

Dear CFS Secretary,

Dear Co-Facilitators,

Following the last CFS Evaluation meeting on 29 March the Russian side is pleased to provide preliminary comments regarding the Co-Facilitators' Proposal. At the request of Co-Facilitators, we focused on the Co-Facilitators' Proposal itself (not Rec 1, Rec 2 or Rec 10).

1) The CFS Reform document 2009 clearly illustrates that "CFS is and remains an intergovernmental Committee in FAO"; "CFS ... will constitute the foremost inclusive international and intergovernmental platform"; "Voting and decision taking is the exclusive prerogative of Members".

In this regard we would like to propose to modify paragraphs 8, 10 and 23 as follows (in red):

**Para 8.** *"Implementing the proposals presented in this report is intended to stimulate the potential of CFS and its policy guidelines and recommendations towards the realization of the CFS vision, serving as ~~the world-leading~~ and foremost inclusive **international and intergovernmental** platform dealing with FSN guided by 3 key principles - inclusiveness, strong linkages to the reality on the ground and flexibility in implementation. CFS is an intergovernmental Committee and provides an inclusive **international and intergovernmental** global platform for a broad range of committed stakeholders to work together in a coordinated manner and in support of country-led processes for better FSN where countries implement the Voluntary Guidelines for the Progressive Realization of the Right to Adequate Food in the Context of National Food Security."*

**Para 10, bullet 1.** *Serve as ~~the world-leading~~ and foremost inclusive **international and intergovernmental** platform to develop global policy messages on FSN (Strategic Objective 1 - PLATFORM)*

**Para 23.** *"The CFS Plenary plays a critical role in creating political momentum and commitment to CFS. This is in line with the centrality, outlined in the Reform Document, of the CFS Plenary for decision-taking, debate, coordination, lesson-learning and convergence by all stakeholders at global level on issues pertaining to FSN and on the implementation of the Voluntary Guidelines to Support the Progressive Realization of the Right to Adequate Food in the Context of National Food Security, **while voting and decision taking remain the exclusive prerogative of Members.**"*

2) The Russian Federation has consistently been expressing its position on the issue of RBA's contribution to CFS budget. The RBA's budgetary contribution is considerable. CFS should efficiently use available financial resources through optimization and prioritization of its work. Therefore, we do not see the necessity to increase contribution from RBAs.

The current paragraph 39 could lead to possible misunderstanding as the formulation "to adjust their contribution in a sustainable way" is open to different interpretations by stakeholders.

In our view, this para should be reformulated as follows:

**Para 39.** *"CFS **Members** ~~will~~ **may** request the RBAs **to consider the possibility** to contribute the full amount of their stated contributions, with guiding principles for monetary and in-kind contributions, and to formalize their contribution for predictability. ~~CFS Members will request the Governing Bodies of the RBAs to adjust their contribution in a sustainable way to cover the core budget for CFS Plenary and Workstreams starting from the 2020-21 biennium.~~"*

3) **Para 25.** *“Suggestions for making plenary vibrant and attractive include a ~~possible joint declaration by Ministers or heads of delegations~~, high level roundtables and debate sessions to catalyze partnerships, a communication strategy to increase the visibility of CFS, which would include a media plan for plenary and the presentation of important reports and global developments related to FSN.”*

In general we have no objections to the idea of having possible joint ministerial declaration within CFS work. At the same time we do not consider such practice should be institutionalized. We are convinced that any joint declarations, especially on a ministerial level, entails a proper negotiation process. In CFS reality it inevitably means that an additional workstream would be needed to create in the intersessional period.

With this in mind we suppose that the decision in favor of any joint ministerial declaration can be made by the Plenary on ad-hoc basis at any time when CFS Members consider that it is necessary to do so with clear understanding of goals, thematic areas, negotiation process and possible financial implications.

4) **MYPoW preparation process.** The next MYPoW is intended to be more comprehensive document with a standing section, with the strategic content and with a rolling section with activities. Thus, this document will identify not only CFS workstreams but also its strategic objectives and overall strategic framework for future activities.

In this regard we strongly advocate for MYPoW preparation process that will be well organized, transparent and based on consensus.

Bearing in mind the decision taking role of Members (para 10, Reform document) and the strategic importance of new MYPoW, we think that it would be important to organize an intergovernmental discussion on the draft MYPoW before its submission to the CFS Bureau for finalization. Otherwise, it seems likely that the Plenary will spend a lot of time and energy on this document before arriving at a consensus.

5) **Para 19.** *“As a result of an inclusive process, the CFS Bureau, in consultation with the Advisory Group on the technical details and feasibility of pursuing suggested activities, will finalize the **draft** MYPoW that will be presented to the CFS Plenary for consideration, **possible adjustments** and endorsement”.*

6) **Para 17.** *“The MYPoW preparation process is intended to lead to a more effective **time/resources/effort efficient** prioritization of CFS thematic activities, ~~mainly through~~ **while** strengthening ownership and commitment of CFS stakeholders in implementing the results of CFS policy work as well as reinforcing the decision that the inclusion of new activities in MYPoW is subject to resource availability and workload”*

7) **Para 37.** *“The comprehensive planning phase for prioritizing CFS activities establishes that the decision on which activities to include in the CFS MYPoW will be made taking into account resource availability and workload. Budget estimates, **timeframe** and indications on potential resource partners should be included in the preliminary proposals prepared by CFS stakeholders for consideration in the MYPoW discussion. Activities will not start until resources are provided.”*

8) **Para 27.** *“Ownership of member countries will be strengthened. Bureau members should brief their regional groups on a regular basis **and communicate to the Bureau the feedback from the countries of their respective regional groups**. All member countries will keep their respective countries regularly informed of CFS activities and progress and reflect their priorities and concerns in Bureau and Advisory Group meetings.”*

9) **Para 20.** *Fewer and clearer criteria for prioritizing CFS thematic activities will be applied which include their contribution to the elimination of hunger and malnutrition, the focus on ~~the most vulnerable and marginalized~~ **people most affected by food insecurity**, relevance to global priorities in the field of FSN, the added*

value compared to existing policy work considering the CFS comparative advantages, the consideration of available resources and existing workload as well as the commitment of CFS stakeholders”.

This amendment is in line with the language from the CFS Reform document.

10) **Para 14.** “The MYPoW preparation process will give particular emphasis to the need of prioritizing activities that address critical and emerging issues in the field of FSN and address the root causes of malnutrition with a focus on ~~the most vulnerable and marginalized.~~ *people most affected by food insecurity*”. (in line with the language from the CFS Reform document).

11) **Para 4.** “The Implementation Report provides a synthesis of progress made in implementing the Plan of Action of the Evaluation (i.e. response to the evaluation recommendations), ~~leading to improving~~ *is intended to improve* CFS relevance, effectiveness and efficiency.”

12) **Para 5.** “...To make full use of this evaluation and best address the difficulties and challenges ahead, we are determined to implement actions which ~~will bring a breakthrough~~ *are intended to bring a breakthrough* of CFS so that it can achieve its vision”.

In conclusion we would like to indicate that we are not in favor of making the text of the draft longer than it already is or introducing new elements not properly discussed before.

Best regards,

Ilya Andreev  
Alternate Permanent Representative of the Russian Federation to FA