

Hi Oliver,

Thanks for sending this document. I haven't had time to review in depth (we've been in our North American Regional Conference for the last few days here in Washington, along with many of our U.S. stakeholders). That being said, in a quick review there are still some areas that are definitely problematic for us. The key ones are the HLPE language and budget. On HLPE, we cannot accept that an HLPE product must lead to a CFS product. There is no such linkage set up in the reform document and we do not support that proposal. This is a significant issue for our delegation. We will be proposing language on those sections again, but this is a major issue for us. Also, we continue to have concerns about the funding language. I know we will have more input after our DC stakeholders can review it, but I wanted to let you know about those at least.

I recognize that there needs to be compromise in the proposals, but some of these issues could fundamentally change CFS and its work - especially if this becomes a foundational document - so they are critical areas for us. As an intergovernmental body, it is important that some of these key concerns are addressed in the text and those two sections are quite problematic for us.

I will not be back in Rome for the evaluation meeting on Monday, but Daleya will be there for the United States so we will share our views again there. Please don't hesitate to let me know if you have any questions. I'll be back late next week, and I remain happy to work with you throughout this process.

Again, thanks for all your hard work to date on a difficult process!

Thanks,  
Emily