

Dear Mr. Chairperson,

Dear Secretariat,

Russian delegation would like to thank you for such an ambitious Options paper “Implications of the UNFSS on the CFS and its HLPE” and would like to provide several comments.

1. On the overview of post-UNFSS progress.

1. Being a most inclusive international and intergovernmental platform the CFS can be used as a space **to discuss the follow-up to the UNFSS** with all stakeholders. Taking into consideration very busy agenda of annual CFS plenaries, it would be inappropriate to over-charge it with additional items.

Extraordinary plenary convened at regularly basis - annually – can no longer be considered as extraordinary, but regular. Convening of another regular plenary will lead to serious financial implications.

From our point of view, better option will be to organize a specific intersessional event that could be held after HLPF in July, where the Hub will report on the results of its work, and before the plenary CFS session. However, we also need to understand the potential financial implications. Another good option is to organize it through CFS plenary week side events.

2. Concerning the proposal for **the CFS to serve as the platform for hosting or co-hosting the regular “stocktaking exercises”** with a specific link to the HLPF, this proposal needs further clarification.

2. Use of the CFS convening power to support members in the implementation of their national pathways/strategies.

1. For this proposal the same explanation can be applied – it can be done either at a specific intersessional event or through plenary week side event.

2. Fostering a **more proactive link with financing and means of implementation** can be done at the ECOSOC Financing for Development Forum.

4. CFS Chair or Secretariat can **participate in National Dialogues or regular meeting with Convenors**, if they are invited to such meetings. However, it might lead to overlapping of functions.

5. Commenting of the **advocating the use of the pertinent CFS policy products** for the implementation of National Pathways we would like to stress that all CFS products are voluntary and non-legally binding. Therefore, National Pathways are centered on national priorities and national legal basis.

### 3. Engage with the UNFSS coalitions

1. The same arguments –plenary week side events will serve the best for the aim of the **presentation of the coalitions and other multistakeholder initiatives launched at the Summit**.

2. The **coalitions may use CFS policy products** as key reference frameworks and may assist in disseminating those CFS products relevant to their objectives, as appropriate. This may be done through a commitment by CFS members and UN entities involved to foster Coalitions to serve as “vectors” of the uptake of CFS products.

3. **The CFS may invite coalitions to inform CFS Members and other stakeholders** of their progress after the discussions at the Bureau and its decision and provided that all coalitions – without reference to their size and scope - be given equal rights and possibilities.

### 4. Strengthening the CFS-HLPE

1. We consider it useful to **increase size of the Steering Committee** taking into consideration geographical balance and transparent procedure of admitting its members.

Developing its initiative functions and broadening its thematic scope should be done after the consultations with the Bureau in each case.

5. Strengthening dialogue and coordination with relevant global, regional and sub-regional fora; and among regional and sub-regional stakeholders

**3.5. Reinforcing collaboration with regional fora as well as reinforcing interaction between CFS and FAO technical committees** should be done in accordance with the Rules of procedures of FAO Regional conferences and regional fora and with FAO technical committees respectively.

6. Concerning the possible **support by the CFS of stakeholders to convene at regional and national levels** it needs further clarification.

6. Reinforce collaboration with the Coordination Hub and the UN system at large

2. The CFS and the Hub have both their own mandate and sphere of responsibilities that are clear and transparent. Creation of additional coordination mechanisms will overcharge the agenda of the CFS and the Hub.

3.4. CFS policy products are voluntary. In this regard, it is up to national governments to decide whether to implement them or not. Moreover, the Coordination Hub does not have mandate to offer guidance to Members how to use CFS policy products.

8. RBAs should strengthen linkages between their operation and CFS policy guidance in accordance with the decisions the RBAs governing bodies and after the consultations with national governments.