

**CSM Plenary Statement on the HLPE Multi-stakeholder Partnerships Report
18 October 2018
Thierry Kesteloot, Oxfam Solidarité (Belgium)**

The translation of the HLPE reports is a minimal requirement to ensure an inclusive discussion. Unfortunately this is not the first time that we cannot discuss the valuable contributions of the HLPE in the CFS because of a lack of financial commitment. This makes it also impossible to have a fully inclusive analysis by the CSM.

Despite this, We would like to thank the HLPE team for its work. However we also want to recall that the task assigned was difficult. Indeed the CFS assignment assumed that MSPs, as suggested in SDG17, are indeed the prime way forward to generate funding to improve FSN. This makes it more difficult for the team to address their limits and inherent potential contradictions and to assess their suitability, in particular as compared with other instruments and mechanisms.

Also the assignment was framed in such a way to mix ‘funding’ with ‘improving’ FSN, leading to governance contradictions since today it is far too often funding and investment (and donor’s and investors’ priorities) that condition public policy rather than the other way around.

Despite this the HLPE can be a first step and we would like to propose the CFS to engage in further work by focusing on the following issues :

1. Fill the independent evidence gap on the contribution of MSP to FSN and the RtF
2. Explore how to respond to the need to establish a policy framework to ensure that MSP are effectively contributing to the realisation of the RtF

In that regard we want to stress the following questions :

- **Whose interests are being served?** In its definition of MSPs the report continues to conflate ‘collective’ interests (the interests of the members of a particular MSP) with ‘public’ interests, although it footnotes the dangers of doing so. Regarding finance, while blended finance could indeed leverage means, evidence shows that it is not focusing on those left behind, as they are not appropriate for lower income countries—those states in which a majority of the world’s most vulnerable to food insecurity reside.

- **How do we address Power imbalances and Conflicts of Interest ?** These issues cannot be overcome simply by improving participation conditions of the weaker partners within the MSP, ignoring the economic, organizational and political power dimensions.
- **Accountability to who ?** The definition of accountability adopted in the report fails to adopt a HR approach to accountability (as been adopted in the GSF of the CFS) whereby states as duty bearers are accountable to citizens as rights holders. It also fails to address how other parties (corporations, academia, international institutions, NGOs) can be held accountable. The three of them are distinct actors and cannot be considered as equal partners in MSP.

Finally, we propose that the CFS bureau together with the CFS AG addresses the follow-up on this HLPE report once the report has been translated.