**UN Food Systems Summit**

Current status of process and potential outcomes

**Member States question opaque, secretariat-led process and unclear outcomes**

The Special Envoy for the Food Systems Summit (UNFSS) hosted a consultation April 23 in which multiple member states (including Brazil, India, Chile, and Norway) raised serious concerns about:

* Member States’ limited ability to participate in and provide oversight for UNFSS preparations;
* Lack of information on the format and agenda of the July ministerial and September Summit;
* Lack of information and transparency about format, content, and status of any Summit outcome documents and whether they will be considered “endorsed” by Summit participants.

 **“Game changers” lack consistency, scientific evidence, and exclude many perspectives**

Each of the five UNFSS action tracks published a “synthesis paper,” highlighting solutions action track leaders believe should be advanced. Many of the so-called “[game changers](https://foodsystems.community/?attachment=2429&document_type=document&download_document_file=1&document_file=170)” propose punitive restrictions on specific foods, including nutrient-dense meat and dairy; take a negative view of modern agriculture and international trade; and miss opportunities to reflect the innovation and efficiency embodied in U.S. policy and practice. Efforts focused around promoting sustainable productivity, efficiency, and resilient crop and livestock production are not yet well reflected in current UNFSS preparations.

Some of the most problematic “game changers” currently being advanced by the UN include:

* Solution 1.3 - Fiscal Policy *(No single author or source identified)*

Calls for taxes on “unhealthy foods” (including sugar-sweetened beverages, which the WHO has defined to include dairy beverages); taxes “related to carbon footprint”; subsidies for “healthy foods”; and an “income transfer model.”

* Solution 2.8 – Labeling *(Sources: World Health Organization, World Obesity Federation)*

Conflates nutrition and environmental “badging” (i.e., interpretive front of pack labeling) and claims without evidence that “FOPL is a recognized cost-effective policy to address the rising prevalence of obesity, NCDs and climate change.”

* Solution 2.10 - Demand package *(Named sources include CGIAR, GAIN, Copenhagen Business School, World Obesity Federation, World Resources Institute, NCD Alliance)*

Admits that the impacts of “on-pack labels, dietary guidelines, limitations on advertising, controls on retail distribution and display and variable tax rates on certain foods” are actually “modest” but claims that “more substantial” changes are possible “when brought together as a “package of interventions.”

* Solution 2.15 - “Just Transition” *(Source: 50x40)*

Broadly claims that animal source foods are “detrimental to our planet, ecosystems, resources, human health and animal welfare.” Calls for promoting plant-based diets by “repurposing” agricultural subsidies, “reshaping conventional trade agreements,” introducing “food sustainability taxes,” changing national dietary guidelines and public procurement rules, etc.

[50x40](https://50by40.org/)’s public goal is to cut the global production and consumption of animal products by 50% by 2040.While the proposal does not include a specific target, it states that “high-income countries are currently consuming double the recommended daily income of animal products” and that studies suggest “diets with few or no animal products at all can be beneficial for certain groups.” The solution calls for developing “country-specific transition roadmaps” to be incorporated in nationally determined commitments for COP26 and the Paris Climate Agreement stocktaking in 2025.

* Solution 3.4 - “Codex Planetarius” *(Source: the World Wildlife Fund)*

Proposes to create an international standard-setting body for “environmental standards” modeled on the Codex Alimentarius (the current international standard-setting body for food safety and trade). Solution 3.4 does not offer further detail on the proposed “Codex Planetarius” governance, mandate, scope, funding, interaction with other international organizations, etc.