

Multi-stakeholder Partnerships – Options Paper

In our view, the added value and key role of the CFS on this topic is to give clear advice to member states on how they can establish the principles and conditions for MPSs that can make them conducive to foster food security and nutrition and advance the realization of the right to food.

This is the rationale for Option 4. As a first step, the independent evidence gap needs to be addressed; in a second step, a focused and light policy process should agree on key principles and conditions for MSPs.

It seems to us that Option 2 and 3 are not feasible at this point. They can only be implemented once a political consensus is reached on how the CFS should address Multi-stakeholder partnerships.

Option 1 only makes sense if is framed as a first step towards the implementation of Option 4, by offering a space and opportunity to address the independent evidence gap, before engaging into a policy process.

If only Option 1 is taken, it might lead to a repetition of some elements of the HLPE report, without leading to a critical political result. The risk of inefficiency might be in the room.

However, if Option 1 was taken in spite of all doubts, the concept of the event should at least address some critical issues, such as conflict of interests, power asymmetries and accountability gaps within MSPs. The proposed concept for an event should incorporate these elements. The event would need to be very well prepared, in order to generate a meaningful and in-depth discussion.

If no decision can be taken now on Option 4, maybe a decision can be deferred to a later stage, also considering other debates in the MYPOW.