

Dear Mr. Mohammad Hossein Emadi and dear colleagues from CFS Secretariat,

We are pleased to send you below the comments/proposals/corrections of the Russian side to the Zero Draft of the CFS Policy Recommendations on “Agroecological and other innovative approaches for sustainable food systems that ensure food security and nutrition”.

Due to the current situation with COVID-19 outbreak, it is difficult to get inputs from all Russian ministries and agencies concern, so additional comments could be submitted by our side in the nearest future.

1. Paragraphs 24-26. “Sustainable healthy diets” is a non-agreed concept, which we do not feel comfortable with. This concept is taken from the parallel workstream on VGFSyN where the Member States are constantly expressing different views on this terminology. We kindly ask you to avoid bringing these contradictions to our «agroecology» workstream. We strongly advocate for considering “diets” primary through the health dimension. The nutrition objectives of public policies (healthy diets) move in parallel with the sustainable objectives of agricultural production.

2. Recommendations 58-59 are unjustified. We cannot go along with the recommendations for the Members States to officially transmit expert publications/reports/papers of HLPE to the Secretary-General or the UN Food System Summit Advisory Committee, or as a contribution to UN Food System Summit. Such decisions may be interpreted as the consent of the Member States to the content of these expert documents, while the conclusions of the HLPE do not always coincide with the position of countries. Let’s take into account that HLPE is not an independent scientific institute. HLPE is a special body within the structure of CFS with the aim to support members and other stakeholders in designing strategies and programs for addressing food insecurity (para 36 of the Reform document 2009). By writing this, we definitely do not have any intention to doubt or to offset the independence of the views expressed by HLPE.

At the same time, we suppose that CFS Chair in his own capacity could disseminate any expert publication of HLPE to whom it may concern with clear remark “*technical and not negotiated paper*”. Furthermore, in such cases, it would be fair to circulate also CFS agreed product together with such HLPE publications.

3. We need some clarity on the proposal to organize the High-Level Dialogue on Biodiversity (para 60). It is questionable whether such initiative is required in the current situation. The CFS Work Program 2020-2023 is already approved and there is no space for such event. Moreover, it is likely that there will be overlaps and delays in the implementation of MYPoW due to the COVID-19 outbreak. In these conditions, in our view, one of the possible scenario is if COP considers the feasibility to transmit Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Agenda (hopefully to be agreed in October 2020) as contribution to the UN Food System Summit. If we look at the current draft of Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Agenda we will find already issues of nutrition, food security and food system that are touched upon in various places of the document.

4. It is useful to underline the important role of women in food systems, but we think it is also necessary to follow the main topic during the process of elaboration of the CFS recommendations. Of course, if there is a task, everything could be mixed in one bowl. At the same time we are reluctant to discuss agroecology together with themes like self-determination of women, gender-based violence and sexism etc. (para 54).

5. Para 4. Please make the footnote after the term «biotechnology» as follows: «\* according to national legislation and regulation».

6. We propose to make para 40 more border in substance (without losing the initial idea), as follows: «*Strengthen public research to assess the impact of the use of agrochemicals on human, animal and environmental health in the field of effective and safe use of agrochemicals.*».

7. Para 11, in our view, could be amended as follows: «*Ensure that policies promote innovations that are appropriate, affordable and acceptable and contribute to the three dimensions of sustainability – economic, social and environmental – in such a way that they strengthen the four pillars of food security and nutrition (availability, access, stability and utilization).*».