

PSM Comments on HLPE V0 Draft Report

Multi-stakeholder Partnerships (MSPs) to Finance and Improve Food Security and Nutrition in the Framework of the 2030 Agenda

The purpose of the report is to analyze the role of MSPs in improving and financing FSN. Do you think that this draft is striking the right balance and give enough space to finance related issues? (Questions posed by HLPE).

The draft is focusing a lot on definitions, descriptions and classifications a broader analysis of multistakeholder partnerships with limited reference, if any, to financial issues apart from 7 pages at the end of the report. The intended purpose and balance of the report was written in Appendix E of CFS 43 Report and clearly laid out the required focus on financial issues. The report is also describing potential and limitations and how MSP's contribution to FSN can be improved and also lacks the important discussion on how the creation of MSPs to finance and improve FSN can be encouraged and facilitated. This discussion should cover the incentives to create partnerships and where the initiative comes from. An important aspect of developing and proposing MSPs is the partnership development capacities and resources in each partner's organisation. These capacities vary between partners. With a common understanding that partnerships, and especially MSPs, are needed for meeting the SDGs, all types of partner organisations need to allocate time and resources (as a core activity) for partnership development and for partnership project development. Under 4.1.3 (page 59) a report is quoted that suggests that UN member states should ensure that partnerships should not be subsidized by core UN resources. This might be true for actual investments in partnerships, but all organisations, including UN agencies, must have project and partnership development resources available as part of their core funding. To ask potential partners for funding before a partnership proposal is at hand, will not lead to many productive partnerships.

This HLPE report is about how to “Finance and Improve” MSPs. How MSPs can improve FSN goes beyond the ability for MSPs to raise financial resources. Other resources needed could be in-kind contributions and also all the expertise, experience and knowledge needed, both at the MSP level and among the beneficiaries that have to be able to absorb and make optimal use of the assistance provided.

An important constraint in raising funds for FSN is the limited access to finance for small holder farmers and SMEs. Their capabilities in making the optimal investment decisions is also an issue, as well as how to benefit fully from the investments made (lack of skills and training). There is a need for both finance and technical assistance to these groups to fully use their potential in contributing to FSN. MSPs have a very big potential to make the most of these groups contributions, but it is crucial that these MSPs build on viable and sustainable business models (commercial, social and environmental viability).

One should also keep in mind that formation of MSPs is not a goal in itself. The partnership model is a tool to achieve results (in this case improve FSN). The refocussing of the report in the next draft on the role of MSPs in financing FSN would allow the CFS to take a leading role in understanding and articulating the gap in financing and role of MSPs in raising and disbursing funds.

Is the structure of the report comprehensive enough, and adequately articulated? Are the concepts clearly defined and used consistently throughout the report? Are there important aspects that are missing? Are there any major omissions or gaps in the report? Are there topics under-or over-represented in relation to their importance? Are any facts or conclusions erroneous or questionable? If any of these are an issue, please send supporting evidence.

One important type of MSP is not described in the draft report, the public private partnerships where donors invite private sector entities to propose projects which the donor agency will co-fund. Sida’s Public Private Development Partnerships (PPDP) is one example. <https://www.sida.se/English/partners/our-partners/Private-sector/About-Business-for-Development/Public-Private-Development-Partnerships-PPDP/> Other donors have similar programmes (USAID, GiZ, DFID).

The scope of MSPs that the report covers is listed in 1.1.5. This is a good and quite complete list. However, the report itself doesn’t have examples of all of

these kinds of MSPs. Some are over represented. For example, under 4.3.1 (page 63) there are several examples of partnerships but they are all in the field of climate and environment. There are a number of other important global challenges related to FSN that should be exemplified here such as food losses and waste, malnutrition (both undernutrition and overweight/obesity) and poverty.

Introduction

The Introduction to HLPE Draft V0 initially highlights both the 2030 Agenda and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda (AAAA) as a means to achieve them and recognises (page 9 line 25) that “MSPs are increasingly forming worldwide”. CFS 43, in developing the theme of the proposed HLPE report further builds on this, indicating that “more and better investments, underpinned by adequate financing, are needed” (CFS 2016/43, Appendix E) and that “multistakeholder partnerships offer promising and innovative means to increase the effectiveness of development finance in the context of the 2030 Agenda”. In setting out the context for the HLPE report, the CFS 43 has recognised that “many types of partnerships exist and several of them have been well described” and that there is a need to:

- draw “lessons” from MSPs;
- “be clear which types of MSPs offer the most potential towards supporting the implementation of the 2030 Agenda”;
- “be clear which ones are the most promising in terms of innovative financing and access to resources, technology transfer, and capacity building”;
- “take stock of new evidence, analyse trends, identify new opportunities and challenges and provide recommendations that could result in evidence based policy guidance”; and,
- “examine the potential for enhancing the role and effectiveness of multistakeholder partnerships as a modality for scaling up innovation, resources and action to deliver the SDGs”.

These broad guidelines appear clear and take forward the 2030 Agenda and the AAAA recognition of the roles of MSPs as a means of implementation.

It therefore needs clarification why Draft V0 proposes a new “context” (page 9 line 35) that opines that MSPs have not developed “without controversy” (page 9, line 23), introduces a “conceptual debate” on terms and meanings and that the role of MSPs going forward “will utterly depend” only on issues concerning rights, conflicts of interest and asymmetries of power (line 33). The purpose of the report is then stated (line 39) “to consider the role of MSPs.....not to assess in detail existing MSPs (line 46)... but suggest relevant criteria and methodology to enable governments and non-state actors to perform their own assessments (page 9, line 48). All actors may be concerned with conflicts of interest: governments, private sector, research bodies, NGOs, among others. This issue can impose a plethora of challenges for all actors, affecting the most vulnerable groups, and hindering any real progress in achieving the Sustainable Development Goals. Preventing conflicts of interest requires all parties to work together and contribute solutions to build credible partnerships based on trust and respect, rule of law, good governance, accountability, and transparency.

It is therefore recommended that the HLPE Project Team consider how to better reflect in the Introduction the guidance given by the CFS 43 Report, Appendix E. In the context of the CFS evaluation and the need to exemplify CFS’s role and continued relevance it is important that this report is clearly seen to be taking forward the 2030 Agenda and the directions for implementation included in the AAAA.

1. CONTEXTS AND DEFINITIONS FOR MULTISTAKEHOLDER PARTNERSHIPS

The report suggests a methodology, and key criteria, to describe and assess existing MSPs. Are there other assessment tools and methodologies that should be referenced in the report?

Chapter 1 attempts to develop criteria (as do Chapters 2 and 3) but all examples are caveated with problems and limitations. E.G. the use of legal status to define three spheres “suffers from several limitations” (page 12, line 38) and where to classify farmers is (page 12, line 47/48) “an unresolved debate”. Similarly, it is correct to include various collaborative arrangements e.g. ‘partnerships’, ‘platforms’, ‘networks’, ‘processes’ (page 13 lines 14-17)) as valid MSP initiatives.

There is a need to include cooperatives in this classification as well. (“Agricultural cooperatives: paving the way for food security and rural development” FAO/IFAD/WFP 2008).

As noted (page 13, line 51) “both more loosely formed partnerships and more structured and institutionalised bodies can be assessed”. Therefore, a focus on the purpose of MSPs rather than source or attributes of members would be appropriate.

Page 11, line 11 Please include reference that identifies and explains the basis for MSPs as a new ‘governance tool’. Otherwise please refer to MSPs in the context of SDG 17 and AAAA recommendations.

1.1.1

Page 11, lines 44-47 CFS 43 Report, Appendix E does not reference a specific request regarding definition of the term ‘stakeholders’ which, if there were issues to be discussed (e.g. inclusiveness, accountability), would have been included. Clarification is needed of the reported “CFS request” and the use of the term ‘debate’ and whether this refers, at this stage, to an advocacy position of “some people” (line 30). Goal 17 of the SDGs underpins all success on partnerships. All stakeholders must work together and contribute to the solutions to build credible institutions based on the **rule of law, good governance, accountability, and transparency**.

1.1.4

Page 14, lines 29-42 The discussion on MSP characteristics continues with a brief review of PPPs. This is a limited review and could be enhanced by reference to many of the (recent) references available E.G.:
1. Public Private Partnerships (PPPs) in Agriculture: Enabling Factors and Impact on the Rural Poor (IDS UK, 2014)
2. Public-Private Partnerships for Agricultural Innovation. (*Lessons from Recent Experiences*) OECD, France 28 Jan 2016
3. FAO. 2016. *Public–private partnerships for agribusiness development – A review of international experiences*, by Rankin, M., Gálvez Nogales, E., Santacoloma, P., Mhlanga, N. & Rizzo, C. Rome, Italy.

4. Public Private Partnerships for sustainable agricultural development. October 14th, 2014 OECD, Paris.

Page 14, lines 43/44 It is not clear why the only two questions raised by this very brief review of MSPs should concern legitimacy and accountability? The success of a multi-stakeholder partnership will need to reflect not only the importance of **transparency and accountability**, but to highlight other necessary attributes for successful durable partnerships, such as: **capacity building, scalability, institutional infrastructure, and sharing of good practice**. Without due account of the full picture of enabling factors, partnerships will not emerge in the numbers and at the scale needed for impact.

Page 14, line 49 given the stated limitations of defining three spheres it is not clear why the definition (page 15 box) refers to three spheres. Suggest to remove definitions of stakeholders. Multi-stakeholder partnerships have more than one stakeholder, but they will not necessarily have all types of stakeholders. Acknowledging that governments, multilateral institutions, private sector (including farmer organisations), science organisations, not-for-profit bodies and others may partner in different ways and combinations, the report will need to identify the need and means to **encourage the engagement of each group**.

1.1.5

The HLPE Draft V0 report is a report on MSPs to finance and improve FSN in the framework of the 2030 agenda. The listing (page 15, lines 42-47 and page 16, lines 1-10) of 7 separate non-financial categories of MSPs and then lumping together five separate financial topics into one MSP with no further discussion belies the importance of the categorisation and topics.

1.2.2

Page 18, Line 3: The Report is given a new purpose, both conflicting with previous statements and not in line with the CFS 43 Report, Appendix E.

Page 18, line 4: The statement regarding the MSPs' higher transactions when compared to other processes implies that MSPs always have higher transaction

costs. Unless there is data to support this assertion, the statement seems overly broad and presumptuous.

Page 18, lines 24-28: A small selection of the (many) more up to date references on PPPs has already been provided above. If statements such as MSPs being ‘counterproductive’ are to be used to conclude sections it would be appropriate to have clear references and, in line with the AAAA conclusions and SDG 17, a more balanced analysis.

Page 19, line 3. Please refer to www.cgiar.org for a more nuanced analysis of public research, funding and priority setting to balance the clear negative positions of the two references used.

Page 19, lines 9-22. The critique of MSPs is repeated in Chapter 3 (page 49, lines 34-47). If the hypothesis of the V0 report is that MSPs delivery may have “no direct relation to their publicly stated goals” (page 19, line 15; page 49. Line 40) which “makes their claims to legitimacy hard to credit” (page 19, line 18; page 49. Line 43) then this should be clearly stated in the Introduction.

1.3

Page 19, line 39/40. Given that it is “difficult to elaborate a comprehensive typology” (a statement with which PSM would agree) it may be appropriate to suggest whether the establishment of a set of criteria has analytical merit.

1.4

Page 23, line 10.

While it is recognised that the ‘concluding remarks’ are a work in progress there is insufficient evidence of a broad review and analysis to support the assertion that there is a need to revisit MSPs critically. This was neither the opinion of the CFS 43 Report, SDG 17 or the AAAA report. Reference to finance (line 13) appears more as afterthought and a more balanced approach is needed in assessing the nature and extend of MSP costs (line 17) while recognising that all other collaborative approaches carry costs.

2. CLUSTERING MULTISTAKEHOLDER PARTNERSHIPS

The report suggests a classification of existing MSPs in broad clusters, in order to better identify specific challenges and concrete recommendations for each category. Do you find this approach useful for identifying specific policy responses and actions?

The draft V0 Report has spent considerable time and effort to develop clusters but it remains unclear if the purpose of developing clusters has been well thought through and if the clusters, as defined, provide the clarity hoped for. Chapter 1 concluded (page 23, lines 19/20) that mapping MSPs would identify ‘similar constraints and challenges’.

The four clusters identified (page 27 lines 6-17) include, knowledge, policy orientated, action orientated and resource mobilisation clusters together with well described examples of MSPs in boxes 3-11. But it is not clear whether clusters are mutually exclusive as clearly, all clusters would define themselves as having a ‘knowledge generation and sharing’ function and few would suggest that they were not ‘action orientated’.

The ‘action-orientated’ cluster is broken down to a further five sub clusters (page 33, lines 9-13). The 4th sub-cluster, ‘agribusiness development’ is broken down to a further 4 typologies but it is noted that (page 36, line 12) “some of these will overlap or belong to previous clusters”. At this point, the number of possible variants in MSP typology prevent any reasonable conclusions and recommendations being drawn.

Further, the entire premise of partnerships is that all actors are valued and to say they may be grouped as being led by one actor rather than others would generally not be the case.

Moreover, section **2.4.4** ‘Agribusiness development’ is currently based on an FAO study of 70 PPPs whereas the subsequent sub-cluster, **2.4.5** is itself a sub-cluster on PPPs. And while the MSPs described “raise finance” (page 38, line 8)

they are not included in the next cluster **2.5** “finance and resource mobilisation clusters’. This plethora of all sorts of taxonomies of agricultural development clusters (2.4.4), public-private partnerships (2.4.5), finance and resource mobilization clusters (2.5) both confuse the descriptive analysis as ‘rounds pegs are forced into square holes’ but prevent any real drawing of lessons, analysis of trends, innovations or challenges, as requested by CFS 43 Report Appendix E. Most activity by the private sector in this regard will be through partnerships or through blended finance, even if they are not listed in the blended finance section (page 66, line 17).

2.1.1

Page 25, line 12: The report lists a number of different types of MSPs. The examples of corporate-led MSP do not cover commercially driven MSPs where private sector work in MSPs in its core business. This is where the big potential lies. CSR activities and not-for-profit foundations are important parts of private sector contributions but will always be limited.

Page 36, line 30: The statement that the private sector is reluctant to do business due to high risk should include examples of the risks that the private sector faces (as set forth in the cited work, FAO, 2016) so the reader knows the risks are broader than just financial and investment risks. For example, the private sector may be reluctant to do business in an area because of regulatory, political, corruption, and infrastructure risks. Instability is a considerable risk for private sector. The report then goes on to say that PPP is a useful mechanism for risk sharing. The latter is definitely true, but the quote from FAO has probably been taken out of context and the private sector is doing business all the time, despite the many risks, as listed.

Page 38, lines 2–3: The statement that the common pattern among MSPs in the private sector led cluster is that they involve creating mega projects is overly broad, especially when only a handful of examples are provided to the reader.

Page 40, line 27: The acronym “RMNCAH” is not defined in the document.

It is incorrect (page 40, line 21) that the function of finance clusters is only to “mobilise funds and raise awareness” without considering the use of those funds for FSN, the very purpose of the analysis intended by CFS 43.

It is not possible to identify specific policy responses and actions with the clusters as reviewed above. The weak ‘concluding remarks’ (page 40, lines 30-34) reflect this.

More companies are now building and rebuilding business models around social goals, setting them apart from the other competitors and developing a broader approach to problem solving. With the help of NGOs, governments, and other stakeholders, business has the power of scale to create real change on major social problems in rural areas. <https://www.sharedvalue.org/search/node/food>

Another example, launched at the [United Nations](#) in 2008, is the Business Call to Action (BCtA) which aims to accelerate progress towards the [Sustainable Development Goals \(SDGs\)](#) by challenging companies to develop inclusive

business models that engage people at the base of the economic pyramid – people with less than US\$10 per day in purchasing power in 2015 US dollars – as consumers, producers, suppliers, distributors of goods and services and employees. <https://www.businesscalltoaction.org/about-bcta#inclusive-business>

A further example, in 2013, the **Rockefeller Foundation** recognized the potential to achieve positive social and economic impact by addressing the post-harvest food loss issue. Elimination of post-harvest food loss would feed 1 billion more people by 2050—many of them across Sub-Saharan Africa, where food insecurity is the greatest. This means much more than just more food for more people; it also means increased nutritional security, greater resilience within food systems, and improved farmers' livelihoods. Engaging a range of stakeholders, the Foundation's YieldWise model aims to create new norms and practices to support an efficient approach to local sourcing across Africa, motivating loss reduction across the supply chain.

https://www.sharedvalue.org/sites/default/files/resource-files/YieldWise%20Case_Final.pdf

3. MULTISTAKEHOLDER PARTNERSHIPS: POTENTIAL AND LIMITATIONS

Do you think that there are other key challenges/opportunities that need to be covered in the report?

In this section, private sector contributions are described mainly as donations. Commercially driven MSPs where the private sector contribution is its knowledge, technical assistance and ability to finance its own and customers' investments, is not taken into account. The private sector's objectives are also referred to mainly as a tool of CSR and to build brands. This is not the whole truth. Many companies work in MSP's to pool resources for a common goal where commercial projects also create development impact and improve FSN.

3.1

This section suggests two areas (page 42, lines 17/18) where MSPs could contribute to 'improve and finance FSN' but neither area, important though they are, actually focusses on finance. Section 3.1.1 'Pool together complementary resources' recognises the guidance offered by the AAAA (page 41, line 20-25) but does not follow up the discussion when the 'new evidence' (CFS 43 Report) of 'trends' in blended finance as an example of innovative financing would be appropriate:

OECD (2018), *Making Blended Finance Work for the Sustainable Development Goals*, OECD Publishing, Paris. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264288768-en>.

In discussing (3.1.2) the areas of facilitation of policy dialogue and policy convergence (page 42, line 48) the existing contractual forms of multi-stakeholder partnerships have proved their worth for many years in such fields as public services and public infrastructure and continue to offer great potential. Public-Private Partnerships simultaneously contribute to a better understanding by the private sector of public needs and more strategic planning by governments that accommodates private sector and other stakeholders' needs so governments can better leverage partner capacities, leading to a more efficient allocation of resources. The promotion of consensus-building through stakeholder engagement and dialogue – notably amongst governments, business and civil society – is vital for designing and implementing effective solutions and for a shared sense of accountability and responsibility.

3.1.1

Page 41, line 44: “Conflicts” seems like a harsh way to note that there are frequent disagreements on the use of natural resources in the context of FSN.

Page 42, line 26: The meaning of the phrase “pro-poor” institutional change is unclear.

3.2.1

Page 43, line 31-33. It is correct to focus on trust issues as mutual trust and respect will ensure an environment where partners can share ideas, concerns and potential solutions in confidence to solve problems together. However, this section (and 3.2.2) would be better linked to the definitional issues discussed in Chapter 1.

Page 43, lines 53–54: The sentence should be revised to make it clear that private companies may be required, under the law, to deliver profits (ethically and appropriately) in the discharge of their fiduciary responsibilities. While the private sector encompasses for-profit businesses, they often undertake non-profit driven actions. Many companies are part of multi-stakeholder partnerships that do not entail any direct return on investments for them, but have a positive impact on other beneficiaries.

Page 44, line 3: CSR is not just about “taming external criticism.” CSR can be used to show proponents and employees of an entity that the entity is committed to a region or a cause, or to demonstrate that the entity’s values align with the values of its proponents, employees, etc.

3.2.2

Page 44, line 29: Is the word “colored” an acceptable way to describe race?

Page 44, line 54: The statement that 3-4 global grain trade transnationals are increasing their control over inputs (seeds, agrochemicals) is inaccurate. The agricultural inputs market is still very competitive and comprise myriad

companies not owned by one of the big four grain traders and the large trading companies are not the same as those involved in seeds and agrochemicals. The statement should be deleted.

3.2.4

The section repeats and further discusses the issues raised in section 1.2.2 on the value added of MSPs with some additional lessons being developed. In particular, the discussion (page 47, lines 5-32) provide useful examples of various PPP initiatives. The lessons from these interventions need to be further developed and the evidence of other initiatives (with the references given in these comments) developed. It is problematic for the HLPE V0 draft report to state (page 47, line 3) "it is difficult to get a global picture" when this is specifically what the CFS 43 Report Appendix E requested.

3.3

The section discussed eight process/results qualities related to MSP performance, inclusiveness, accountability, transparency/access to information, reflexivity, effectiveness and efficiency. (page 48, lines 3-5) and develops a diagram (page 55) to show how these qualities relate. This is interesting but could be considered as part of Chapter 1 and then the themes developed could be applied to the boxes 3-11 of MSP examples in Chapter 2.

One criteria that could be added is sustainability and it could be divided into three parts: commercial/economic viability (if relevant), social sustainability and environmental sustainability. If the MSP deals with food production, and many MSPs for FSN do, then commercial viability is important. Food is mainly produced in the private sector by commercial actors (farmers, food processors) and if this production is not commercially viable in the longer term, it will stop as soon as the partnership is over.

The only financial perspective offered is that referring to resource mobilisation and focuses mainly on access to resources for the MSP 'per se' as opposed to any financial purpose and functions the MSP has. Review of the references and links in the next Chapter may allow the issue of overall financial performance and delivery of financial products and services to be assessed and lessons learnt.

This is mentioned in the 3.4 Conclusions (page 55, lines 13-17) where the topic of ‘innovative modes of funding’ is mentioned (for the first time.....).

4. PATHWAYS TO IMPROVE MULTISTAKEHOLDER PARTNERSHIPS’ CONTRIBUTION TO FSN

This chapter analyzes the internal factors and enabling environment that could contribute to enhance the performance of MSPs in improving and financing FSN. Could you provide specific examples of successful or unsuccessful policies and programmes designed to shape such enabling environment that could contribute to illustrate and strengthen the Chapter?

As noted by the covering question, analyses the internal factors and enabling environment that could contribute to enhance the performance of MSPs in improving and financing FSN. However there is little in either of the two sections (4.1, 4.2) that addresses the issue of MSPs financing FSN, the focus is on improving the functioning of MSPs in general. In this regard it could be more directly related to the eight performance qualities identified in Chapter 3.

Section 4.3 introduces the topic of Financing for Development (FFD) referring (page 62, lines 10-15) to both the 2030 Agenda and the AAAA on FFD. This mirrors the context and rationale for the HLPE report as established by CFS 43. Innovative financing is highlighted due to declining ODA and budgetary pressured (lines 13/14) but it would be more appropriate (utilising OECD reports and the World Bank report on Agriculture (2012) that assessed the growing financial needs of the agricultural sector and the needs for financing of FSN. These requirements and levels are further developed in section 4.3.1 and are noted (page 63, line 51) to be “huge”.

4.1.2

Page 58, lines 35-40 Action from the more powerful: building capacity The reference quotes that one of the options to prepare MSPs capacity to improve FSN is to “develop measures to promote philanthropy and corporate social responsibility”. This quote is another example of how the private sector is seen as a donor of funds and not a partner through its core business. Philanthropy and CSR is just one example of private sector engagement, the

more important and impactful example is when private sector uses its core business and competencies to improve FSN, on its own or in partnerships.

4.3.2 Sources of Financing

Page 64, line 7 Domestic public finance

More analysis of agricultural sector public funding is needed as current section is too general. See following:

<https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/786.pdf>

<http://www.worldbank.org/en/programs/agriculture-in-africa-public-spending-priorities>

<http://www.ifpri.org/publication/public-expenditures-agricultural-and-rural-development-africa>

http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/Pnads602.pdf

Page 64 line 29 Domestic Private Finance

Analysis of private finance given in links below. Is this distinct from private sector activity by corporate entities or philanthropies? The report states on p. 64, line 30 “In the context of financing sustainable development or FSN, the private sector includes a range of 30 diverse actors, from households to multinational corporations and from direct investors to financial 31 intermediaries, such as banks and pension funds” (UN (2014). Are all these domestically sourced?

This section on domestic private finance has to recognize local private sector (farmers, SMEs and local large corporations). Much more can be said about the private sector’s ability to finance FSN than the need for companies to sign the “Principles for Responsible Investment” and the UN Global Compact. The private sector must be recognized for its important contributions and not just for its potential in causing harm.

The report prepared by United Nations Development Programme and Philippine Business for the Environment "Philippine Business Contributions to the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals" <http://sdg-biz-ph.org/> reports on domestic investments with multi-sectoral partnerships with the government as well as the launch of a pilot online portal in September 2016 to report on these initiatives.

Another important group in providing resource and influence are consumers/households. Their choices of products to purchase influence the

production and investment in the agriculture and food value chains. This is mentioned on page 16 (line 2) but could be followed up with more substance in 4.3.2.

Further references:

<http://unsdsn.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/150529-The-Roles-of-Public-and-Private-Development-Finance.pdf>
https://www.oecd.org/daf/inv/investment-policy/PFIA_April2013.pdf

Page 66, line 15 International Private Finance

If corporate activities and that of philanthropy are included, then the following link are is relevant
<http://sdgfunders.org/sdgs/dataset/recent/goal/zero-hunger/>
<http://www.businessfor2030.org/>
(search 'food' in main search bar or look under Goal 2)

The Rainforest Alliance and the Citi Foundation's Sustainable Value Chain Finance Workshop held on April 20, 2011 in New York City, brought together actors in agriculture value chains—representing buyers, exporters, retailers, producers, insurers, the financial sector, civil society, and development partners. Value chain finance encompasses the financial flows among the players within a value chain as well as financial flows from outside actors directed at the value chain. In recent years, as value chains have become more closely integrated and more sophisticated, dozens of new forms of in-kind and cash financing have developed to assist actors to produce more and better quality products, particularly in the agriculture sector.

<https://www.rainforest-alliance.org/sites/default/files/2016-08/sustainable-value-chain-finance-workshop-report.pdf>

Agriculture-related research at the Global Impact Investing Network:

<https://thegiin.org/research?filters=4&sortby=relevance%2Cnewest>

Innovation can help direct-to-farmer finance providers better serve farmers by addressing the challenges associated with direct-to-farmer lending. Through a collaborative research, design, and ideation process involving farmers, donors, finance providers, and more, Dalberg and the Initiative for Smallholder Finance has identified five opportunities for direct-to-farmer finance innovation.

<https://www.dalberg.com/system/files/2017-07/direct-to-farmer-finance-innovation-spaces-playbook.pdf>

Page 66, line 17 Blended Finance

OECD (2018), *Making Blended Finance Work for the Sustainable Development Goals*, OECD Publishing, Paris.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264288768-en>

http://www.ifc.org/wps/wcm/connect/242afe004c60ea82b81bbcaccf53f33d/EMCo_mplass+-+Blending+Public+and+Private+Finance.pdf?MOD=AJPERES

<https://www.oxfam.org/sites/www.oxfam.org/files/bp-private-finance-blending-for-development-130217-en.pdf>

5. CONCLUSION

The Introduction to this V0 Report rightly quotes the salient parts of SDG 17 (17.16): to “encourage and promote effective public, public-private and civil society partnerships”, that “mobilize and share knowledge, expertise, technology and financial resources, to support the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals in all countries, in particular developing countries”.

Furthermore, SDG 17 (17.17) also includes to “Encourage and promote effective public, public-private and civil society partnerships, building on the experience and resourcing strategies of partnerships”. Together with the AAAA, as drawn together in CFS 43 Report, it is imperative, with this clear global commitment, that partnerships are built and continuously improved.

It is also important to note that the UN has itself been developing the roles, understanding and working processes for multistakeholder partnerships which underlies the fact that SDG 17 and AAAA approaches to further use MSPs

already draws on a rich and established history. Some of the UN initiatives in Multi-stakeholder Partnerships include:

A General Assembly resolution – Towards global partnerships (2001). This stressed the need for member states to further discuss partnerships and consider ways and means to enhance cooperation between the UN and all relevant partners.

B Bali Guidelines for Partnerships 2002 at the World Summit on Sustainable Development considered multi-stakeholder partnerships to be a mechanism to deliver the political commitments and developed the **Bali Guidelines on Partnerships**.

1. Objective of Partnerships
2. Voluntary in Nature/Respect for fundamental Principles and Values
3. Link with Globally Agreed Outcomes
4. Integrated Approach to Sustainable Development
5. Transparency and Accountability
6. Tangible Results
7. Funding Agreements
8. New/Value Added Partnerships
9. Local involvement and international Impact

C World Summit on Sustainable Development 2002 included commitments and action-oriented multi-stakeholder platforms focused on deliverables and would contribute in translating political commitments into action.

D The UN Conference on Sustainable Development: Rio+20 included commitments by all stakeholders and their networks to implement concrete policies, plans, programmes, projects and actions to promote sustainable development and poverty eradication.

E 2015 UNGA Revision of the Guidelines on Cooperation between the UN and the Private Sector provides a framework to facilitate the formulation and implementation of partnerships between the United Nations and the business sector while safeguarding the integrity, impartiality and independence of the United Nations and preventing and mitigating potential risks of adverse impacts on people and the environment.

The current draft of the conclusion (page 70) draws on text from previous chapters, particularly lines 2-25. Use of language in line 26 e.g. “potential”

benefits and “evident” costs uses subjective language that has an implicit bias in the outcome. Statements such as these need to have references backing up such assertions and should recognise that all institutional entities “carries costs” and MSPs are not unique in this regard. Currently, this conclusion does not address any of the basic issues included in the CFS 43 Report Appendix E. For example, the CFS asked for ‘lessons’; statements (line 25) that “MSPs can be a learning process” is not a satisfactory response and that “innovations exist in inclusive finance that MSPs can undertake to intensify financing FSN” is only a restatement of AAAA findings.