

VII. MULTISTAKEHOLDER PARTNERSHIPS TO FINANCE AND IMPROVE FSN

Chairperson

We go back to item two. I am sorry, I jumped the gun, as they say in English, because the Secretary reminds me that before we resume item two, we need to take care of item seven, as per the agenda that we approved, that is our multi-stakeholder partnerships to finance and improve food security and nutrition.

With this item, we come to the conclusion of a policy convergence process. The CFS High-Level Panel of Experts, our conglomerate of scientists and scholars published a report on this topic in June of last year. We began discussing it in our previous Plenary last October and the Bureau followed up. This is the moment in which I have to mention the HLPE for another reason. I have promised Professor Patrick Caron that I would be mentioning the HLPE in the context of item five, food security and nutrition and I had made a note but, with the problems with timing I totally forgot.

So, the HLPE gives us that basis, that foundation, science and evidence for us to do our work. They did it for food systems and nutrition, they did it also for multi-stakeholder partnerships for financing food security and nutrition. This item that we are dealing with now is of obvious interest to all of us because this Committee is in itself a multi-stakeholder partnership that is always looking for financial resources for sponsoring tangible actions against hunger and all forms of malnutrition.

Mr Oliver Mellenthin, Germany, led consultations for identifying ways forward and the Bureau decided to hold the item that is now on the table for which the Chair is delighted. Our keynote speaker, sitting next to me, is Mr Willem Olthof, from the European Commission where he is Deputy-Head of Rural Development, Food Security and Nutrition in the Directorate for International Cooperation and Development. That is a very long title for you. Before returning to Brussels, to occupy this important position, Mr Olthof distinguished himself as a European delegate to the Rome-Based Agencies and as a consistent advocate for the CFS.

Also in the podium is our moderator, Ms Ute Klamert, Assistant Executive-Director for Partnerships and Advocacy at the World Food Programme. At WFP, Ms Klamert oversees the partnerships and resource mobilization with Governments and other partners. She previously served as the Director-General for various regions within the German International Cooperation Agency and we met recently in New York.

We also have five panellists: Ms Anshu Mohan, a Senior Expert in Maternal, New Born and Child Health, WHO. Mr Jonas Mugabe, Manager of the Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa based in Accra. Mr Badrul Arefin, Director-General at the Ministry of Food in Bangladesh. Mr Kevin Marinacci, Chief Executive Officer of the Fabretto Foundation in Nicaragua. Ms Patty Rundall, Policy Director of the International Baby Food Action Network.

We will now start with Mr Olthof's key note presentation. Willem, please.

Mr Willem Olthof, Deputy-Head of Unit, DG DEVCO, EU

Thank you, Mr Chair. Excellency's, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to start my intervention with a quote, an unconventional quote, actually. A quote taken from a children's book, rather than from a philosopher or from a Nobel Laureate. The children's book in question is from a Swedish author called

Astrid Lindgren and she has a main character in the book called Pippi Langstrumpf or Pippi Longstocking in the English version.

Many children know and love the book, including me, and probably many of the ex-children also know it. But, for those who do not, Pippi Longstocking is a red haired, freckled, unconventional and superhumanly strong nine year old girl. When she was asked to do something new, she answered: "I have never tried that before, so I think I should definitely be able to do that", and that is the character that she has and I had to think about that particular quote when the HLPE was asked to do the report on multi-stakeholder partnerships.

The HLPE had never done such a thing before. They never report in that direction neither was there much territory covered. So, the HLPE was courageous in a certain way, it was also confident it could do it and, looking back, I think we should all be grateful to the HLPE that it had taken up this challenge in the way Pippi Longstocking would have done it. Since last year, when the HLPE report came to us in Plenary, we know a lot more about multi-stakeholder partnerships. We know, for instance, that they offer great opportunities, yet they also pose big challenges. It is not evident that multi-stakeholder partnerships are successful and, clearly, there are conditions that have to be fulfilled and dangers that have to be averted.

Let us start from the opportunities and recall that there are at least three important benefits of stakeholders working together towards a common goal.

First, by bringing together the different stakeholders, a broad set of perceptions should be taken into account in designing and implementing projects, programmes, policies, actions, whatever. This should obviously include the perspectives of the ultimate beneficiaries. This is likely to make actions more realistic, feasible and better targeted to the needs of those that are food insecure.

Second, different stakeholders have different strengths, qualities and resources. By bringing those together, synergies and efficiency gains can follow.

Third, and related to that, by pooling resources, larger scale activities can be undertaken, more people can be reached and better results achieved.

But, obviously, there are also costs to multi-stakeholder partnerships. It takes time to build trust among the stakeholders and to agree on the objectives and the ways of implementation. There are also transaction costs in rounds of coordination and consultation and power asymmetries need to be addressed through appropriate governance and accountability mechanisms.

This year, at the European Commission, we have started to take stock of international cooperation in agriculture, food security and nutrition during the last five years. Besides discovering that we had about 1,500 contracts signed in that period or about one contract per day, we learned that we had a huge variety of actions, not all of those lend themselves to multi-stakeholder partnerships but, in a number of cases, multi-stakeholder partnerships were extremely important and that particularly includes all the work on value chains. But, also, in other areas, such as building resilience against food crisis, MSPs and the use of an MSP mix has been used and let me mention here today that as we talk in this room, at the same time, there is a launch again of a multi-stakeholder partnership in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, where the launch takes place of the RESET plus innovation funds. A fund financed by the EU, managed by an NGO, in cooperation with Government and aimed to finance private sector innovators, small scale, in food insecure areas.

Mr Chair, let me conclude by coming back to Pippi Longstocking. One of the charming aspects of Pippi Longstocking is that she somehow lives by own rules and when we think about multi-stakeholder partnerships, although we can distil, a number of generalities of success, MSPs will always have to be context specific and have to be adapted to the situation at hand, redefining the rules of the game in every case. And with you, I am sure, I look forward to learning how the rules of the game have been applied in the four case studies. Thank you, very much.

Applause

Chairperson

Thank you, Willem. You are a true father of this workstream and the results that we examine here today. May I ask Ms Klamert to start moderating? Please, conduct the session.

Ms Ute Klamert, Assist. Executive-Director, WFP, Moderator

Ladies and gentlemen, when I was asked by the Secretary whether I volunteer to facilitate the session, I spontaneously said yes. Now, I am faced with a difficult task because we have a variety of speakers and we want to open up to the floor and I want to make sure that every person a freely adequate place and time to speak. So, I thought, in terms of timekeeping, a broader red rose, and if I feel you are extending too long and speaking too long, I will just raise the red rose and I hope you are still friends at the end of the session with me.

So, I want to invite you to a variety of perspectives and I am so happy about the composition of the panel because we will listen to a global perspective, one colleague representing every woman, every child as a global movement, as part of the panel. We will continue and I invite you to listen to regional perspective from Africa, very interesting because that is a platform which started in 2007 and ended in 2018. So, we can definitely hear some lessons learned and then I am very happy to invite you to listen to two national interventions from Nicaragua, Fabretto Foundation, as well as to a governmental programme intervention and a contribution by the Department of Agriculture from Bangladesh. The last intervention will take us back to a global perspective in the sense of a transversal initiative, the Civil Society Mechanism, and I will make sure that every speaker has time.

In respect of time, I want to immediately start with the presentation. I try to end up at 5.30 p.m., Chair, if that is fine for you? In a little bit less than an hour. So, let me start with Ms Anshu Mohan, Senior Technical Advisor to the Global Initiative. I want to listen to you and if you want, you could share with us your perspective in terms of what kind of multi-stakeholder perspective was really making a difference, what was the benefit of your multi-stakeholder partnership and if I may ask you, also, to share with us one challenge, one of your major challenges. The floor is yours.

Ms Anshu Mohan, Senior Technical Advisor, WHO

Thank you, very much. I'm not sure if it is appropriate to start my answer by invoking the Greek philosopher Aristotle while in Italy but, Aristotle said: "The Whole is Greater than the Sum of its Parts" – aptly defining the modern concept of synergy which is the driving force of a global multi-stakeholder platform like PMNCH. It brings together various perspective from ten constituencies which do always talk to each other across levels global regional and country level. So, it is very much the need for a platform for a safe space for these constituencies to come together.

Secondly, there is more than a substantial body of empirical evidence that shows that to achieve the SDG Goals, we necessarily have to work with a multi-sectoral, multi-stakeholder approach. The last decades have seen an explosion of research into the complex interactions that feed into health and wellbeing more broadly speaking. While some of these factors are health related to the health systems and access to health services, it is abundantly clear that a broad range of factors beyond health services play a critical role in shaping health and well-being. Let me give you a quick example:

Child mortality decline between the period of 1990 to 2010, half of it has been attributed to factors that are outside health, for example better gender equality which includes increasing age at marriage, improved water and sanitation, improved economic growth, improved education status. These are all beyond traditional health inducing factors, so increasingly we have to use that approach of not just what is health but, beyond what contributes to health and this is not just limited to health, this is vice versa, other sectors also. Roads, for example.

Very quickly, to answer your question and before I am shown the red rose, I will tell you what we have done over the last decade and a half. EWEC partners have mobilized USD 88 billion USD and 724 commitments in support of women's, children's and adolescent health and well-being. Let me break it down for you, over the last two years, 2016-2018, we have mobilized USD 43 billion USD and 314 commitments for women's, children's and adolescent health. That is the reward of a multi-stakeholder platform. You get private sector on where the big money is, you get the Governments on. These commitments are not just a global partners, a majority of these commitments actually come from leveraging domestic financing.

Again, a little more information on these commitments, 30 percent of these commitments actually come from Governments. They are leveraging domestic financing and their commitment to improve women's and children's health and wellbeing.

One part of your question was around what it is that this multi-stakeholder platform has done, which if we had not done, would have created an issue, correct? PMNCH led on the multi-stakeholder consultation for both the global health strategies with as many as 7000 inputs from all over the world – safe to say that without PMNCH taking on that role both the GS would have been shaped very differently.

That is huge. If PMNCH had not taken on that role of neutral convenor, the Global Strategies would have looked much different than they do today.

Finally, challenge, transaction cost. Willem spoke about transaction cost. I think there are necessary evils. We have to handle them but, how we have addressed them is a trade-off. We have made all considerations being equal, everyone is equal, everyone has a voice, everyone comes with a value add and we, as a platform, do not attach a cost to it. It is free, it is voluntary, so the people who coalesce around this cause are committed to the cause and the cause takes over then, rather than the power dynamics. Thank you.

Ms Ute Klamert, Assist. Executive-Director, WFP, Moderator

Thank you, Anshu. It is unfortunately a little bit difficult to read but, I want to invite you now to the regional aspect. I am quite excited because the Platform for African/European Partnership in Agriculture Research and Development was established ten years ago and came to an end in 2018. So, Jonas Mugabe, who managed the Platform, if I am informed correctly, please let us know what kind of difference you made and what was your biggest challenge? Thank you.

Mr Jonas Mugabe, PAEPARD Manager, FARA, Accra

Thank you, Madam Moderator. I am from FARA, Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa. When we talk about research today, we are not talking about research only in the laboratory, but we are talking about Integrated Agricultural Research for Development (IAR4D), which involves a lot of partners, a lot of stakeholders, including private sector, researchers, farmer Organizations and also NGOs. So, that is what FARA does.

Now, coming to PAEPARD, which stands for Platform for African/European Partnerships in Agricultural Research for Development. This Platform brought together farmers, NGOs, private sector researchers from Africa and Europe, of course, with policy makers, to jointly diagnose problems innovation

challenges and opportunities and we came up with some platforms. I am just going to mention some examples, like in Uganda, we had a platform formed around indigenous vegetables. In Benin, it was around Soya bean milk processing. In Burundi, it was about improved seed of potatoes. In Malawi and Zambia, it was about reducing a toxin in ground nuts. So, all these platforms, or multi-stakeholder partnerships, were involving different actors and we came up with the capacity building concept which could not have happened if we are working in isolation and the capacity building led to development of proposals and from 15 million received from the European Commission and partners, we mobilized 41 million. It is not as much as 80 billion of course but, for us, it is a big envelope and from this 41 million, we reached successful results because, for example, in Uganda, from 20 percent of households consuming the indigenous African vegetables, we ended up by 47 percent of households.

Now, there are many challenge, of course, some of them have been mentioned by my predecessors. One of them is the coordination of multi-stakeholder partnership between researchers and non-researchers. To overcome this issue, because, at the beginning, it was difficult to trust each other and also it was difficult to say, let us apply for this call or this other call. So, the solution was that we brought in what we called agriculture innovation facilitators and, with this, we managed to manage the power differences between stakeholders and also we build the capacity of platforms in general in soft skills because, for some people they think that building the capacity, we should go to the formal capacity with researchers only. But, we have project management, leadership, conflict resolutions, all these soft skills helped to overcome the issue of coordination and this led to the successful platform. Later, the platforms became the platform for information sharing, learning and knowledge sharing as well. We have produced a lot of literacy. We have the thematic on managing power differences in agricultural research for development partnerships. Thank you, Madam Moderator.

Ms Ute Klamert, Assist. Executive-Director, WFP, Moderator

I was trying to encourage you to finalize. Our next speaker is a representative of the Government of Bangladesh Ministry of Food, from the section Food Planning and Monitoring Unit, the Director-General, Badrul Arefin and the floor is yours.

Mr Badrul Arefin, DG, Ministry of Food, Bangladesh

Thank you, Chair. Excellency's, Bangladesh now can feed its population from its own production. The population is the eighth largest in the world, the country is 92nd in surface area. A small comparison: the population density is just 1,000 times denser than that of Canada, with 3,000 people per square mile. With this tremendous development in agricultural production, thanks to the outstanding leadership of our service award winning Prime Minister, Sheikh Hasina, and the farmers as well as the development partners.

We could not improve our nutrition situation, for example, the underweight and stunting, though developed to one third in proportion in ten years to 15 years. There has been large disparity in nutritional status among population of different geographical and social jurisdiction, as well there was and has been problem of obesity. FAO nowadays says that the obesity in women is more than 60 percent. That means not everyone is like me or the Food Secretary of Bangladesh over there.

This happened despite a large number of nutritional interventions ran under many Ministries, 22 Ministries operated a nutritional intervention separately. The challenges which were identified this year by the Government publication that witness in coordination and coherence among Ministries and stakeholders, lack of comprehensive nutritional interventions to the targeted people and various nutritional governance. Bangladesh has strong constitutional and statutory arrangements and, also, political commitment to ensuring nutrition. But, it did not have a field department or a platform

specifically on nutrition. To meet these needs, the multi-partner Bangladesh food and nutrition security programme (BFNS) came up from European Union, United States and even United Kingdom grants.

Three major components covered those three major areas. First, FAO, through its meeting on the nutrition challenge march, covered the policy and coordination aspects. An eight partner consortium led by Save the Children, ran field level nutrition governance and interventions as well as a consortium of around two dozen partners ran nutrition interventions and field level governance of nutrition in the field. A food supplementary component called national information platform for nutrition, it is also run by a consortium of CSOs, NGOs led by Helen Keller International that provides with necessary data analysis and relevant policy advice.

The number of partners, if I read it, it will run out my time. It involves ICCO, the International Organization for Development, World Fish, Save the Children and many others helped us. But, the number of Bangladeshi Ministries and Agencies involved are not also little. In the absence of a field department, these CSOs cover mainly aspects like strengthening local Government structures to address food and nutrition security, enhancing accountability system, participative planning and monitoring. Increase nutrition sensitivity and promoting behaviour change, like diversity care practices, water sanitise and worst climate resilience, especially families with women of reproductive age and children and improving quantity, quality and diversity of food consumption. Like food production, it also helps grow resilient crops for nutritious food and the like and promoting public/private partnership for food and nutrition security.

Four nutrition governance components are included in this. The while finding and regulatory operations, including selection or bidding process, etcetera, are run by the delegation of the European Union which conquerors for the highest Government of Bangladesh (GoB) level. Ministry of Food, through the office called Food Planning and Monitoring Unit, grants the monitoring and Government ownership with technical assistance from FAO's MUCH programme, meeting the nutrition challenge.

Normally, too many cooks spoil the broth. But, here, we could manage it. We had experiences also earlier. It is run under a country investment plan who just triggered from feed the future initiative of the US8 and it was a prerequisite of the GAFSB, the Global Agriculture and Food Security Programme, and they ran for five years, field level, and multi-sectoral interventions as well. So, we are building better.

This designing and operationalizing such a complex process requires lengthy preparation time and negotiation and this was a major challenge. This is demonstrated through the preparation and kick-starts of different components happening from January 2015 to late 2018. This costs a lot and this has a transaction cost. Also, building relationship among even personal and institutional issues was a big challenge and also the components would be complete at different times which will make the evaluation on which the replication and expansion would depend, more difficult, not very comfortable for uncompromising bureaucrats. Thank you, very much.

Applause

Ms Ute Klamert, Assist. Executive-Director, WFP, Moderator

I think we could sense your proudness, what you achieved. Thank you. That is good and energetic. I want to turn to my left. The President and the CEO of the Fabretto Foundation, Kevin Marinacci, the floor is yours and please, if you just want, can share with us what you are proud of, what made a difference and what you think we could have done better, a challenge still ahead of us. Thank you.

Mr Kevin Marinacci, Chief Executive Officer, Fabretto Foundation, Nicaragua

Thank you, Madam Moderator. Thank you, Mr Chairman. Your Excellency's, colleagues, Fabretto Foundation of Nicaragua is very proud to be here with you today and proud to be part of the global 4H network in the Private Sector Mechanism.

For the Partnership to succeed, it must be greater than the sum of its parts, leveraging each of the partners unique contributions in turn must strengthen the other partners and the community. Our Partnership was created two and a half years ago to provide access to training, appropriate technology, markets and credit. We have benefitted over 2,000 youths and their families with over 40 percent women participating. The training in climate smart agricultural practices helped them engage in value chains such as coffee, chia, fruit and honey, increasing their family income and livelihoods. The introduction of bio fortified varieties of rice, with WFP, and beans has improved nutrition and food security. Working with anchor commercial firms, we have incorporated into the design of the trainings, the practices that can sustainably produce the quality that the market rewards.

These companies share with their customers the best practices being carried out at origin and differentiate themselves from the market. I think, for a partnership to be successful, it should also add value beyond the partners. It should provide a model in how the different actors can come together to achieve their own goals and contribute to the common good.

Our multi-stakeholder partnership is held as an example how to contribute to FAO country programming that has at its heart inclusion, innovation, natural resource management and climate change. These alliances and partnerships are critical in order to achieve zero hunger and eradicate poverty. If our work can inform policy makers and other actors to contribute opportunities to scale beyond the original partners then it can have truly great impact on the public good. This is especially true if the work is done to advance national goals. For example, our 4H and Sistema Apredisaje Tutorial training, the methodology of learning by doing is done to enhance and complement the national Ministry of Education's rural secondary programme, not to supplant it, helping the goal to access quality post-primary education in rural areas. Digital extension assets being developed and being deployed through video and SMS will be available for many more than the original partners, going beyond the footprint of the project to create knowledge. Perhaps most importantly, the benefits of the partnership will last beyond the period of the inter-American Development Bank funding. The knowledge created through the training will allow these smallholders to produce high value crops and access the markets that were once unavailable to them.

Certainly, there are challenges in any agricultural endeavour. These challenges can be either exacerbated or lessened in the context of a partnership and each partner must bring resources to mitigate the challenge. For example, opportunities that new market channels offer producers can be difficult to achieve the timing, the quality and the volumes that the buyers demand. Support for this transition phase has been provided by the funding of the inter-American Development Bank and other private funders, allowing producers to move up the learning curve and lesson transaction cost. We also need to keep in mind the additional risks climate change adds to the context and the climate smart solutions that need to be deployed. One way we have encouraged the adaption of climate smart best practices and contribute to a stronger partnership is by engaging youth. Using our learning by doing methodologies, again 4H and Sistema Apredisaje Tutorial that allow youths to take their leadership in their learning through hands on workshop. This generation takes their environmental responsibilities serious and they are more entrepreneurial and eager to use methods and technologies to be smart and improve quality in yields. Our trainers work with the youth and their families to take soil samples, georeference their farms to allow them to make more informed decisions on land use and inputs, optimizing resource. This knowledge is also power and helps keep a healthy equilibrium in the partnership.

Ms Ute Klamert, Assist. Executive Director, WFP, Moderator

Thank you, very much. You have made my life easier in terms of timekeeping. Thank you.

I want to come back to the first speaker if I may, Anshu Mohan. You highlighted the complexity of multi-stakeholders and the related issues in terms of different interests of multi-stakeholders, how do you compromise between the interests of your members and trust to maintain the public interesting? How do you balance that? How do you manage that?

Ms Anshu Mohan, Senior Technical Advisor, WHO

Thank you, very much. A very interesting question and those of you Tweeting from this room, please use #accountabilitymatters because now I am addressing the elephant in the room: accountability.

A little bit of a history lesson for all of us, so bear with me and I will try to be accountable to Ute on the time as well. The objective, PMNCH, hosts something called the Independent Accountability Panel (IAP) and the emphasis is very much on independent. Independent, protected by firewalls and above it all. The objective of the IAP, the Independent Accountability Panel, is to provide an independent review of the implementation of 2016-30 Global Strategy for women's, children's and adolescent health and we support the Independent Accountability Panel. It comprises of experts in academia who are good at data, who are good at generating reports, who are good calling out.

Very quickly to say that, in 2010, when the then-UN Secretary-General (SG) Ban Ki-moon launched the Global Strategy, he setup something called the Independent Expert Review but, the previous global strategy was very much limited to 72 high burden countries. The next one, which came up in 2015, in universal, so the then SG was also forward looking and he setup the Independent Accountability Panel as we know it today.

So, how does the IAP function? It has three core principles. It works on M for monitor, R for review and A for act. Monitoring is crucial for accountability. This accountability requires reliable collected data, disaggregated to detect disparities to indicate who is being left behind because those are your most vulnerable population. My colleague here and other colleagues from countries would know, this is how you work. You identify where the most vulnerable is and you put in the maximum amount of resources to get things moving. So, they monitor, then they do an independent review. Now, an independent review means that they can come back to a country or a Government and say, your certain policies or your certain legislations are not working, we need to build on them or strengthen them or, in case when they are working, we need to ensure that their implemented universally in that country. So, they take that role of independent review. The third important point that IAP works around is, remedial action and most country colleagues would find some resonance with remedial action when you have joint review missions or common review missions, you come back and you do a set of remedial actions, that is accountability really being brought home to you that the Government is holding itself or stakeholders around a common cause, in our particular case, women's, children's and adolescent health. They are holding each other accountable by reviewing, by monitoring and also setting up a plan for implementing remedial actions.

Finally, I do want to also highlight that IAP very strongly believes in the notion that voluntary code of conduct for private sectors, for example, I am going to take a random example, the international code of marketing of breast milk substitutes and the voluntary action taken against that does not hold good. They very much advocate that states have an obligation to effectively regulate private entities operating within their borders or under their effective control, such as in marketing of unhealthy foods. So, very much, holding everyone to account, a 360 degree form of accountability.

The IAP also generates reports, for example, previously, they have generated reports on adolescent health, they have generated reports on private sectors, so the example that I share with you is from the private sector and they have called out and I said, this is not happening, this should not happen and Government

should take a more proactive stand on adolescence. Very interestingly, there were two recommendations that came out, make adolescents visible and measure how you do that and PMNCH took that to heart. Now, we have made sure that young people and adolescents are part of every global dialogue. They are part of every strategy that comes out of global headquarters like Rome, Geneva, New York and so that their perspectives, which are absolutely unique, we all know adolescents and young people are not homogenous. So, they are fed into policy making and, therefore, they go down to the country level, feed into policy making at the country level. This is one of the recommendations of IAP and we have taken it to heart and tried to implement this. Thank you.

Ms Ute Klamert, Assist. Executive-Director, WFP, Moderator

Good, thank you. I want to pass on and invite our panellist from Bangladesh, again, the same topic, public interest versus interest of members.

Mr Badrul Arefin, DG, Ministry of Food, Bangladesh

Thank you, Moderator. Such a collaborative mechanisms take into account all stakeholders as partners as well as active participation from the civil society, NGOs and private sector actors. I said that we have a country investment plan, it is called the nutrition sensitive food systems. That is the Government's document that guides the intervention process in our country and another reason is that the stakeholders involves the youth and they are accountable themselves. In our country the youths come each year to the capital city to celebrate a nutrition Olympiad. These are the trigger points from the civil society's actions in our country. May it is the boon of the Civil Society Mechanism of FAO also and even they speak to our upcoming new food and nutrition security policy aimed at SDGs and beyond.

Let me give you an example because saying that we, of course, look for independent evaluation, one of which will be kick-started in this month by the European Union. We will look for the third party evaluation results also, but as benefit which came up from this multi-stakeholder partnership, is that we are talking about putting messages on nutrition to the children in the school environment as Germany was talking about. Then, one page of nutrition, colourful message, was proposed to put into the empty back cover, inside the back cover of each textbook. First, everyone loved us because, from 100,000 of target, it will go 100 times bigger. So, 10 million students and their siblings and their parents will see it. But, ultimately, it happened that the Prime Minister's office and Ministry of Education is thinking to include that empty hardcover inside the back cover to put colourful messages on life building information with cartoons and colour because youth love cartoons and colour and I think all the youths are colourful. Thank you.

Ms Ute Klamert, Assist. Executive Director, WFP, Moderator

Thank you, very much. I want to start talking about innovative financing mechanism and just to make sure that you are not always the last speaker, Kevin, let us hear in terms of innovative finance mechanisms?

Mr Kevin Marinacci, Chief Executive Officer, Fabretto Foundation, Nicaragua

Though our multi-stakeholder partnership is small in comparison to global or regional examples, I believe there are some lessons learned. Our three years, USD 4 million budget is funded approximate half by the inter-American Development Bank and the balance of the support from private philanthropy in the United

States and Europe. This mix allows us to invest the monies from the multilateral and philanthropic community into the capacity building that the smallholders need to be able to access the formal markets and contracts, creating an opportunity for commercial partners to contribute to the financing of production with mitigated risk.

We also believe that our small USD 750,000 short term fund for pre-harvest and harvest financing from private foundations is an example of funders using their assets to make impact investments and loans. The concessional terms that we have received are significantly less than the local options when they exist, which is not often the case.

Foundations leveraging their assets for lesser return and greater impact is a very important increasing amount of capital globally. We believe that impact investment can play an important role in this space and our commitment to that is to raise a USD 5 million impact fund to scale our work with smallholders. Perhaps lessons from these loans and investments might encourage others that will mention the High-Level Panel of Experts report, such as pension funds and corporate social responsibility programmes to contribute.

Ms Ute Klamert, Assist. Executive-Director, WFP, Moderator

Thank you, very much, Kevin. I thought you should be the last panellist in terms of innovative financing because you finalized your engagement with the platform. Lessons learned you want to share in terms of innovative finance mechanisms?

Mr Jonas Mugabe, PAEPARD Manager, FARA, Accra

Under PAEPARD, what we have learned is that the multi-stakeholder partnership to be operational, we need resources and to get resources we need capacities. I do not know if we can talk about innovative funding mechanisms because apparently they are not there. What we have learned from PAEPARD, actually, is that the current funding architecture, which is based on competition, favour research Organizations with more resources and capabilities to develop quality proposals because evaluation is based on excellence rather than small Organizations in Africa.

The second lesson is that research partnership, rather than partnership between researchers and non-researchers, and also research products are favoured because they are much measurable in the short term because projects are just there for three years, then we are basing the project in terms of product, not in terms of outcomes which come from innovation and change. So, that is what we learnt from PAEPARD.

During the lifespan of PAEPARD, we just got one innovative funding mechanism which was launched by the Government of the Netherlands, which was called Applied Research Fund and to tell you how much this was innovative, we got 10 proposals funded under that mechanism because it was appropriated to my stakeholder partnership which PAEPARD was promoting. Otherwise, what is currently global, it is competitive funding mechanism which will not favour private sector, which will not favour NGOs, which will not favour farmers in Africa. It comes in favour of European researchers and African researchers. Thank you.

Ms Ute Klamert, Assist. Executive-Director, WFP, Moderator

Thank you, very much. I want to invite Patricia Rundall to share with us the perspective of the Civil Society Mechanism. My understanding is, you are sharing with other transversal analysis. Please?

Ms Patricia Rundall, IBFAN

Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you for all the very interesting interventions. Before I start, I want to actually say that nothing in what I am going to say now is intended to criticise the many people who choose to work closely in multi-stakeholder partnerships and closely with the food industry in order to protect health. I am absolutely convinced that everyone who has spoken does so for the right reasons.

However, my presentation is based on IBFAN, the International Baby Food Action Network, and we have worked for 40 years advocating for strong laws, United Nations Resolutions, codex standards, guidelines that aim to improve transparency, address conflicts of interest and end the harmful and misleading marketing, while facilitating the right to adequate food. The IBFAN concerns are shared by the CSM and many other public interest NGOs, movements and networks.

I will come straight to the point on one thing that I think everyone in this room will agree, whether they take money or not, multination corporations have played and continue to play a major role in the harm caused to human and planetary health. What I suspect we disagree on is whether working in partnership and accepting financing from corporations and especially food corporations, because we are here at the CFS, is a wise thing to do.

In our experience Governments attempting to retain, improve, adopt effective regulation and codex standards face fierce opposition from the food industry and are pushed to weaken their positions. In fact, I will be going there next month, to Codex, and this will happen. This is a fact, yet when properly monitored and implemented, these laws actually save lives and have saved thousands if not millions of lives.

The CSM values its role in the CFS, an important, inclusive, inter-governmental consultative body where Governments remain the decision makers. However, at every turn we see the promotion of multi-stakeholder partnerships as the answer to malnutrition, despite the fact that even the HLPE report states there is little or no evidence of their efficacy. We believe this is a huge risk and that takes us in entirely the wrong direction. Indeed, we see the risk of Governments and the United Nations being reduced to the role of facilitator, rather than the primary actors in address malnutrition.

I am going to take two examples that we have looked at, the scaling up nutrition (SUN) and the European Commission Platform for Diet and Physical Activity and Health. First, let me say that any multi-stakeholder partnership focused on nutrition that will involve the food industry will inevitably place great emphasis on innovation, micronutrients and fortification. Rarely is it acknowledged that this can undermine confidence in real minimally processed biodiverse and culturally appropriate food. All too often, these single nutrients are promoted with claims while the multiple nutrients in breast milk, for example, or fresh foods come with no such commercial promotion.

We have done a three-country analysis of some and this revealed many other problems. For example, we found a lack of adequate accountability procedures and a lack of truly independent monitoring. Indeed, if things go wrong, no one can be held accountable. SUN's conflict of interest policy is inadequate and confusing, it focuses on trust and collaboration rather than the need for caution. There is no requirement for democratic scrutiny of the implications for Governments before countries join SUN. So, no Parliamentary vote or anything.

Regarding the EU Platform, along with six other leading NGOs, IBFAN has left because the Platform completely failed to achieve its aims. Instead of focusing on curbing marketing, the corporate members would challenge the much needed proposals, focusing instead on funding nutrition education in its effort to appear a benign force.

We ask the following questions to all those in this room hoping to join or create a multi-stakeholder partnership at country level. Do you have adequate safeguards in place to stop undue corporate access and influence on public food and nutrition policies? Do you think it will speed up or slow down the progressive realization of the right to adequate food? Will the multi-stakeholder partnership make it easier

or more difficult for the promotion of strategies that address the root cause of malnutrition and equal power, poverty, land grabbing, harmful marketing, these sorts of things?

I just have two more points to make. Just to be wary of terminology, the word partnership, by definition, implies arrangements for shared governance to achieve shared goals. Shared decision-making is its unifying feature. I would prefer corporations funding Government programmes. That is straightforward and to the point.

Lastly, we just hope that the United Nations Secretary-General can be persuaded to end the recently signed strategic partnership agreement with the World Economic Forum. Nearly 300 civil society organizations believe that this will risk delegitimizing and weakening the role of the United Nations System in global decision making. Thank you.

Applause

Ms Ute Klamert, Assist. Executive Director, WFP, Moderator

Patricia, thank you, very much, very well noted, I would summarize. In fact, I will come back to your input when I am wrapping up. On behalf of the CFS I want to thank you for the contribution of the panellists, but maybe we want to say thank you for the inputs. Thank you.

Applause

I want to open up and ask for some contributions or inputs from the floor. The first input we expect from Equatorial Guinea. One minute, please?

Guinea Equatorial

Thank you, very much indeed, Madam Chairperson. The Republic of Equatorial Guinea is speaking on behalf of the Africa Regional Group. I would like to congratulate the Chair and the Secretariat of the CFS for the excellent work they have been putting in since yesterday. We are satisfied with the quality of the report from the HLPE on the question of the multi-stakeholder partnerships to finance and improve food security and nutrition in the framework of the 2030 Agenda.

We welcome the efforts being put in by FAO in drafting this report which clarifies the concepts and looks at the difficulties and also shows the evidence and the available data and it establishes relevant criteria so that Governments and non-state actors can conduct their evaluations on the basis of a common methodology. We also welcome the progress which has been made in terms of assistance to countries in assessing the contributions between interested partners in order to achieve food security and nutrition on a sustainable basis.

We hope that we will see capacity strengthening amongst all of the people involved here. We want to ensure that there is adequate funding so that the projects can be rolled out in the field. The recommendations go along the same line as we have already heard mentioned, we want to see involvement of all actors in the plans and programmes which will help us achieve the targets and goals of food security and nutrition.

We are sure that we will be able to move in this direction. Thank you, very much indeed.

Ms Ute Klamert, Assist. Executive Director, WFP, Moderator

The next input is from Switzerland.

Switzerland

Thank you, very much, Madam Moderator. The evidence and data on multi-stakeholder partnerships to finance and improve FNS are still limited and quickly evolving. Therefore, we welcome that, through this discussion, we further contribute to close this gap and work for more concrete evidence and data on this topic.

Switzerland actively cooperates with FAO and other stakeholders in several multi-stakeholder partnerships and would like to share some lessons learned on its effective financing and management and I will focus just on one element and we will send in our statement.

Regarding the internal governance, the Global Agenda on Sustainable Livestock (GASL) has a structure of seven clusters that represent most concerned sectors of society regarding livestock sustainability. Furthermore, GASL has nine action networks, championed by well-known research institutions which generate and communicate evidence on the various livestock sustainability dimensions. All clusters have the same weight when seeking consensus and the GASL Secretariat provides the necessary sponsorships for all clusters to be appropriately represented. Assuring a balanced representation of all stakeholder clusters and keeping the discussions based on scientific evidence has been key in the case of GASL and the SFS programme.

We believe that multi-stakeholder partnerships offer promising mechanism to achieve a dynamic yet systemic interaction between all stakeholders and to accelerate the much need transition towards sustainable agriculture and food system. Thank you, very much.

Ms Ute Klamert, Assist. Executive Director, WFP, Moderator

PSM, please. One minute, would be very polite, please.

PSM

Thank you, Chair. Today's session is a timely contribution to address the need for sustainable finance for SMEs and recognizing the essential role the multi-stakeholder partnership can play. We welcome the excellent comments from panellists, particularly from the partnership in agricultural research and the innovative ways to exchange much needed knowledge.

This highlights the critical need for cross-sectoral and holistic approaches pulling together the resources and expertise of different stakeholders in the achievement of food security and nutrition. There is "no one size fits all" solution to tackle hunger and we emphasise that there is a broad diversity amongst the many successful partnerships. PSM believes that effective and practical partnerships should be inclusive or diverse approaches in addition to public and private partnerships. In particular, with my own work in Guatemala, Mexico, Tanzania and DRC, I have seen how NGOs can work in cross-sector collaborations with investors and SMEs providing capacity building for sustainable practices and financial leaders training to agriculture SMEs. The NGO plays a mitigation role in analysing the risks that the investors can incur when financing small enterprises. We believe today's panel has reaffirmed the successful partnership need to be mutually beneficial, establish clear roles and responsibilities and be honest and transparent. Thank you.

Ms Ute Klamert, Assist. Executive Director, WFP, Moderator

CSM, please.

CSM

Thank you. The first point I would like to make is that under theme 4.3 in the report, it says that CFS is an inclusive inter-governmental platform where responsibility and decisions lie with Member States. It is not a space for participation by multi-stakeholders.

We heard the private sector earlier today which said that, at local level, it was difficult to achieve headway on food and nutrition related issues. We would like to give you an example of where there is a lack of consistency in Latin America, in Colombia, where the industrial sector and the Government have established agreements which aim at increasing production and consumption of highly processed foods which are presented as foodstuffs when they are not actually.

Now, we, in the CSM, think that it is not acceptable and not credible to have these multi-stakeholder platforms working on this basis on food and nutrition. These should be public policies which should involve people, the populations and the communities. Thank you.

Ms Ute Klamert, Assist. Executive Director, WFP, Moderator

Thank you very much. The next contribution from Finland. Please.

Finland

Thank you very much, Madam Moderator. I am honoured to speak on behalf of the European Union and its 28 member states. We welcome the continued attention being given by the CFS to multi-stakeholder partnerships and also this specific format which this has taken at this year's Plenary Session. We are convinced that MSPs are instrumental in achieving effective policy making and impactful innovation and in broadening the resource base for action. If MSPs are to be successful, it is essential to address governance, accountability and decision making processes and to build trust.

We would like to invite all CFS stakeholders to pay due attention to the CFS guidelines, principles and policy recommendations and to follow the principle of inclusivity when designing and implementing projects.

We would like to see MSPs remain high on the CFS agenda. We propose that the systematic collection of MSPs experiences be compiled within the framework of the CFS.

In the end, I want to thank all the panellists for a very important and interesting presentation and especially, Mr Olthof for taking up my absolute heroine, Pippi Langstrumpf. Thank you.

Ms Ute Klamert, Assist. Executive Director, WFP, Moderator

Thank you very much. The last contribution we can expect from the World Bank. It seems there is no one here. So, I take the floor and try, not to summarize, but maybe just to conclude what I found. Natasha, Please

GAFSP

Thank you, Ute. Thank you, and good afternoon. My name is Natasha Haywood, I am the head of the Global Agriculture and Food Security Programme, and I am very happy to be able to contribute to this valuable discussion by sharing a little bit of our experience as a multi-stakeholder partnership.

As some brief background, GAFSP was created in 2010 by the G20 in response to the then 2008 food crisis and it is a funding mechanism designed to invest in resilient and sustainable agriculture and food systems worldwide in low income countries. However, in the face of the dual challenges of the climate crisis and persistent food insecurity, GAFSP's mandate is unfortunately as relevant today as it was a decade ago.

As some of you may know, we are not a delivery agency, but we are a flexible mechanism that pulls donor resources and channels this additional financing through existing multi-lateral agencies, including the Rome-Based Agencies, to where it can be most effective. Our very operational model rests on partnership with these Agencies, including WFP represented by yourself, moderator, and those others best placed to provide technical support in the delivery of our resources to the final country, producer Organization or private sector clients.

While there are many different features of our multi-stakeholder partnership that I could share, including our results on the ground, shared of course by Mr Arefin from Bangladesh, or indeed how GAFSP amplifies the goals of other partnership platforms like the CFS, from my vantage point in the Secretariat, it is our inclusive governance that is a unique factor contributing to the programme's success. Our governing body includes representatives from donors, recipients, implementing partners and civil society and sets the strategic direction for the programme. While it generally governs by consensus, the voting rights are formally equally distributed between donors and recipients and it provides a forum where all stakeholders have a seat at the table.

Over the years, we have had several working group processes that involve all constituents in making tough strategic and operational adjustments and to acknowledge Willem's point, and also that of Patricia, in terms of the challenges and the risks involved, this process does indeed take time and effort. These working groups have required like-minded partners willing to roll up their sleeves and keep the common goals in mind while often coming from different sectors.

I will finish right now. I just wanted to say that I think, with the benefit of these lessons of experiences over the last decade, we look forward to continuing to apply those in the forthcoming decade to 2030 with our likeminded partners. Thank you, very much.

Ms Ute Klamert, Assist. Executive Director, WFP, Moderator

Natasha, I think I have to also interrupt the World Bank. Thank you, very much.

I want to conclude and try to summarize what I found quite interesting and thank you for sharing with us your rich experiences and all your contributions and interventions. What I found particularly interesting that everyone was talking about the power of synergies and I think what you mentioned in terms of researchers talking to non-researchers and trying to understand the different professional rationale and just to tap on that power of synergies.

The power of patience, we need to unfold and discover the power of multi-stakeholders. Everyone was talking about transaction costs and how to bring down transaction costs and that kind of awareness. Every one of you was talking about capacity building and trying to appropriate allocation of resources toward a multi-stakeholder partnerships in that respect. What I liked, in particular, that everyone was talking about from various perspectives, including from the Civil Society Mechanism, about accountability. I think accountability is one of the key components. The issues of governance bodies, also raised by the World Bank, how to go about and how to address accountability including different stakeholders, like youth for

example, in these processes to invest in impact and trust how to demonstrate that there is a difference in terms of what could be achieved by multi-stakeholder partnerships.

In particular, I wanted to highlight the last issue in terms of independent monitoring, third party monitoring, including third parties in this respect, and thank you, very much, in particular, very well noted all the critical comments from the Civil Society Mechanism, very well noted and I am sure that we will, in a way, take note of that and include it in our future projects.

With that, Chairperson, I want to give the floor back to you and thank you, very much. It was not just what I promised, a little bit delayed, I hope that is fine. Thank you.

Applause

Chairperson

Thank you. Can we have a round of applause please for Mrs Klamert and for all the panellists and also the CFS Secretariat for having brought this very important issue up for discussion when that workstream is coming to a close on the question of the multi-stakeholder partnerships to finance and improve food security and nutrition.

It is so important because it is this Committee which is an example for this type of partnership. So, thank you, once again and let us now move back to item two which has been left pending since yesterday.

Now, it is coming up to 6.00 p.m. when our interpreting time will run out. So, I am going to make the following proposal. I was obliged to get my head together with the Secretariat and not pay due attention to what was happening here in the room because we were trying to figure out how we can solve the following issue. We have a very lengthy list which is now closed, of course, but it is a lengthy list of speakers who have requested the floor on item two, the state of food security and nutrition in the world 2019. Its policy implications in the context of the Agenda 2030 based on the SOFI report.

Now, the list of speakers we now have would take us over an hour. I have done my sums, you would have five minutes, some people speaking time, or three and it would take us over an hour.

So, let us have a look at the options. The first option already suggested is that delegations would provide their text in writing. In fact, Nigeria has already indicated from the list of speakers I have that they are going to send in their speech, their presentation, by e-mail. I would urge all those delegations who would like to take the floor, please, to do the same. We will upload all of the speeches to the CFS website that are sent in to us in writing.

The second option would be a video recording. All those delegations who would like to record their speech instead of actually making the speech here in the Plenary would simply have to contact the Secretariat, the Secretary or any other member of the Secretariat in order to make their speech with a camera man. We can coordinate that, it can be done at any point during the rest of the week.

Option three, the third option is to extend and run into a night session. What does that mean? Well, first and foremost, we cannot do it today. We do not have interpreters who are accredited by the United Nations who could extend their working day to do a night session today. That is ruled out. It has already been explained. Friday, we cannot do it either because all of the speeches have to be made before the Drafting Committee meets. So, we cannot do it on Thursday either because the Drafting Committee will meet at the end of the daily meetings. The only possibility will be tomorrow, Wednesday. But, tomorrow is World Food Day and FAO, the anniversary of FAO, and that is going to be commemorated as well and so the session tomorrow, as you know, we have approved the agenda. The actual session is going to start not at 3.00 p.m. but, rather at 4.00 p.m. so the three hour block will be from 4.00-7.00 p.m.

So, in order to convene a night meeting, it would have to start at 7.00 p.m. tomorrow evening. It has also been explained to us in FAO that we cannot arrange for half an hour, one hour, three hour, we have to pay the interpreters by the day, for six hours in other words, from 7.00 p.m. in the evening until 1.00 a.m. the next morning and that is total madness, if I can be very honest, six hours of simultaneous interpretation, starting at 7.00 p.m. in the evening.

Let me tell you what happened the last time the CFS called a night session. It was last year in October 2018, the 45th Session. We called a night session and we did not have a quorum. We did not even have half, not even half of the delegation that would have created the quorum. If the quorum was 50 delegations, we did not even have 25. Not even half the quorum, so that is a risk we will be running.

So, what I am going to propose is that we should now take two or three delegations, the two or three at the top of the list and the other ones we will listen to by extending tomorrow's session as of 7.00 p.m. in the evening but without interpretation. In other words, delegations will be able to make their statements but, without being interpreted and if we do not finish tomorrow, then if there is enough time on Thursday, which I doubt because we have already added one of the aspects for other business from Friday, we have put that on Thursday afternoon's agenda, then we could finish there. Anybody that we cannot fit in would then have to submit their statements in writing.

So, these are the options. Now, my list of speakers would start with Spain, then South Sudan on behalf of group of 77 and then we have China and I think we would then have to stop it there for this afternoon. I will give the floor to Spain.