|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| C:\Users\RicciF\Dropbox (FAO)\HLPE Internal\Graphics\HLPE Logos\2016 HLPE Logo EN\CFS_HLPE_Logo 2016_EN-600px.jpg | Secretariat HLPE, c/o FAO Viale delle Terme di Caracalla00153 Rome, ItalyTel: 0039 06 5705 2762 Website : www.fao.org/cfs/cfs-hlpeE-mail : cfs-hlpe@fao.org |

**HLPE report #13 on**

***“Multi-stakeholder Partnerships to Finance and Improve***

***Food Security and Nutrition (FSN) in the Framework of the 2030 Agenda”***

**Existing MSPs: Case studies**

The following questionnaire aims at collecting detailed inputs on existing MSPs. This material is to be used where appropriate by the HLPE to illustrate its abovementioned report #13 with concrete examples.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Name of MSP: | # (for HLPE use only): |
| 2. Thematic domain of activity: (…) Food production; food supply chain; (…) Natural resource management;(…) Education, information, knowledge sharing;(…) Resource mobilization;(…) Other (specify): Brief description of mandate / activities / objectives: |
| 3. Website (official website of the MSP and, or, relevant web sources): |
| 4. Year of Origin / Creation: |
| 5. Scale/Level of operation (choose one option):( ) Global (Specify major areas/regions of presence:………………..…………….……………………)( ) Regional (Specify region[[1]](#footnote-1):…………………………………………….….……………………………..)(…) Sub-regional (Specify sub-region[[2]](#footnote-2): …………………………………………………………………….)( ) National (Specify country……………………………………………………….………………………)( ) Local (specify country: ……………………………………….…………………………………………)  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **STRUCTURE AND ORGANIZATION**
 |
| 6. Number of main partners: |
| 7. Composition of the MSP: list of main partners: names and/or categories (i.e.: public sector, private sector, civil society, *others*[[3]](#footnote-3))  |
| 8. Which partner(s) initiated the MSP? How the MSP may have evolved?  |
| 9. Degree of formalization: does the MSP result of an informal agreement, or is there a formal structure of decision-making? (…) full legal entity: legal personality(…) formalized agreement among partners, but no legal personality for the MSP(…) informal arrangementDescribe the decision-making process (including frequency of meetings of the governing bodies…) |
| 10. Governance structure: describe the roles, responsibilities and level of involvement of the different partners in the partnership. Describe, the case being, power asymetries between partners. Which partner(s) lead the MSP?  |
| 11. Representativeness: How and by whom are the members chosen? Do they speak only for themselves or represent a broader category of stakholders? How long is their mandate? How does the MSP ensure inclusiveness and “fair” representation of the most affected people? What are the channels of communication between the MSP and the government(s)? Are the decisions/recommendations of the MSP to the government(s) are prescriptive or consultative? What public strategies/priorities this partnership supported at different scales?  |
| 12. Finance: How and by whom the MSP is funded? Who underwrites the partnership? Add relevant data about the budget, and budget share of each category of partners (public, private, civil society). Is the budget sufficient for work plan implementation? What are the financial tools and mechanisms used by the MSP?  |
| **II) OUTCOMES** |
| 13. What is the main function of the MSP? Is it mainly: (…)“policy-oriented”(….) “action-oriented”(…) Other (specify):  |
| 14. What are the main areas of contribution of the MSP? Please tick in the table below the main, secondary and tertiary areas of contribution of the MSP.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outcome Area | Primary | Secondary | Tertiary |
| 1. Policy design, policy implementation, laws, advocacy and awareness
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Increased participation/inclusiveness: priority given to women as well as to marginalized and vulnerable groups.
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Capacity building, among the MSP partners, and beyond
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Resource mobilisation and fund raising
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Activities related to facilitating improved FSN outcomes (e.g. environmental stewardship towards biodiversity/ water conservation…)
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Outcomes that directly contribute to FSN (e.g. increased production, economic growth, income and employment generation, improved diets, better nutrition education and information…)
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Monitoring and evaluation
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Other (Specify: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_)
 |  |  |  |

 |
| For each of the areas of contribution mentioned above, please give examples of the MSP outcomes and impacts:What are the main organizational and collective benefits gained from setting-up this MSP?  |
| **III) OVERALL ASSESSMENT** |
| 15. Please rank your overall assessment of the MSP, ranking from 1 to 5 (with 1 being lowest to 5 highest) |
| 16. Explain your above ranking |
| 17. How do you assess the MSP according to the following criteria (*high*, *medium*, *low*)? Why? |
| **Criteria / Assessment** | **Low** | **Medium** | **High** |
| ***Inclusiveness***(the intention to include everyone affected by decisions, especially those who are routinely ignored) |  |  |  |
| ***Accountability***(assigned responsibility that a representative or a group acquires with the action of speaking or deciding on behalf of someone else) |   |  |  |
| ***Transparency/Access to Information***(openness to public scrutiny, availability of information) |  |  |  |
| ***Reflexivity***(capacity of a MSP to learn from mistakes, to assess long-term trends, and to react accordingly |  |  |  |
| ***Effectiveness***(assessment of the achievement of MSP’s objectives) |  |  |  |
| ***Efficiency***(comparison between the use of resources with the potential benefits the MSP can generate, including intangible benefits) |  |  |  |
| ***Resource mobilisation***(raising of financial resources, and other enabling resources to improve FSN) |  |  |  |
| ***Impact***(impact on FSN in its four dimensions at different scales) |  |  |  |
| 18. Any comments on the above ratings: |
| 19. How do you rate the power relations between participants? (choose one option)( ) More Equal( ) Equal( ) Less Equal( ) Un-equal |
| 20. Explain your above rating |
| **IV) THREATS, OPPORTUNITIES, LESSONS LEARNED AND WAYS FORWARD** |
| 21. Could you identify current strengths supporting and/or weakness challenging the MSP?  |
| 22. Could you identify projected threats and/or opportunities that the MSP would cause/offer, (included for those stakeholders that are not included in the MSP)? |
| 23. Which conditions could enable the MSP to better function? |
| 24. What is the potential of this MSP to influence public priorities across sectors and allocation of budget for improved FSN? What is its potential to mobilise further funds for improving food security and nutrition? |
| 25. What is the potential of this MSP to address the specific needs of marginalized and vulnerable groups most affected by food insecurity and malnutrition? |
| 26. How can other regions/countries use this experience to organize similar spaces? what are the necessary conditions to extrapolate/adapt/scale-up this MSP experience? |

|  |
| --- |
| **REFERENCES** |
| 27. The HLPE is interested by any article, mainly scientific references but also practical experiences on MSPs you would like to share (scholarly articles, reports, reviews, analysis, etc): |
| 28. Any other observation.  |

1. For the answer to this question, please use the 7 “FAO regions”: Africa, Asia, Europe, Latin America and the Carribean, Near East, North America, Southwest Pacific, as described online:

<http://www.fao.org/unfao/govbodies/gsbhome/council/council-election/en/> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. In some cases it might be relevant to specify a sub-region or a regional intergovernmental organization such as African Union, European Union, MERCOSUR, ASEAN… [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. See V0 draft for a more detailed description of the three first broad category. For “others”, please specify. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)