

AIDE-MÉMOIRE

on Global Food Security in the Context of Unilateral Coercive Measures

Ensuring food security, eliminating hunger, promoting sustainable agricultural development and increasing its productive potential are of particular relevance today.

The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) estimates that hunger affects about 690 million people, or 8.9 percent of the world's population, an increase of 10 million in one year and nearly 60 million in five years.

A similar upward trend is observed in the prevalence rate of severe food insecurity, which also reflects the incidence of hunger. Three billion people – nearly 40 percent of the world's population – lack access to adequate nutrition.

COVID-19 economic impact exacerbates already difficult food situation – additional 140 million people are facing food shortages.

This jeopardises the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. The world is behind schedule in achieving Sustainable Development Goal 2 “Zero Hunger”. If trends continue, the number of people suffering from hunger will exceed 840 million by 2030.

According to FAO, in September 2021, the average value of the FAO Food Price Index was 130.0 points, which is 32.8 percent higher than in September last year. The growth in the Index in September was mainly due to the increase in prices for most cereals and vegetable oils. According to FAO's forecast, despite reaching a historical high, the volume of cereal production in the world in 2021 will be below the level of consumption.

According to UN agencies' estimates released on October 4, 2021, the world is now facing an unprecedentedly catastrophic level of food insecurity, and an estimated \$ 6.6 billion is urgently needed to support 41 million people at risk of hunger.

Belarus has always made a significant contribution to ensuring global food security. Our country exports agricultural and food products to more than 100 countries of the world. However, the thoughtless sanctions pressure of Western countries on Belarus endangers not even our country, but global food security. In the context of the coronavirus pandemic, the results of the sanctions policy acquire far from bright prospects in the field of development and the fight against hunger in the world.

There is a direct relationship between the sectoral sanctions of the European Union and other countries against the potash industry of Belarus with an increase in food risks around the world, the threat of a food crisis. Obviously, taking into account the share of Belarus in the world market of

potash fertilisers (20%), a ban on their export will lead (and is already leading) to an increase in the cost of both fertilisers and food products, which contributes to an increase in the number of hungry people on the planet. And these are not only our assessments. Similar conclusions are made by the UN, FAO and a number of international companies and associations in the field of potash fertilisers and foodstuffs trade. In this regard, the question arises: do the countries imposing sanctions against the potash industry of Belarus realise this real threat to the whole world, or prefer not to notice this threat in order to achieve some ephemeral goals, increasing the sanctions pressure on Belarus?

The UN Secretary General convened the Food Systems Summit on the sidelines of the 76th session of the UN General Assembly in September this year, following which states pledged to continue efforts to end hunger and make healthy eating more affordable. At the same time, it was noted that solving the problem of hunger is impossible without providing agricultural producers with access to fertilisers in the required amount and at an affordable price for them.

In the spirit of the World Food Security Summit Declaration, Belarus calls for abandoning the use of sanctions that not only contradict international obligations, including within the framework of the implementation of Agenda 2030, but also run counter to the provisions of the UN Charter and UN General Assembly resolutions on unilateral coercive measures.