

**Contributions of the CSM
to the CFS Advisory Group and Bureau Meeting
29 November 2016**

Agenda Item 7 Budget

a) Updates for 2016-2017

- The CFS budget gap for 2017 continues to be very concerning.
- If no major financial contributions are made available, the financial deficit of the HLPE will have the consequence that the two upcoming HLPE Reports for 2017 can only be published in English. This is not acceptable. We call on Members states and RBA to make an emergency extra-effort to support the HLPE.
- Concerning CSM: we've been active engaging in talks with governments and RBAs, to address the deficit, we face for 2017. We still hope that we can bridge the gap, but we do not have certainty yet.

b) Sustainable funding to implement agreed MYPoW Activities

CSM has stated repeatedly that a solid and sustainable funding structure of the CFS should reflect the support of all members and the RBA to the CFS. The CFS must be funded by public funds. The integrity of the MYPoW is important, a donor-driven CFS would be a weak CFS. We look at the note from the CFS secretariat from that perspective and ask, how the public funding sources of the CFS can be increased, secured and better shared in future.

Regarding the table presented by the CFS Secretariat we recall the Advisory Group to not compare the CFS, an intergovernmental UN Committee which also includes others as participants, is different in nature from voluntary initiatives such as SUN and REACH. It is more appropriate to look at other examples in the table, particularly the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture.

Regarding specific suggestions, we propose to explore the following pathways:

- 1) A first option could be that CFS is fully funded by its members through a Scale-based suggested contribution of all its members.
- 2) A second, mixed model could be to maintain the current support from RBA to the CFS and to cover the missing part through a Scale-based suggest contribution of all its members.
- 3) A third, combined-mixed option could combine the support from RBA and members countries in a Scale-based model in which the RBA cover the contributions of the low-income countries.
- 4) A fourth option would be to increase the contribution of each of the three RBA to the CFS by 1 million per year. For such a decision, CFS members should agree to propose such solution jointly in the governing bodies of the RBA.

In any case, CSM would like to support Afghanistan's proposal made during the last AG/Bureau Meeting of set-up a one-off OEWG on CFS Budget which could draft and agree on concrete proposals for a long-term funding strategy for the CFS.