

Dear colleagues,

Please note that this written input is preliminary United States reaction to the Co-Facilitators proposal. We will continue to have more complete edits as we go through the process, so any comments or lack of comments here should not imply full acceptance of the document as not all U.S. equity holders have had sufficient time to give input in our system and we need further consultations with capital. At its core, CFS is a consensus, intergovernmental, voluntary organization. It is critical that these factors be considered throughout this process. Overall, we really appreciate the work of the Co-Facilitators and the CFS secretariat in putting together this initial draft and we look forward to working with you on it. We find this approach to be useful and should help us make progress. Thank you again for the continued hard work.

Direction

These three elements are unclear, particularly on the development of policy. What are policy messages? What is the difference with policy guidance? We believe CFS has convening power to bring disparate actors and voices together to have frank, real discussions and there is value in this convening power. We believe we should cut the language “informed by an HLPE Critical and Emerging Issues Note” from paragraph 12. CFS stakeholders can draw on any existing products, but we do not believe this one note should be a criteria for which activities stakeholders believe we can make progress on.

Demand Driven

We believe we should cut paragraph 14. The MYPOW process is spelled out elsewhere. This lists just some of the criteria for prioritization, and we need to consider all of them together. We need to see language on the advisory group.

Prioritization

This focus lists many types of policy messages/guidance. We need language on the voluntary nature of all CFS products. We agree MYPOW should go through the CFS Bureau and support that language in this section.

Evidence/Science Basis

This section assumes that HLPE is the only entry point for evidence and science in the CFS. The Rome based agencies, research institutions, and other CFS stakeholders all work on the basis of scientific evidence, and the role of the Advisory Group is to provide . We do not concur that the HLPE is the only entry point for evidence and science into the CFS policy process. Specifically, we do not concur that all HLPE reports will automatically lead to a policy convergence process. CFS stakeholders, after considering any given HLPE report, must have the opportunity to discuss the outputs of the report and decide whether it is a topic worth pursuing for policy convergence, based on prioritization and potential ramifications. This section of the report implies even more policy processes out of CFS, which we do not support given the need to have further prioritization.

We suggest cutting the sentence in paragraph 21 on the understanding of how HLPE feeds into CFS processes. We should also cut language on the HLPE reports supporting the preparation of policy guidance and how the report will feed into the process. We agree on the need for better interaction

between the Steering Committee and the Bureau, but we also believe that the CFS stakeholders should be able to frame the reach of HLPE reports.

Ownership

We do not believe a CFS product should dictate what level of representation member states or other stakeholders choose to send to CFS. Suggest changing “ministers” to “high level participation.” We strongly oppose language on joint declarations or adding additional products out of plenary. A looser format would allow for a more inclusive, robust discussion. CFS is also a multistakeholder platform, not a gathering of member countries, so a ministerial declaration would be inappropriate. Given the voluntary nature of CFS products, we do not support the “definition of post-endorsement roles and responsibilities.” Or “commitments on the implementation of the policy work.” Similarly, we do not support “express commitment to report and monitor the policy work after its endorsement.” We also do not support language on “ownership of member countries will be strengthened.” CFS should not dictate how member states feel about CFS just by stating it. We support paragraph 28. On paragraph 29, CFS is an intergovernmental platform, so we do not support the language on “political and strategic role” since it is unclear what stakeholders are providing the guidance on that political role.

Uptake

This section needs to emphasize the voluntary nature of CFS products. We do not support language, such as “responsibility” or “should” that imply CFS stakeholders must do an activity. On the partnerships language in paragraph 30, how will this be done and with what funding? We do not support this language. We suggest that CFS stakeholders could seek partnerships. Paragraph 31, communication is voluntary. Similarly, the uptake and application of products is voluntary. We do not support language that HLPE reports should be distributed. It should be stated that HLPE reports are available for CFS stakeholders to use. We will not support additional language on monitoring the use of CFS products – this is a voluntary activity. We do not support the language in paragraph 33 on the proposed use of FBA resources “to actively promote CFS and mainstream its work where relevant.” Member states can provide such guidance to the individual RBAs through governing bodies, if appropriate. In paragraph 36, CFS stakeholders can be encouraged to have voluntary dialogues or do voluntary country assessments. One general comment – we would like CFS to use more resources to producing more useful products, rather than pushing CFS products for being CFS products.

Funding

We fully support the language that requires activities not to start until resources are provided. On paragraph 39, we do not support language requesting RBAs to have guiding principles for monetary/in kind contributions or to formalize their contributions. Similarly, we do not support language requesting CFS members to request the RBAs to adjust their contributions. Member states can choose to do this through the governing board processes already established at the RBAs. It is not appropriate in this venue to dictate to member states the positions they should take on funding questions in other venues.

Recommendations 1, 2, and 10

We remain unclear what format these will appear in any CFS plenary decisions. As such, we prefer to comment once we see the final documents since we have already provided input throughout the

process. We urge these sections to remain short and targeted – it would be best to integrate any input from these sections directly into the CFS Co-Facilitators proposal. We remain concerned about the results chain and all of the elements here. We also oppose some of the specific language from recommendation 2. On criteria, we need to ensure that “consensus” and “available resources” remain part of the criteria.