunde Larsen – resourced through his current position as Fellow in the Food Programme.	Likely WRI expertise will be most relevant to environmental management issues and so the current MYPOW areas would be food systems and AE and other approaches. WRI currently works closely with previous AG members such as the World Bank and CGIAR and has significant expertise and resourcing at its disposal that could be of benefit to the CFS.		Expertise relevant to Food Systems/Nutrition and agroecology and innovation work streams only so suggest ad hoc Participant status.		

	Name	Fit with current CFS categories – (if applicable)	Level of representation (global, regional, national)	Resourcing and likely ability to contribute (attendance at meetings, support for work programmes)	Unique expertise and value addition to CFS work programme? <i>[Value addition can include inter alia expertise and level of influence to promote CFS products]</i>	Suggested mode of CFS involvement?			
						<i>Advisory Group (including option to merge into existing structures?)</i>	<i>Ad-hoc Participant - Issues to cover in MYPOW? Which AG sessions?</i>	<i>Observer</i>	<i>Standard CFS engagement (consultation, OEWG's)</i>
21	Youth Council for Zero Hunger	Civil society/Private sector (cross-cutting)	Global - current membership is comprised of roughly a hundred young people from around the world. Planning to engage further with Youth organizations such as Nuffield International, 4-H International (with 7 million members internationally) – who have expressed initial support.	To date, have received funding from individual members states and organisations that will support the role in the Advisory Group in the short term. Have the intention of seeking funding from member states and other bodies over 2020/21.	Strong support across CFS members for a strengthened youth voice across CFS workstreams. The youth perspective is important across all workstreams, with a specific contribution of expertise to the youth workstream. PSM and CSM have extensive youth delegates so it would be useful to understand the interrelationships and value add of a Youth Council.	Further clarification of relationship and value add relative to CSM and PSM delegates is needed and also ability to finance involvement is needed before a full AG seat is recommended. Also clarification of which category the youth council would sit.	Propose ad hoc Participant status and review value of participation before AG status is considered at a later date.		
22	OECD	Not a current category	Regional – OECD countries	Paris-based	Can contribute to policy (to support development of policy guidelines) and uptake. Specific reference to current MYPOW not included in response, apart from a reference to OECD work on food				Is not a global entity or current category so cannot be considered for the AG or as an ad hoc Participant. Suggest to encourage participation through the OEWG process.

	Name	Fit with current CFS categories – (if applicable)	Level of representation (global, regional, national)	Resourcing and likely ability to contribute (attendance at meetings, support for work programmes)	Unique expertise and value addition to CFS work programme? <i>[Value addition can include inter alia expertise and level of influence to promote CFS products]</i>	Suggested mode of CFS involvement?			
						<i>Advisory Group (including option to merge into existing structures?)</i>	<i>Ad-hoc Participant - Issues to cover in MYPOW? Which AG sessions?</i>	<i>Observer</i>	<i>Standard CFS engagement (consultation, OEWG's)</i>
					systems. OECD is already working with FAO on food systems and can potentially contribute expertise to CFS policy guidelines as part of consultation process. Wider areas of expertise relate more to other areas of FAO work outside of current MYPOW such as fisheries. Although not stated, it is assumed that OECD would have a useful contribution to the data workstream.				
23	UNEP	UN Agency/Body	Global	Nairobi - based	Likely focus on technical input on workstream on agroecological and other innovations in the current MYPOW. Mandate and expertise not focused on youth, gender, inequalities and data - relative to other CFS AG participants.		Suggest ad hoc member during 2020 given areas of expertise. Will not have substantive input once food systems and agroecology are concluded.		

	Name	Fit with current CFS categories – (if applicable)	Level of representation (global, regional, national)	Resourcing and likely ability to contribute (attendance at meetings, support for work programmes)	Unique expertise and value addition to CFS work programme? <i>[Value addition can include inter alia expertise and level of influence to promote CFS products]</i>	Suggested mode of CFS involvement?			
						<i>Advisory Group (including option to merge into existing structures?)</i>	<i>Ad-hoc Participant - Issues to cover in MYPOW? Which AG sessions?</i>	<i>Observer</i>	<i>Standard CFS engagement (consultation, OEWG's)</i>
24	Global Agriculture and Food Security Programme (GAFSP)	International Financial and Trade Institutions	Global - Since its inception in 2010, has brought together different partners through its multi-stakeholder structure to work in support of country-led processes towards fighting hunger and improving food security. GAFSP is led by a Steering Committee comprised of recipients, donors, civil society, and major development partners such as the RBAs and Regional Development Banks.	Washington DC based	GAFSP has supported public and private sector investments to fight hunger, malnutrition, and poverty in over 40 low-income countries, by financing resilient and sustainable agriculture that benefits and empowers smallholder farmers, particularly women and youth. GAFSP offers a range of public and private investment tools including grants, concessional loans, blended finance, technical assistance and advisory services. MYPOW items of interest are food systems and nutrition, gender equality and women's empowerment, and youth engagement and employment, which are				Working group not convinced of value add to Bureau relative to the World Bank. Suggested engagement through OEWG's.

	Name	Fit with current CFS categories – (if applicable)	Level of representation (global, regional, national)	Resourcing and likely ability to contribute (attendance at meetings, support for work programmes)	Unique expertise and value addition to CFS work programme? <i>[Value addition can include inter alia expertise and level of influence to promote CFS products]</i>	Suggested mode of CFS involvement?			
						<i>Advisory Group (including option to merge into existing structures?)</i>	<i>Ad-hoc Participant - Issues to cover in MYPOW? Which AG sessions?</i>	<i>Observer</i>	<i>Standard CFS engagement (consultation, OEWG's)</i>
					<p>cross-cutting issues in GAFSP's portfolio. Our participation in the CFS Advisory Group would allow us to better contribute to the implementation of the CFS policy outcomes at the national levels through GAFSP's operational model and guidelines.</p> <p>Seeking ad hoc membership.</p>				