**Summary of Action Areas and template responses to public survey**

After each UN FSS action track released in late March a “synthesis paper” highlighting chosen solutions from wave 1 submissions, the secretariat further narrowed the game changers it proposes to advance in the FSS process and reorganized the game changers into 15 “[action areas](https://foodsystems.community/game-changing-propositions/).” Stakeholders are able to submit comments on each of the Action Areas, responding to the three questions on each of their respective pages. Comments can address 1) how the action area could be strengthened (mandatory); 2) what existing initiatives relate to the action area, and 3) what role the commenter would be willing to play in advancing the action area. The Action Areas were posted on May 7, and while the deadline for comments is unclear, UN staff have noted they should be **submitted as soon as possible.**

Based on previous feedback, some suggestions are provided below that may help inform organizations responding to the action area surveys. A table summarizing the game changers chosen by the UN in each action area is also included. The summaries and comments provided are not exhaustive but may help inform analysis/submissions. The UN’s full summary list of all wave 1 game changers is available [here](https://foodsystems.community/?attachment=2429&document_type=document&download_document_file=1&document_file=170).

**PRIORITY ACTION AREAS FOR COMMENT**

**Action Area 1.1: Promote food security and reduce hunger**

**LINK:** [**https://foodsystems.community/action-area-1-1-2/**](https://foodsystems.community/action-area-1-1-2/)

**How can this action area be strengthened?**

The role of technological innovations should be further emphasized as a critical driver for increasing food security and decreasing hunger. According to the 2020 Global Agricultural Productivity (GAP) report, in order to sustainably double the amount of food, feed, fiber, and bioenergy needed to nourish nearly 10 billion people in 2050, “agricultural productivity needs to increase at an average annual rate of 1.73%” - an increase that cannot be feasibly achieved without technology.

Technological innovations in agriculture and food chains have facilitated agriculture and dramatic improvements in environmental impact in recent decades, including by reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and optimizing land, water, and energy use, all while increasing food production for a growing population and working to reduce food waste. Technology enables farmers to produce high quality, high-yielding crops that have a direct bearing on improved food security and poverty alleviation with increased production, while also, for example, increasing resilience to heat and drought.

Technology and innovation should be elevated in many different areas of focus, including crop protection and plant breeding. The power of these technologies includes enhancing soil health to grow more food on less land; creating high-yield plant varieties that produce more consistent quality and plants that stay fresh longer; optimizing processes for producing sustainable chemicals, biobased products, and biofuels; and more.

Solutions 1.2 and 1.16 are promising in their support for use and/or expansion of technology and data, but more work is needed to address practical challenges of ensuring access to basic support like smart phones and broadband data, as well as to determine effective ways to connect partners. Technology and broadband access need to be scaled appropriately and made available and affordable to farms of all sizes, with continual outreach to keep farmers abreast of technology changes.

In addition to strengthening the overall focus on technology and innovation at the center of food security and combating hunger, the action area should be expanded to address the necessary evidence-based regulatory frameworks needed to assure approval and acceptance of food produced with modern technological practices. Modern agricultural and food production/manufacturing practices advance sustainable food systems while efficiently meeting nutritional needs. The FSS should promote rather than discourage scientific and technological advancements in food systems in order to help deliver affordable access to nutrition and support food security. Supporting proven agricultural practices must be part of the solution to tackle food insecurity and protect our environment. In fact, encouraging shifts to less efficient production practices could worsen food insecurity and damage environmental outcomes.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Topic** | **Source** | **Notes** |
| 1.1 | Zero Hunger Fund | No single named source but directly inspired by the Ceres2030 Report and PARI (2020) report. | No clarity on how the fund would operate or be administered. The tone of the proposal takes an inherently negative view of the private sector, particularly food companies, and invokes external judgments on companies' existing efforts, reputations, and the nature of such a fund. References Pope Francis' call for such a fund and comments from South Korean President Moon that some companies are "winners" from COVID-19. |
| 1.2 | Democratize precision ag tech | "Emerged from ideas submitted by the public and was built out by Working Group members” | Acknowledges the value of ag tech and proposes approaches like using smart phone apps to help smallholder farmers access better information on climate, planting conditions, etc. Promising elements, but the proposal does not address practical challenges connecting public/private partners, challenges access to basic support like smart phones/broadband data.  Does not mention further opportunities such as crop protection, GMO, or other new breeding technology. There is also no mention of the necessary evidence-based regulatory frameworks for approval and acceptance. |
| 1.3 | Social protection networks | No named source | Proposes scaling social protection programs with emphasis on expanding cash transfers developed during COVID-19. |
| 1.4 | Catalytic funding for SMEs | AfDB, GAIN, SAFIN Secretariat, GAFSP and ResponsAbility | Proposes a multi-donor fund advancing agri-food SME financing to operate at regional level, with capital channelled across food chain |
| 1.16 | Biofortified crops | "Emerged from programmatic learnings between GAIN, HarvestPlus and other partners." | Innovations like biofortification present efficient, affordable, broad-scale opportunities to eliminate micronutrient deficiencies.  Does not mention opportunities to include crop protection, GMO, or other new breeding technology. There is also no mention of the necessary evidence-based regulatory frameworks for approval/acceptance. |
| 3.17 | Tree-based foods | World Agroforestry (ICRAF) and the Centre for International Forestry Research (CIFOR) and other scientists/stakeholders | Proposes community-based agenda setting for food tree-based landscape restoration that will deliver triple win of healthier diets, healthier landscapes and climate change mitigation. |

**Action Area 1.2: Improve access to nutritious foods**

**LINK:** [**https://foodsystems.community/action-area-1-2/**](https://foodsystems.community/action-area-1-2/)

**How can this action area be strengthened?**

As there is no single, universal healthy diet or definition of individual foods as nutritious without context of an overall balanced diet, solutions in this space should ensure that consumers are supported in accessing and choosing foods that meet their needs, tastes, budget, cultural context, etc.

Consumers need a variety of foods to make tailored and affordable choices that meet their personal, cultural, and traditional preferences. Innovation in areas such as food processing, product formulation, storage, and distribution support these needs, and supporting SMEs’ access to research, technology, and innovation is a promising area of focus.

There is no single, universal diet, set of farming or production practices, or group of policies that can or should be applied in all contexts. The FSS’ recommendations should avoid overly prescriptive or “one-size-fits-all” approaches and should allow adaptation as needed to suit myriad production and manufacturing systems; development circumstances; historical, cultural, and personal contexts; and other factors.

This action area misses opportunities to support production and consumption of nutrient-dense foods. Solution 1.15 on tackling iron deficiency does not seem to be included in any action area, despite the global prevalence of iron deficiency and the critical role of animal-source foods as high-quality sources of easily digested iron and other nutrients.

This action area and all FSS outcomes would be strengthened by greater emphasis on the positive role of rules-based international trade: Rules-based international trade is a major contributor to food security around the world, as it increases access, availability, and affordability of food. FSS outcomes should promote rules-based international trade and support access to international markets for agricultural and food products.

Finally, FSS outcomes would be strengthened by maximizing the benefits of engagement with the private sector while operating under clear guidelines consistent with international and domestic obligations and best practice.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Topic** | **Source** | **Notes** |
| 1.6 | Cold chain | Prof. Toby Peters of the Univ. of Birmingham, in collaboration w/Prof Pawanexh Kohli, previously CEO of the National Centre for Cold-Chain Development, India. | Proposes community-focused efforts to create cold storage and cold chain capacity, with benefits for connectivity to markets, reducing food waste, and even knock-on benefits for (e.g.) health product supply chains. Stemming from discussions between AT1 and the Cool Coalition. |
| 1.7 | PPPs for investment in infrastructure for public procurement | **No single named source** but "came up regularly in AT1 conversations" and group member Jessica Fanzo (formerly of the EAT-Lancet Commission) contributed. | Proposes to reduce direct costs, transaction costs, and risks for investment in infrastructure to connect smallholders/entrepreneurs with local markets and procurement. Includes two elements: 1) a "Back to basics investment partnership" to promote investment in infrastructure, education, and market access and 2) "guaranteed institutional markets" - the latter would seem to erect potential trade barriers by favoring only certain producers and references redirecting current crop subsidies. |
| 1.10 | Women-led, neglected crops | Members of AT1, Maureen Muketha, founder of Tule Vyema, and Alessandro Meschinelli of the Global Forum on Agricultural Research and Innovation. | Focuses on women’s economic empowerment and agency in decision-making via improved growing/markets for neglected crops. Goal is to build on existing efforts in Asia, East Africa and Latin America countries. Organizers discussing in cross-cutting coalition with AT3. |
| 1.11 | Nutrition-sensitive social protection networks | Initiated by WG member Julio Berdegue | Proposes to augment and adapt national cash transfer programmes to help nutritionally vulnerable households afford healthier diets, while stimulating food systems to supply nutritious foods. Will use existing tools to calculate the size of the affordability gap in different gaps but no further elaboration. |
| 1.13 | Virtual nutritious foods innovation hub | WG member Ndidi Nwuneli; endorsed by Sight & Life and Partners in Food Solutions. | Acknowledges that modern consumers often desire affordable, convenient, easy-to-prepare, and ready-to-eat food, which requires investment in research and development for product formulation, storage, and distribution. Supporting access to research, technology, and innovation for SMEs is appropriate, but the solution should be careful not to mischaracterize or denigrate food processing, which allows many such innovations to be brought to market. References WEF Food Innovation Hubs as precedent. |
| 1.21 | New standards for private sector change | AT1 Lead, Lawrence Haddad, and B Lab | Based on the B Corp Movement. Incorporates voluntary engagement in B Corp type movements but also creation of new legal obligations. "1) the creation of best-in-class, social and environmental food standards to drive behaviour change in the private sector, coupled with 2) the promotion and adoption of a corporate legal framework that holds companies accountable for their impact on society and the environment." Source = Laurance Hadad and the B Lab. Claims total costs to research, develop, and implement these new standards, produce the Stakeholder Governance Toolkit for Government, and write and promote five case studies would be an investment of less than $3 million. |

**Action Area 1.3: Making food safer**

**LINK:** [**https://foodsystems.community/action-area-1-3/**](https://foodsystems.community/action-area-1-3/)

**How can this action area be strengthened?**

Safe food is the foundation of all efforts to increase food security, and combatting foodborne illness continues to be a core challenge in many parts of the world. This action area should increase focus on implementing internationally-agreed food safety standards under the leadership of the Codex Alimentarius, as well as sharing successful experiences in evidence-based food safety regulation.

For example, the United States’ robust regulatory framework includes prevention-based policies and practices that ensure meat, poultry and eggs are wholesome, safe and properly labeled. Prevention must be the anchor and science the basis for every food safety action. Science, data and research have led to tremendous innovations, for example the U.S. Department of Agriculture has worked to: patent new technology for protecting pasteurized liquid eggs; examine the safety of beef trim imports; and publish genomes of six dangerous strains of E. coli.

Solutions should increase investment in food safety research, education, and extension projects that will help build a modern public health system that meets the evolving needs of the farm-to-fork system.

It is critical that solutions not duplicate or undermine the work and mandate of existing international organizations or standards, such as the Codex Alimentarius. Where food safety standards are referenced or suggested, those standards must be consistent with Codex standards and other international and domestic obligations.

**What are already existing initiatives you know of that relate to this action area?**

Tools like the [USDA Meat and Poultry Hotline](https://www.fsis.usda.gov/wps/portal/fsis/programs-and-services/contact-centers/usda-meat-and-poultry-hotline), the [USDA Food Safety Discovery Zone](https://www.fsis.usda.gov/wps/portal/fsis/topics/food-safety-education/get-answers/usda-food-safety-discovery-zone-mobile) traveling exhibit and [Ask USDA](https://ask.usda.gov/) are key components of USDA's consumer education programs and may provide examples or lessons learned for food safety solutions.

USDA is also a major contributor of consumer food safety content to the website, [FoodSafety.gov](https://www.foodsafety.gov/), the gateway to U.S. federal food safety information.

To further engage consumers about the importance of food safety at home, USDA launched in 2011 the [*Food Safe Families* campaign](https://www.foodsafety.gov/keep/basics/index.html), in partnership with the Ad Council. The campaign is a national, multi-media food safety public education effort that includes messages in English and Spanish and motivates consumers to take four simple steps - clean, separate, cook and chill - to prevent foodborne illness.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Topic** | **Source** | **Notes** |
| 1.17 | Global food safety index | “From the WG” | This solution proposes a Global Food Safety Index to be managed by an international government organization but does not specify governance, funding, etc. The proposal does not mention Codex. |
| 1.18 | Global Alliance for Safe Food for All | “From the WG” | This solution proposes to establish an alliance with global headquarters and 8-10 regional centers in LMICs, based on mapping of foodborne disease burden, "ideally linked to existing institutions with food safety capacity so as to reduce the lead time." The centers would focus on the informal food sector. The proposal does not reference Codex. |
| 1.19 | Food safety toolkit | “From the WG” | Focused on standards, tools, information, and enforcement in the informal food sector. |

**Action Area 2.1 Enabling, inspiring, and motivating people to enjoy healthy and sustainable options**

**LINK:** [**https://foodsystems.community/action-area-2-1/**](https://foodsystems.community/action-area-2-1/)

**How can this action area be strengthened?**

This action area misses critical opportunities to promote multisectorial, evidence-based approaches to helping consumers build and maintain overall balanced and sustainable diets (one specific solution from other action areas is also relevant here - workplace nutrition programs as in solution 1.9).

The focus of solutions on education could be beneficial, but several proposals here are overly narrow and unjustifiably targets specific foods (including nutrient-dense meat and dairy) as “unhealthy.” If such solutions are pursued, they should be evidence-based and adapted to different national circumstances, for example relevant national and international dietary guidelines. Some of the specific principles invoked in this action area are not from internationally-agreed or endorsed sources. Information and education efforts should focus on nutrient-density, diet diversity, and overall balanced diets and should also reflect the value of science, technology, innovation in building healthy and sustainable diets.

Similarly, school feeding, procurement, and market-based solutions should allow adaptation to national and other contexts and should not erect barriers to trade, which is instrumental in increasing access to and availability of diverse foods.

This action area misses opportunities to support production and consumption of nutrient-dense foods like meat, poultry, dairy, and eggs, which contribute to addressing all forms of malnutrition and are recognized in many international and national dietary guidelines as critical sources of essential nutrients including high-quality protein, calcium, phosphorus, potassium, iodine, and vitamins B2 and B12.

Evidence does not support classifying individual foods as “healthy” or “unhealthy” (without context of overall diet), and such classifications should not be used to recommend overly-prescriptive measures in areas like marketing, labeling, or fiscal policy. Some of the proposals in this action area are not consistent with previous international consensus, including the Committee on Food Security’s Voluntary Guidelines on Food Systems and Nutrition, may conflict with domestic and international regulatory frameworks and legal obligations, and do not acknowledge the ongoing work and mandate of international organizations including the Codex Alimentarius (i.e., on front of pack labeling, nutrient profiling, and marketing of breastmilk substitutes).

Overall, this action area and FSS outcomes would be strengthened by increased focus on ensuring all foods optimize their environmental and diet quality impacts.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Topic** | **Source** | **Notes** |
| 1.8 | Equitable food marketing | Paul Newnham & Rosie Cowper SDG2 Advocacy Hub, Alyson Greenhalgh Ball, founder of Conscious Impact | Makes broad statements classifying certain foods as healthy or unhealthy per se and dictates overly-prescriptive approaches to marketing, including requiring disclosure of all companies' marketing spend and taxing sales/marketing of "unhealthy" foods. The proposal reflects a limited understanding of marketing fundamentals - for example, the challenge in marketing fruits and vegetables that typically are not branded and have no/little differentiation within their categories. |
| 1.12 | School feeding | Irish Baguilat, WFP, FAO, Chile, and experts outside of the working group | Aims to expand school feeding programs and ensure cohesive frameworks defining funding and aligning with food quality and nutritional guidelines. Cites good practices such as Brazilian model of linking schooling feeding with local farmers. Ambition to have local and regional organization. Notes that Chile, China and Germany have championed similar approaches. |
| 1.14 | Policy coherence | Lorena Allemandi, Pan American Health Organization (PAHO) w/member Sirpa Sarlio, adjunct prof of nutrition at the University of Helinski | "This solution proposes to: 1) provide "clarity" on nutrient profiling on ‘healthy’ and ‘unhealthy’ foods for the purpose of policy implementation at the national and subnational level (e.g., which foods should be taxed); 2) build capacity on designing and implementing food taxes, labelling, and marketing restrictions; 3) helping countries "anticipate and overcome potential policy barriers" and "vested interests"; and 4) change the narrative on healthy food environment policies (e.g., integrating child rights in advocacy). The solution references "ultra-processed" food (a term for which there is no definition and no evidence that level of processing is associated with health outcomes per se) and calls for tobacco-style approaches to food policy. |
| 2.3 | Fiscal policy | No named source | Member states have repeatedly and specifically declined to endorse fiscal policy prescriptions like those in the solution proposition (e.g., during negotiation of the 2021 CFS Voluntary Guidelines on Food Systems and Nutrition and the 2018 political declaration of the UN High Level Meeting on NCDs). The proposition fails to reflect the reality that there is no single, universal definition of healthy diet and that individual foods cannot be defined as "healthy" or "unhealthy" in isolation. Evidence does not support taxation as a method to improve health outcomes or reduce obesity (e.g., Mexico's taxes on sugar-sweetened beverages and certain foods has had negligible impact on calorie consumption and obesity rates). |
| 2.4 | Education | Led by Helen Harwatt, Chatham House and Barbara Gates, Lean and Green Kids, with reference to multiple existing initiatives | In general, educational programs offer opportunities. However, the proposal is very focused on one particular set of priorities ("Health People, Healthy Planet" - phraseology that echoes the EAT-Lancet diet) and calls for education to target, for example, animal-source foods. If this solution is pursued, information and education efforts should be broad and cover the value of science, technology, innovation, and focus on nutrient-density and overall balanced diets. |
| 2.8 | Front of pack labeling | Cites various existing labeling schemes and supporting organizations | Front-of-pack labeling and nutrient profiling. FSS outcomes should not duplicate or undermine existing international standards workstreams related to front of pack labeling and should be consistent with existing international consensus, as well as domestic and international regulatory frameworks and legal obligations. |
| 2.9 | Breastfeeding | Cites public submissions including Mexican National Institute of Public Health and UNICEF Mexico | Basis for this solution comes from various WHO, UNICEF, UNESCO, PAHO, FAO, IBFAN and other UN initiatives already taking place. Addresses labeling and marketing of breastmilk substitutes. The proposition also makes inappropriate comparisons between food policy and anti-tobacco policy/approaches. |
| 2.10 | Demand package | “Based on conversations w/in AT2 and range of solutions submitted” | Concedes that the impact of multiple proposed measures ("on-pack labels, dietary guidelines, limitations on advertising, controls on retail distribution and display and variable tax rates (e.g. soda tax)") is "modest." It claims that combining a "package of interventions" will have greater impact but offers no evidence to that effect. |
| 2.16 | Food-based dietary guidelines | Multiple submissions | FSS outcomes should allow adaptation to national and other contexts, which may or may not permit incorporating factors like environmental sustainability into national food based dietary guidelines. |
| 2.19 | Education through web-based tools and providing school meals | No named source | Aims to address problem of food illiteracy - including dietary choices, handling of food waste, choices on farming practices and management of food production landscapes. Solution is child education from an early age and focus on long-term investment. Successful examples cited of Brazil and Denmark which have “driven transformational change.” In Denmark, solution was serving 90% organically sourced food in school cafeterias. |
| 4.11 | Supermarkets buy local | Draws on outcomes of CFS HLF on Connecting Smallholders to Markets | Calls for an international organization (FAO or CFS) to administer a global commitment by "main global supermarket chains operating in the Global South, to source, by 2030, at least 1/3 of the net value of its fresh products supplies from local small-producers (directly or via coops or farmers’ groups)." |

**Action Area 2.2 Food waste**

**LINK:** [**https://foodsystems.community/action-area-2-2/**](https://foodsystems.community/action-area-2-2/)

**How can this action area be strengthened?**

The animal food industry plays a significant role in helping to close the food supply cycle and in reducing food waste that would otherwise end up in landfills. For example, more than 40% of U.S. animal feed ingredients are by-products from other production processes, such as soybean oil and dried distillers’ grains, and pet food makes use of nutritious ingredients left over from human food production (e.g., unsold bakery or brewery items or wholesome parts of the animal that people do not eat). Nearly 90% of food waste from frozen food facilities in the United States is repurposed for animal feed.

Proposals in this action area related to reducing food waste by leveraging diversion of waste into animal feedstock should be cross-referenced with proposals in other action areas that discourage production and consumption of animal source foods, to ensure that all action areas acknowledge the value of sustainable animal source food production including as a food waste solution.

**What are already existing initiatives you know of that relate to this action area?**

Diverting food waste away from landfills is a key goal of the [Food Waste Reduction Alliance](https://foodwastealliance.org/), including through partnership with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Topic** | **Source** | **Notes** |
| 2.11 | Food is never waste | Richard Swannell, WRAP, WS3 member | Proposes to expand current and advance new tech to ensure no food is wasted. Measures include: (i) Mandatory segregation of food waste by businesses and households; (ii) incentives for food donation; (iii) mandatory measurement of food waste by businesses; (iv) taxing or banning landfill and incineration of food waste; and (v) incentivizing use of FLW as a feedstock for added value products such as new processed foods, animal feed or fertilizer production. |
| 2.12 | 15x50x30 | WRI, WRAP, WWF, World Bank, Consumer Goods Forum (CGF) and multiple other sources | Proposes that 150 countries launch national public-private partnerships and campaigns to reduce their food loss and waste by 50% by 2030. |
| 2.13 | Activate the activists to end food waste | Dr. Liz Goodwin, WRI, WS3 Deputy Lead | Idea is to establish a global network of activists to halve food waste, enabling locally driven action. Organisations involved in this effort are Unilever, WWF, Wageningen University, UNEP, WRAP and WRI. Would involve leveraging social media with an end goal to shift social norm so that it is no longer culturally acceptable to waste food. |
| 3.13 | Decrease on-farm and post-harvest loss | WWF, World Bank, Rabobank, WFBR, Olam Group, IFPRI, WUR, CIAT, CGIAR-CCAFS, FAO, UNEP | Invest $1 trillion to reduce global food loss of high-impact commodities by 2025, including in beef, dairy and rice supply chains the solution claims contribute at least 70% of agricultural greenhouse gas emissions globally. |
| 5.14 | Grains storage | WFP, (Burkina Faso, Tanzania, Zambia, Burundi, Niger, and Rwanda) | Proposes scaling existing post-harvest loss programs to address the ⅔ of unconsumed food lost at the beginning of the food chain. Proposes to implement policies supporting PHLM including through national agricultural policy frameworks; analysis to understand bottlenecks; integrated programming for knowledge, access to technologies; and knowledge generation and practice sharing. |

**Action Area 3.1 Protect natural ecosystems**

**LINK:** [**https://foodsystems.community/action-area-3-1/**](https://foodsystems.community/action-area-3-1/)

**How can this action area be strengthened?**

All solutions in this action area and all FSS outcomes should reflect international consensus, not duplicate or undermine the work of existing international standard-setting bodies, respect all domestic and international obligations and commitments, uphold good regulatory practices, and support and expand the positive role of rules-based international trade.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Topic** | **Source** | **Notes** |
| 3.1 | Just transition through policy reform | Just Transition initiative | Proposes to study and eventually redirect/reform public support for agriculture. References as precedent: UK COP26 Presidency, the World Bank, the World Farmers Organization, OECD, FAO, WWF, UN Environment and the Just Rural Transition initiative. "Just transition" could be a problematic echo of solution 2.15. |
| 3.2 | Transforming commodity supply chains to benefit people and to protect and restore nature | Multi-stakeholder group including Tropical Forest Alliance, The Food and Land Use Coalition, WWF and WBCSD | Proposes to expand the existing Forests, Agriculture, Commodity Trade (FACT) Dialogue aimed at halting global deforestation and natural habitat conversion. Supported by UK COP26, WBCSD, others. |
| 3.4 | Codex Planetarius | WWF-US (Jason Clay, Executive Director) | Proposes an international standard setting body for environmental standards, modeled on the Codex Alimentarius. Does not specify governance, mandate, or overlap with existing international bodies. Claims some government support/”looking at” (UK in COP26, US “Climate Czar”) and cites private sector support such as "The World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD) has used its platform to publicise the concept. WWF is in touch with the Consumer Goods Forum (CGF), the Sustainable Agriculture Initiative Platform (SAI), and the World Economic Forum (and its subgroup, the Tropical Forest Alliance) about the concept. |
| 3.5 | Riparian buffers | UNFSS Areas of Collective Action & Innovation (ACAI) members | Solution aims to protect and restore native vegetation within private agricultural lands that acts as buffers to rivers, streams, wetlands etc. and can be affected by sediment and pollution if agricultural practices disregard their protection. |

**Action Area 3.2 Managing sustainably existing food systems**

**LINK:** [**https://foodsystems.community/action-area-3-2/**](https://foodsystems.community/action-area-3-2/)

**How can this action area be strengthened?**

Solution 2.15 mischaracterizes the environmental and nutritional impact of producing nutrient-dense animal source foods from livestock. The FSS should encourage, not denigrate, sustainable production and consumption of nutrient-dense foods like meat, poultry, dairy, and eggs, which contribute to addressing all forms of malnutrition and are recognized in many international and national dietary guidelines as critical sources of essential nutrients including high-quality protein, calcium, phosphorus, potassium, iodine, and vitamins B2 and B12. According to the UN Food and Agriculture Organization, livestock production directly employs 1.3 billion people around the world and supports many more indirectly, and livestock accounts for 40 percent of the global value of agricultural output.

Evidence does not support classifying individual foods as “healthy” or “unhealthy” (without context of overall diet), and such classifications should not be used to recommend overly-prescriptive measures in areas like marketing, labeling, or fiscal policy. Some of the proposals in this action area are not consistent with previous international consensus, including the Committee on Food Security’s Voluntary Guidelines on Food Systems and Nutrition, may conflict with domestic and international regulatory frameworks and legal obligations, and do not acknowledge the ongoing work and mandate of international organizations.

The action area would be further strengthened by solutions that acknowledge that all production systems can be made more sustainable and that producing enough food for the world’s population is not feasible without technology and innovation. The action area should also incorporate greater experience, perspectives, and practice as relates to regenerative agriculture, land use, conservation, sustainable livestock production practices, soil health, carbon sequestration, and land use - which also have cross-over synergies with other action areas including 3.3.

Technological innovations in agriculture and food chains have facilitated agriculture and dramatic improvements in environmental impact in recent decades, including by reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and optimizing land, water, and energy use, all while increasing food production for a growing population and working to reduce food waste. Modern agricultural practices like planting modern seed varieties and optimizing nutrient stewardship enable farmers to produce high quality, high-yielding crops that have a direct bearing on improved food security and poverty alleviation with increased production, while also, for example, increasing resilience to heat and drought.

Technology and innovation should be elevated in many different areas of focus, including crop protection and plant breeding. The power of these technologies includes enhancing soil health to grow more food on less land; creating high-yield plant varieties that produce more consistent quality and plants that stay fresh longer; optimizing processes for producing sustainable chemicals, biobased products, and biofuels; and more.

Modern agricultural and food production/manufacturing practices advance sustainable food systems while efficiently meeting nutritional needs. The FSS should promote rather than discourage scientific and technological advancements in food systems in order to help deliver affordable access to nutrition and support food security. Supporting proven agricultural practices must be part of the solution to tackle food insecurity and protect our environment. In fact, encouraging shifts to less efficient production practices could worsen food insecurity and damage environmental outcomes.

**What are already existing initiatives you know of that relate to this action area?**

Thanks in large part to large part to technology, new production practices and a commitment to continuous improvement, animal agriculture has made significant contributions to producing food using fewer resources than ever before. In the United States, farmers and ranchers produce beef using 33% less land, 12% less water, and with a 16% smaller carbon footprint in 2007 compared to 1977. Pork producers use 76% less land, 25% less water, and 7% less energy to produce twice as much pork. Chicken producers use 72% less land and 58% less water, with 36% lower GHG emissions.

U.S. beef, pork, poultry, lamb, and dairy producers are committed to develop transparent metrics and ambitious targets to further strengthen contributions to safe food, balanced diets, thriving communities, healthy and humanely treated animals, and the environment. U.S. dairy farmers lead the way on animal welfare standards, implementing the world’s first dairy welfare standard to meet the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) Technical Specification requirements as set by the World Organization for Animal Health (OIE). The FARM Animal Care pillar boasts participation from 99% of U.S. domestic milk production and includes more than 31,000 dairy farm participants from more than 130 cooperatives

and processors in 49 of the 50 U.S. states.

Dairy companies representing 74% of U.S. milk production have adopted the U.S. Dairy Stewardship Commitment, a rigorous set of standards that demonstrate positive impact and contribute to U.S. dairy’s ability to track, aggregate and report on progress. In 2020, the U.S. dairy industry made the commitment to be carbon neutral or better by 2050, while also optimizing water use and improving water quality.

The 4R Nutrient Stewardship Principles promoted and recognized by the fertilizer industry and the USDA Natural Resource Conservation Service provide a pathway to improved productivity and farmer profitability, improved water quality, and reducing GHG emissions. Case studies show the 4R principles at work. For example, one Illinois corn and soybean farmer reduced GHG emissions by 34%, improved nutrient use efficiency by 28%, and reduced cost of fertilizer management by $24 per acre.[[1]](#footnote-1)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Topic** | **Source** | **Notes** |
| 2.15 | Just transition away from livestock | [50by40](https://50by40.org/) | This proposition mischaracterizes the environmental and nutritional impact of producing nutrient-dense animal source foods from livestock. Meat and dairy are uniquely nutrient dense and are essential sources of protein, iron, zinc, and vitamin B12, and more - critical nutrients for cognitive and physical development particularly for hundreds of millions of children and women suffering from chronic and acute malnutrition. According to the UN Food and Agriculture Organization, livestock production directly employs 1.3 billion people around the world and supports many more indirectly, and livestock accounts for 40 percent of the global value of agricultural output. |
| 3.6 | Transforming agricultural innovation for climate, nature and people | First proposed in the ‘Actions to Transform Food Systems Under Climate Change’ report (Steiner et al., 2020), | Solution aims to ‘spin the dial’ on investments in agricultural research and development to focus on innovation and invest into initiatives that have demonstrated ability in providing end-to-end solutions working across the innovation ecosystem for food systems, with research targeted towards end user needs. Some examples of this in Latin America, with WEF partnerships to decarbonize food systems. Inputs include (i) inclusive dialogue to identify evidence-based approaches; (ii) investment in R&D, technology, knowledge sharing; (iii) realign agricultural innovation systems to address climate change; and (iv) identify best practices of scaling innovation. Needs to occur across context but with priority on low- and middle-income countries with agriculture dependence. Assumes buy-in from these countries. |
| 3.7 | Nature positive livestock | ACAI members and other sources | This proposal mentions many benefits and innovations already occurring and that could be expanded in sustainable livestock production, including use of feed additives, feed innovations to increase feed conversion. Specifically mentions Dairy Sustainability Framework. |
| 3.8 | Regenerative agriculture | "Nominated by several food dialogues and members of the drafting committee” | Relatively broad, flexible focus on soils, biodiversity, water, nutrient cycling. Proposes building a coalition of strategic partners who will invest in building a network of Regenerative Food Scapes - living labs or food production, with a prioritizing of regenerative solutions for investment and scaling. |
| 3.9 | Agroecology | “Inter-disciplinary group from various constituencies” | Solution presents a framework for agroecology based on FAO 10 Elements of Acroecology to guide policy makers, practitioners and stakeholders. Focus on (i) providing women and men farmers with improved access to knowledge about agroecology; (ii) redirect significant funding to agroecology research; and (iii) build and foster solid value chains and access to local markets for agroecology-based products while abandoning subsidies for unsustainable practices. Notes interest in agroecology from EU ‘Farm to Fork’, Senegal, Togo, Mexico, India, Bhutan and France, as well as CSOs. |
| 3.10 | Agrobiodiversity | First developed from Food Forever Initiative | Proposes to tackle the 4 dimensions of the knowledge gap, the incentives for use of agrobiodiversity in production systems, the policy necessary to enable more diverse systems and the required financial investment and incentives mechanisms. Agrobiodiversity can be a component of the solution to climate change, malnutrition, land degradation and biodiversity loss. “Interested countries” include the United States, European countries, South Korea, Japan, Australia, and New Zealand |
| 3.11 | Blue food production systems | “Collaborative process between EDF and Stockholm Resilience Centre” and others | Proposes: (i) development of national nutritional and livelihood assessments that account for the role of blue foods in delivering protein and micronutrients; and (ii) policy and funding decisions in support of effective fishery management and/or launch of ‘next generation’ sustainable aquaculture. |
| 3.15 | Climate smart food systems fund | CCAFS program, led by the Alliance for Bioversity International and CIAT | Aims to launch a $200m impact investment fund providing long-term expansion debt financing to SMEs in Asia Pacific, Latin America and Africa. Will assist increase in food production and transition to nature-positive, low-carbon and climate-resilient global food systems. |
| 3.16 | Blue food | ACAI Action Track 3 discussions | Designing aquatic food systems to be equitable and inclusive, with efficiencies that minimize waste (e.g. by-catch, fish-farm outputs, supply chain losses). |
| 3.24 | Indigenous peoples' food systems | Various FAO offices incl. Indigenous peoples unit | Indigenous peoples’ territories cover 28% of the world’s land surface and harbour 80% of the planet’s biodiversity. This solution aims to address vulnerabilities and increase indigenous peoples’ food systems resilience, and degradation of forest and water ecosystems. It also will recognise the Indigenous Foods Systems approach as an effective landscape management approach that can contribute to ensuring food and water security and mitigate climate change. |
| 4.8 | Agroecological network chains for small farmers and indigenous communities | No named source | Solution aims to support the transition of 10 value chains in 50 countries towards agro-ecology-based solutions, relying on strong inclusion of small farmers and indigenous communities. REquires development of innovative services, and provision of bio-inputs, seeds and access to finance. Notes that some European support for agroecology, but equally that some groups of countries, firms and associations are clearly against it, instead favouring high-input industrial agriculture. |
| 5.16 | Agroecology | Cites various precedents | Starts with premise that "the world’s agriculture and food systems are the opposite of resilient" and that "The fragile system of industrial agriculture has brought humanity to the brink of agricultural disaster." Includes elements of regenerative agriculture and notes commitments from General Mills, Cargill, and McDonalds by name. Calls for broader awareness and implementation of FAO 10 Elements of Agroecology framework and Tool for Agroecology Performance Evaluation (TAPE). |

**Action Area 3.3 Restoring degraded ecosystems**

**LINK:** [**https://foodsystems.community/action-area-3-3/**](https://foodsystems.community/action-area-3-3/)

**How can this action area be strengthened?**

This action area can be strengthened by further reflecting and building on proven efforts to proactively implement good soil health, maintenance, and conservation practices. Efforts such as planting more cover crops, using more conservation tillage, and using more no-till methods preserve and increase nutrients, improve water quality, and trap excess carbon in the soil. In the United States, 15% of all farmland is used for conservation & wildlife habitat. The U.S. soybean crop uses conservation tillage on 70% of acres, and 40% of U.S. soybean acreage is no-till.

Technology and innovation also have a role to play in protecting and restoring our environment. Seed varieties developed for cover crops and grasses promote carbon sequestration and improve soil health, while seed varieties developed for conservation can restore land damaged by mining, forest fires or other environmental disasters. Biotech crops, such as those that require no-tilling, have saved 27.1 billion kg of carbon dioxide, equivalent to taking 16.7 million cars off the road. The use of feed additives for ruminant livestock has been demonstrated to reduce methane levels produced by ruminants during digestion by up to 30%.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Topic** | **Source** | **Notes** |
| 3.19 | Enhanced restoration monitoring and data to guide investment | Organizations involved with the Task force on Monitoring in support of the UN Decade on Ecosystem Restoration | Estimates put the current finance gap to achieve biodiversity protection at between $598-824 billion. This solution claims to offer the potential to increase efficiency from current conservation expenditure, whilst promoting the tools needed for adaptive management and to help identify further opportunities for targeted financial investments. Solution proposes the development of a holistic monitoring system and geospatial platform to complement existing reporting processes at all levels, under one umbrella. Will enable knowledge transfer and develop capacity of local people to monitor and report their own restoration progress. |
| 3.18 | Restoring grasslands, shrublands and savannahs through extensive livestock-based food systems | Consultative process of different stakeholders facilitated by WWF’s Grasslands and Savannah Platform. | Solution proposes to (i) establish multi-stakeholder platform to raise awareness of value and advocate for protection, sustainable use and restoration; (ii) develop global data platform; (iii) Develop good practices in restorations through nature-positive livestock production/food systems; (iv) awareness raising of livestock production/food systems in protection and restoration; and (v) improve investments in restoration, including public, commercial and private finance. Some mobilization on this issue with good practices from WWF, WOCAT and GASL. Potential political support from Mongolia, Ethiopia, Australia, Afghanistan, Burkina Faso, Finland, Jordan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Sudan and Namibia but further developments likely to come from WWF. |
| 3.22 | Soils Investment Hub | WBCSD | Based on expanding WBCSD’s Soils Investment Hub (SIH), aims to convene and facilitate a coalition of companies and key soil stakeholders to set investment commitments and develop a method, tools and guidance for food and agriculture companies to align their investments to accelerate and scale healthy soil agriculture practices. |
| 3.23 | Soil health, carbon sequestration | No named source | Inspired by the 2018 publication: The Business Case for Investing in Soil Health. Furthermore, a session organized during the November UNFCCC Race to Zero event co-hosted by 4 per 1000 Initiative, World Farmers Organisation and WBCSD Soil as a Climate Solution: Getting to Scale, coalesced a number of organizations around the topic. Most recently, a joint publication with the U.S. Farmers and Ranchers in Action (USFRA), Transformative Investment in Climate-Smart Agriculture, highlighted the scope and scale of the opportunity in the United States. Gamechanger submissions from Bayer, Syngenta and the Baltic Group were also considered in putting this proposal together. |

**OTHER ACTION AREAS**

**Action Area 4.1 Rebalancing agency within food systems**

**LINK:** [**https://foodsystems.community/action-area-4-1/**](https://foodsystems.community/action-area-4-1/)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Topic** | **Source** | **Notes** |
| 2.6 | Civil society and youth:Mobilizing civil society and lifting up youth-led initiatives | Bloomberg Philanthropies, Food@COP, Real Food Systems, Youth Climate Save, Youth Pledge, the Food Foundation (UK), and others | The solution outlines the ‘Bloomberg Approach’ - purposeful funding of civil society will create social demand that will compel governments and the food industry to act. This will enhance the reach and impact of youth-created and youth-led civil society interventions underway to redirect food environments in a more healthy and sustainable direction. |
| 2.17 | Women’s Economic Empowerment for Sustainable and Healthy Consumption Patterns | Susan Kaaria, FAO | Proposes 50 countries create, finance, and implement national plans for the economic empowerment of women to achieve sustainable and healthy consumption patterns by 2030. Aims to (i) enhance women’s decision-making in policy and programming; (ii) empower women in value chains to increase production of nutritious food; (iii) enhance women’s access to and control over means of food production; (iv) ensure access and affordability of quality food, especially for rural women and the poor; (v) incentivize gender-responsive research; and (vi) strengthen women’s knowledge and voice as educated consumers to counteract the movement for processed foods. |
| 3.3 | Strengthening Indigenous and Tribal Peoples’ Rights to Management of their Territories | Cites Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES), IPCC special report on land and CLIMATE, others. | This solution calls for the recognition and protection of indigenous populations’ lands, forests and water supplies. The solution calls for new technological and governmental assistance to achieve this end as well as the introduction of agroecology and precision agriculture technology investment in tribal communities. |
| 4.4 | Land tenure | AT4 Leadership group discussion | This solution aims to secure land tenure rights for and with people, responding to the needs and protecting the rights of those who live on and from the land in achieving and strengthening food security and food systems. It aims to address unequal land distribution and lack of tenure security; the people affected face adverse impact to plan, invest and produce food in a world where competition for land has never been greater. Assumption that democratic governance framework of countries facilitates transparent processes, with adequate investment by key stakeholders, political will to act and effective participation of local communities and CSOs ensured. |
| 4.6 | Social dialogues | ILO | Social dialogue is an important means of improving working conditions. Effective social dialogue in the agri-food sector can help ensure stable labour relations and boost productivity and quality of work life. The solution proposed is to promote social dialogue mechanisms, and enhance collective bargaining and negotiation. These platforms will give plantation workers and small-scale producers a voice in socio-economic development and ensure inclusive development. It notes widespread political support for the ILO’s Decent Work Agenda, including ILO Conventions as reflected in SDG 8. |
| 4.7 | Strengthening organization in the agri-food sector | ILO | The solution aims to improve legislation, and promote policies and action that support the establishment, growth and functioning of rural workers’ organization and guarantee freedom of association and collective bargaining, build capacity of coops, and empower producers to organize into formal associations. |
| 4.19 | Digital divide. Integrate Gender Transformative Approaches for equity and justice in food systems | AT4 Science Paper and the Gender Lever discussion note | The solution proposes a framework to ensure the systematic integration of gender transformative approaches in food systems interventions. Aims to address gender-based discrimination, which is a major cause of poverty, and food and nutrition insecurity. Notes success of studies in Burundi, Tanzania, Nepal and longstanding political support for this solution. Very little detail on the ‘how’, including issues like financial access, challenging cultural norms, local/regional etc. |
| 4.15 | MAC Protocol (Mining, Agriculture, and Construction) Protocol | United States | Expand implementation of measures related to MAC Protocol to the 2001 Cape Town Convention - improves access to and costs of finance for companies, family farms, collectives to purchase/leave modern MAC equipment in countries that adopt the Protocol (currently Nigeria, Gambia, Paraguay, Rep of Congo and the US - but no ratifications. Needs 5 to enter into force). Most immediate impact will be in credit market for MAC equipment, with anticipated increase in overall volume of available credit; reduction in cost of secured debt; and switched from unsecured credit to lower cost secured credit. |
| 4.17 | Farmer Field and Business School | Based on CARE’s Gender Equality Framework | Participatory, women-focused training and extension approach that helps farmers build skills necessary to increase production, access markets and sell at competitive prices, collaborate, and engage in efficient decision-making. |

**Action Area 4.2 Eliminating worker exploitation and ensuring decent work**

**LINK:** [**https://foodsystems.community/action-area-4-2/**](https://foodsystems.community/action-area-4-2/)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Topic** | **Source** | **Notes** |
| 1.9 | Workforce Nutrition Alliance | Workforce Nutrition Alliance and SourceUp | Scale the WNA to expand access to individuals by using companies as a strategic lever to connect through the workplace to their employees and supply chain workers. Solution has the “full support” of the CGF, one of the world’s leading business organizations. Political support is high in Bangladesh, Mozambique, India and Kenya, and is growing in Tanzania, Nigeria and Malawi. |
| 4.1 | Strengthen Labour Regulations by Placing People’s Dignity and Rights at the Centre | ILO | This solution calls for the enforcement of guidelines and recommendations proposed in HLPE (The High Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition, science-policy interface of the UN Committee on World Food Security (CFS)) 2020 report. By accepting these recommendations and incorporating various initiatives by other UN agencies the solution aims to improve labour regulations and worker rights |
| 4.2 | Improve Governance of Labour Markets | No named source | The solution proposes to institutionalize waged agricultural workers’ labor rights as human rights, ensuring conditions such as a living wage, direct employment, social protection and sick leave etc. |
| 4.3 | Promote Ratification and Implementation of Intl Labour Standards | ILO | The solution aims to focus on social standards, noting that jobs in the agriculture sector are often characterized by significant decent work deficits, including informality, poor working conditions, lack of labor and social protections, and low and irregular incomes. Builds on the ILO’s Decent Work Agenda. |
| 4.5 | Institutionalize and Mainstream the Anti-Discrimination and Labour Rights of Migrant (Foreign) Workers | Joint submission by the ILO, IOM, and OHCHR to the World Conference Against Racism | Proposes using a rights-based anti-discrimination and labor rights framework, including greater access to open work permits and permanent resident for migrant works in agriculture and across the food chain. This will help food security by taking into account the most marginalized persons in the food sector - including subsistence farmers, women, indigenous persons, and socially and culturally racialized persons. |
| 4.18 | Promoting Social Protection in Coherence with Agri-Food Systems Related Sectors | No named author but based on ILO | This solution promotes the expansion of social protection in coherence with agri-food systems related sectors, in order to boost economic growth; enhance the productivity of families and support them in diversifying income sources; achieve food security and nutrition; and build the resilience of poor rural families. It also focuses on accelerating the progressive realization of nationally defined social protection floors tha guarantee at least essential health care and basic income security to all. |

**Action Area 4.3 Localizing food systems**

**LINK:** [**https://foodsystems.community/action-area-4-3/**](https://foodsystems.community/action-area-4-3/)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Topic** | **Source** | **Notes** |
| 1.9 | Workforce Nutrition Alliance | Workforce Nutrition Alliance and SourceUp | This solution calls for the further development of the workforce nutrition alliance, which has already been piloted by various countries and organizations. |
| 2.2 | City regions | (i) Tailor Quinn, Tailored Food. (ii) World union of Wholesale markets through the public survey (iii) Salome Bukachi, Institute of Anthropology, Gender and African Studies, University of Nairobi, Kenya. | The solution focuses on cities as epicenters of food consumptions, given that 54% of the world’s population now lives in cities. It aims to address the problems in cities that prevent is from creating food environments where healthy and sustainable diets are accessible. These include poor air quality, food deserts, hunger, and patterns or urbanization that exacerbate the consumption of lower-cost, high sugar/salt/fat ultra-processed foods. Existing solution that needs scaling and standardizing.  Examples/sources cited include: (iv) [Milan Urban Food Policy Pact](https://www.milanurbanfoodpolicypact.org/); (v) [C40 Good Food Cities](https://www.c40.org/other/good-food-cities); and (vi) [Example Paris Food Strategy.](https://www.apisite.paris.fr/paris/public/2018%2F9%2FENG_Abrege_StratAlim.pdf) |
| 4.9 | Engaging with Cities and Local Governments for Equitable Livelihoods | Member of AT4 Leadership Group but “based on extensive multi-actor work” | This solution acknowledges that there is no easy path to implementing the systems the solution calls for. In order to enact change in developing regions they must first be stable enough for governments to have the capacity to engage with food system stakeholders and address the issue of food insecurity within urban settings |
| 4.12 | Global fund for small producers |  | This solution calls for the establishment of a matching SME fund to support the investments of small stakeholders. |
| 4.13 | Making Food Systems Finance Accessible for Rural People | No named author | This solution calls for the establishment of an innovation fund, Agriculture IT hub and data hub. |
| 4.14 | Public Development Bank Initiative to Catalyze Green and Inclusive Food System Investments | SAFIN network and IFAD | This solution calls for the development of public development banks aimed at meeting the development and investment goals outlined in the Paris Climate agreement. |
| 4.16 | Agri-SME Business Development Platform: | Builds on FAO, WBCSD, GAIN, SUN, Agripreneurship Alliance and the WFP dialogues and others | Key functions of the BDP will include: (i) toolbox of resources for agri-SMEs to enhance investment-readiness and bankability; (ii) digital financial discovery function for agri-SMEs and investors; (iii) assessment and training resources for entrepreneur and busdev services; (iv) reference documents for agri-SME investor performance metrics, due diligence, and impact tracking and reporting; and (v) learning community for agri-SME finance, with active learning and outreach programme. All building on existing initiatives and informed by dialogues over past 6 months including Bold Action for Food as a Force for Good dialogue on the Role of SMEs co-hosted by FAO. |
| 4.20 | Promote living incomes and wages in value chains for small-scale farmers and agricultural workers | No named source | This solution calls for equitable wages for small stakeholders and laborers across the globe. While the solution is noble it does not address the impossible nature of the solution. Not only would this require massive governmental reform across dozens of countries there is no way to guarantee its success in the at risk regions it hopes to help. |
| 5.9 | Ecommerce ecosystem solution | public survey of Action Track 5 | This solution calls for the development of e-commerce systems within developing regions. The proposal relies heavily on Chinese pilot programs within sub-Saharan Africa. |

**Action Area 5.1 Food systems resilience**

**LINK:** [**https://foodsystems.community/action-area-5-1/**](https://foodsystems.community/action-area-5-1/)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Topic** | **Source** | **Notes** |
| 5.1 | Food and peace | AT5 and working group members | Establish a multidisciplinary hub made up of humanitarian, development and peacebuilding analysts, actors and funders in a country that faces the risk, reality or aftermath of violent conflict and its humanitarian impact. The Facility houses the capacity to develop, plan and carry forward activities that address and ameliorate the double burden of food insecurity and conflict. |
| 5.4 | Blended financing project women and youth | UNCDF in partnership with the European Union | Provide business development services, project development and finance structuring services, and financial products offering seed capital in form of concessional loans and grants. Offer to local gender and youth inclusive incubation projects along the agricultural value chain in LDCs and graduated countries. |
| 5.8 | Expanded and improved food security forecasting and monitoring, | United States | This solution proposes expanded and improved food security forecasting and monitoring, based on the IPC (Integrated Food Security Phase Classification) as the accepted global food security analysis standard). Leading international organizations are working to actively improve the state of food security analysis, basing their work on the IPC. |
| 5.10 | Tools for accelerated breeding and trait mining underserved crops | The solution emerged from two workshops convened in August 2018 and August 2020 by The Supporters of Agricultural Research (SoAR) Foundation. | This solution calls for a worldwide effort to map out the genome and phenotype all various crops and variants. The goal is to fully catalogue each species to better address environmental and physical strains placed on crops worldwide. |
| 5.23 | The global network against food crises, an innovative approach to address complex food crises with integrative approaches | GNAFC, EC, FAO and WFP endorsed by USAID | The GNAFC was launched by the European Commission, FAO and WFP at the 2016 World Humanitarian Summit. Since then, other resource partners and UN agencies have engaged in the Senior Steering Group that now also includes USA, UK, Canada, Netherlands, the Global Food Security and Nutrition Clusters. |
| 5.24 | Establish a global centre for risk assessment and policy response on conflict and hunger | AT5 working group member | This solution will strengthen the global food system and ensure resilience in the face of events such as COVID-19. In order to maximize its effectiveness more emphasis on data sharing and investment must be shown within the solution |
| 5.25 | Systematic approaches to risk analysis | UNDRR | The solution proposes strengthening the resilience of food systems by applying systemic approaches to risk analysis and accelerated learning methods, that in turn encourages transformation towards more integrated, agile management systems. Aims to overcome problem of sector-specific and short-term information is only information used to understand risk in food systems. Also aims to highlight resilience-building options that pay multiple dividends in protecting food systems as well as supporting the attainment of all SDGs. Requires public sector, private sector and civil society buy in. |

**Action Area 5.2 Universal food access**

**LINK:** [**https://foodsystems.community/action-area-5-2/**](https://foodsystems.community/action-area-5-2/)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Topic** | **Source** | **Notes** |
| 5.2 | Strategic reserves | World Food Programme | This solution calls for regional food reserves (stockpiling) designed to fill in the gap of the food system when disruptions occur. |
| 5.13 | Use of previous CFS guidelines | CFS, Private Sector Mechanism | This solution calls for the adoption and implementation of previously agreed to voluntary CFS guidelines |
| 5.17 | Local and public procurement | WFP |  |
| 5.18 | Universal food access | No named source |  |

**Action Area 5.3 Climate resilient development pathways**

**LINK:** [**https://foodsystems.community/action-area-5-3/**](https://foodsystems.community/action-area-5-3/)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Topic** | **Source** | **Notes** |
| 5.5 | Financial inclusion to small-scale producers through climate risk profiling | Submitted by member of WG (Dr. Tom Mitchell, Chief Strategy Officer, Climate-KIC) | Scale the WINnERS agricultural supply chain de-risking programme to bring finance access to small holder farmers, as the foundation for systemic transformation of agri-supply chains. Access to finance can place conditionality loans to build capacity and incentivise climate resilient practices at the farm level. |
| 5.7 | Empower women’s agency and leadership in developing resilience solutions | Robynne Anderson – Private Sector Mechanism | Empower women’s agency and their leadership in developing resilience solutions. It will focus on (i) women’s assets and tenure rights; (ii) women’s leadership in resilience program and policies; and (iii) create a fund for gender transformative resilience programs. It aims to address following problems: (i) women have less access to capital and banking services; (ii) there are fewer women in leadership roles; and (iii) women have less independence and social mobility. |
| 5.11 | Global Soil Partnership |  | Builds on the World Soil Charter (FAO, 1981) and Voluntary Guidelines for Sustainable Soil Management (FAO, 2017). Global Soil Partnership. |
| 5.12 | The SAHEL resilience initiative |  |  |
| 5.15 | Agroforestry practices in arid and semi-arid lands | Eddy Rogerio Mauricio, member of the Global Agenda for Sustainable Livestock (GASL) | Calls for the combination of agroforestry and soil management solutions to help revitalize arid and nutrient poor regions to better increase food security for shock susceptible regions |
| 5.21 | Long-term conservation of food diversity in gene banks and in the field | No named source | Calls for increased production of new crops (Orphan Crops) and new sources of food such as algae insects etc. There are no definitive asks/actors named and the solution is somewhat neutral |
| 5.22 | Community based decision-making mechanisms/info systems on land rights | ANGOC Members | Calls for focus on the organization and support of village level/small stakeholder farming. Through data collection and investment from the private sector the solution aims to improve vulnerable small regions from supply chain disruption shocks. |

1. https://nutrientstewardship.org/4r-news/4r-farming-case-studies-available-online/ [↑](#footnote-ref-1)