

From: Ilya Andreev
Sent: 04 February 2018 21:20
To: CFS (ESA); Fulton, Deborah (ESA)
Cc: Mellenthin, Oliver
Subject: Russia_input_Recommendation 1 and 2

Dear Ms.Fulton,

As agreed during the CFS Evaluation meeting held on 24 January please find below the input of the Russian Federation to the discussion on issues as «next MYPoW», «strategic objectives for CFS» and «criteria for selecting CFS activities».

1) Russia in general supports the structure of future MYPoW proposed in the background document, in particular the idea that it should consist of 3 following blocks:

- Standing sections;
- Sections to be updated every MYPoW;
- Rolling sections to be updated every year or biennium.

2) The inclusion of CFS vision into the **Standing section** seems like a good idea. The text should reproduce the respective provisions of CFS Reform document 2009.

3) **Sections to be updated every MYPoW** (4 years is acceptable) should define a limited number of CFS strategic objectives for the selected period of time and the overall strategic direction.

4) We agree that the overall strategic direction should be based on implementation of the Agenda-2030, in the first place SDG2 on ending hunger, as well as SDG 17 on revitalizing global partnership. The formulation proposed in the background document is acceptable for us and it doesn't exclude the importance of other SDGs relevant to FSN. We believe that CFS should carry out those core tasks for which the Committee had been created, instead of a scatter of activities.

5) Along with that, the strategic objectives themselves should be based on the CFS mandate and be concrete, focused and short as much as possible.

6) CFS is encouraged to deal with critical, urgent and emerging issues on FSN. The idea that Committee should deliberately be a platform for controversial issues is unacceptable for us . Therefore, we strongly recommend to skip the wording «controversial issues» (see the background document, p.2).

7) The reference to «UN Reform» (the background document, p.3) doesn't seem to be relevant in the context of CFS Evaluation. Therefore, we suggest also to skip it at all.

8) **Rolling sections to be updated** (every biennium is acceptable) should clearly identify the workstreams/activities for the selected period of time.

9) The criteria for selecting MYPoW activities. We fully support the list of criteria enumerated in the document CFS 2015/42/12. Special attention we attach to the criteria «CFS mandate and value added», «no duplication», «relevance», «available resources» and «consensus».

10) By selecting CFS activities as well as CFS strategic objectives we strongly advocate for respecting the CFS44 decision «**Stress the importance of a feasible MYPoW in terms of time, human and financial resources, and of limiting the number of parallel workstreams**». We suppose that the quality of CFS work could be increased only if the workload and financial situation of the Committee are adequately assessed.

11) It is also important to avoid launching new workstreams/activities before the current ones are finalized (decision of CFS 44).

12) We consider the principle of consensus as one of the major assets of CFS. It was not established by chance. The consensus among all CFS Members should not be undermined in any way.

Best regards,

Ilya Andreev

Alternate Permanent Representative of the Russian Federation to FAO