Participants

**Absent**

Naouar Labidi (gFSC), Alberto Bigi (FAO), Erika Dettoni (WFP), Joanne Grace (SCI), Thomas Ølholm (NRC), Anne-Usn Lazar (SI), Paul Kinschla (WVI), Davide Rossi (gFSC), Fabien Tallou (FSC)

---

### Agenda points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introduction &amp; welcome</th>
<th>Key issues/Action points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Naouar Labidi will chair the SAG, as the interim gFSC Coordinator</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Global Partners Meeting (GPM)

**Dates:** 25-27 & 27 May  
**DAY 1:** dedicated to Famine/FS Crisis  
- Session ONE: panel of experts that discuss about Famine from different angles (e.g. conflict, C19, weather, coordination, local communities/local actor engagement, IFC phase “real meaning”, etc);  
- Session TWO: “Voices from the field: to select few countries (including “forgotten” crisis) or regional approach (NGO to lead + CC can facilitate this session);  
- Session THREE (Optional) could be dedicated to coordination issues, including inter-cluster, FSC role on current crisis, etc.  
**DAY 2:** dedicated to MTR:  
- SAG to introduce current strategic plan + breakout rooms divided by the 4 results: discussions to be reported in plenary for the suggested areas of improvement, action to be taken by gFSC & FSCs in the field up to 2022  
**DAY 3:** dedicated to MTR: general update + discussions on the impacts on current crisis on the technical support and how to better engage with the field. WGs to play a key role in leading discussions.  
- SAG members to support gFSC to better define the sessions/panelists/breakout room discussions.  
- To better define the agenda contents it was discussed the opportunity to involve directly gFSC members (Survey). In previous years, this was not done and gFSC & SAG normally built up the agenda. Members willing to present include some agenda point were to write to SAG or gFSC. For the upcoming meeting, a survey with gFSC members could be done, but it is important to look at the timeline, process can be long (in that case the survey should be very light and with clear indicators).  
- Translations: for simultaneous interpretation during the meeting, gFSC team is assessing the feasibility, since there are technical and financial challenges.

### MTR

- MTR: has been decided to go through a “lighter” process/ final document, compared to 2018;  
- MTR will be discussed during the GPM; there is a preparation work to be done before the GPM meeting: e.g. strategic plan presentation in plenary and results up to date + breakout rooms discussions organization (area of discussion, inputs to receive).  

### Famine group

- A first meeting was held. WVI sent very good inputs, including FSC involvement. There is a general agreement that what is missing in the current discussions is the “human face” of the crisis, and field perspective. FSC can play a key role in this. Agreed to have a statement from gFSC (draft being finalized) by the SAG to discuss additional actions to be taken in the coming weeks to keep the attention high.  
- Important to have NGO/gFSC partners active involvement (at global and field level).

### Inter cluster Nutrition WG

- There is a general consensus among SAG members, that the ICNWG should remain a platform where common areas are discussed between Food Sec and Nutrition actors and the platform should be more technical. There is a concern due to the last joint meeting between the group and the SAG;  
- 4Cs Approach: the 4Cs are key for Nutrition since FS, Wash, Health, Nutr are the main drivers of Malnutrition, but additional clarification are needed from FSC perspective, and its engagement at inter-cluster level.

### GNAFC TSU UPDATE

- GNAFC TSU presented to the SAG work plan and the road map to the Food Systems summit.  
- What engagement for gFSC/SAG and for international NGOs with GNAFC? was mentioned that some international organizations are eager to collaborate with TSU but still not clear the angle of engagement. Areas of collaboration and opportunities should be defined (global and local level). For example at local level: more collaboration in strengthening datasets, analyzing data gaps and, in general, on FS analysis, additional collaboration can pass through country clusters (e.g. Yemen, FSC supported the GNAFC FS analysis). Global level: contribution can include “research” (TSU mentioned research ongoing studies such as the one on pastoralism), advocacy, and partnerships/Visibility.  
- On next steps: to better understand the concrete angle of collaboration (field perspective) interested SAG members could join the meeting that has been organized by TSU and gFSC on Chord experience.

### NEXT MEETING

**Monday 19 th of April - 15:00 - 16:00**