

## **MSP follow-up**

### Contribution from the CSM

#### **Introductory remark:**

As the translations of the HLPE report will only be made available in the coming week, the language requirement for an inclusive process could not be met until now. Non-English speakers have not had yet the possibility to read the full report and have not been able to fully contribute to the discussions on the report and its follow-up. While we support the need for a meaningful follow-up process, we also note that the delayed availability of translated reports also affects the timing of the proposed process.

Despite this limitation, we'd like to provide this preliminary contribution to your questions.

#### **1. What would you propose for the follow-up process on effective multistakeholder partnerships to contribute to knowledge and lesson sharing, and to mainstreaming the concept of MSP in the work of CFS?**

The facilitator's question implies that the MSPs are effective and need to be mainstreamed. On the basis of findings of the HLPE report, the CSM questions this general assumption. For a qualified and critical follow-up process, we suggest to consider the following elements for the proposed option paper and the suggested event:

The follow-up process needs to be firmly rooted into the mandate and vision of the CFS. As an intergovernmental platform, it should provide the needed policy guidance in the first instance for States alongside with other CFS participants to ensure that the MSPs, if adopted, effectively contribute to FSN and the realisation of the RtF for all.

In this respect, the CSM would like to focus in the follow-up on two major challenges highlighted by the HLPE report:

- The need to pursue analytical work due to the lack of independent evidence that MSP are relevant and effective in ensuring FSN and realizing the RTF, as compared to other ways to achieve these.
- The need to establish policy framework that clearly define the principles and conditions that need to be met for a MSP to be considered a legitimate tool for ensuring FSN and the RtF, that it:
  - o Defends public interests (as opposed to the collective interests of the partners of the MSP) and the public goods of RtF, FSN and sustainable food systems;
  - o Respects the human rights framework and principles, including by adopting the HR approach to accountability as adopted in the GSF;
  - o Addresses the power imbalances and potential conflicts of interest.

In this respect, it is clear to the CSM that the goal of the CFS process should be to establish policy guidance on the basis of agreed principles and conditions coherent with the CFS vision. Knowledge and lesson sharing should be functional to this goal.

#### **2. What would be the expected results of your proposal?**

Raise consciousness about the challenges and limitations of MSPs, identify if and under which conditions MSPs can effectively contribute to FSN and the RtF, and, develop the policy guidance for

establishing the required policy framework for MSPs to ensure FSN and the RtF by addressing the challenges above.

**3. What would be the specific objectives of such an event?**

A light intersessional technical event can be organized in 2019 to explore how to address the independent evidence gap as identified by the HLPE, and deepen the analytical work that has been initiated by the HLPE. This could bring together different researchers, also drawing lessons from experiences in other sectors. This initial event should be prepared in close cooperation with the HLPE and the HLPE task team for the MSP report.

A task team could be appointed to define the ToR of an intersessional inclusive consultation aiming at discussing and developing proposals for policy guidance. The conclusions of this intersessional consultation could possibly be discussed and adopted to the CFS plenary session in 2020.

**4. Do you have any suggestions on the format of the event: duration, involvement of panelists, moderator and keynote speakers?**

To be defined by the TTT

**5. Should the event be organized in plenary or during the intersessional period?**

Intersessional period (in two steps)

**6. Could you contribute actively to such an event and present an example of an effective multi-stakeholder partnership?**

In contributing to raise cases illustrating challenges and limitations