

**CSM talking points on the theme and scope of the *HLPE report on Multi-Stakeholders Partnerships to Finance and Improve Food Security and Nutrition in the Framework of the 2030 Agenda***

- We the CSM already expressed our concerns around the topic proposed **HLPE Report on “Multi-Stakeholders Partnerships to Finance and Improve Food Security and Nutrition in the Framework of the 2030 Agenda”** The subject as proposed does not do respond to the priority interests of social movements, being so distant from their daily life and the food security challenges of small-scale producers.
- It also does not do justice to the range of challenges that are involved in implementing the SDGs with the support of a variety of different actors. For this reason we suggested using the broader term “platforms” (which is understood to cover mechanisms that deliberate about policies and strategies as well as investments) instead of the narrower term “partnerships” (which has more strictly operational connotations), and not limiting the report solely to the financial aspect. We proposed the following title: *HLPE report on multi-stakeholder platforms to advance food security and nutrition in the context of the 2030 Agenda*.  
The rationale behind this proposal was to include many different kinds of multi-stakeholder platforms (including some national experiences and regional platforms) and to take a broader look at how these platforms foster FSN towards the progressive realization of the right to adequate food by examining the policy decision-making processes and not just the funding opportunities through partnerships.
- The current concept note starts from the assumption that all the partnerships are beneficial to FSN, yet research (including by FAO and IFAD) does not support this assumption. An HLPE report could make an important contribution by undertaking a critical review in order to learn from the challenges and the constraints of such platforms. Such a report could help to clarify roles and responsibilities of different actors in food security and nutrition governance, and to assess the central challenges of some of such settings, including the tensions between rights-holders and stakeholders and issues related to conflicts of interest.
- In addition to this, the current proposal is far too detailed and prescriptive. The scope of the report should outline why the CFS is requesting the report and provide guidance on what are the expected outcomes, not on the content of the report. The autonomy of the HLPE needs to be respected. In this regard, the list of focus areas is too detailed, goes too far in predetermining the focus areas. It constitutes a shopping list that is not useful in research terms and it should be removed. The HLPE and the consultation that is usually launched to better define the scope should further identify the areas to be investigated to meet the expectations deliberated by the CFS.