



Food and Agriculture Organization
of the United Nations

**REPORT OF
THE TECHNICAL CONSULTATION
ON THE CODE OF CONDUCT
FOR FOOD LOSS AND WASTE PREVENTION AND
REDUCTION**

10 OCTOBER 2019

BOGOTA, COLOMBIA

**REPORT OF
THE TECHNICAL CONSULTATION ON THE CODE OF CONDUCT
FOR FOOD LOSS AND WASTE PREVENTION AND REDUCTION
HELD ON 10 OCTOBER 2019**

**DURING THE 1st LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN SUMMIT FOR THE
REDUCTION OF FOOD LOSS AND WASTE
BOGOTA, COLOMBIA**

1. INTRODUCTION

At its 26th Session of October 2018, the FAO Committee on Agriculture (COAG) requested FAO to take the lead, in collaboration with relevant actors, to develop voluntary codes of conduct (CoC) on the reduction of food loss and food waste. In response to the request, FAO launched a global process for developing a CoC that would present voluntary, global, internationally agreed, guiding principles and practices, which different stakeholders can adopt and apply in order to achieve food loss and waste (FLW) reduction and prevention, while yielding positive outcomes in terms of the environment, natural resources, livelihoods, food security and nutrition in alignment with the 2030 Agenda.

In order for the CoC to represent a global consensus on internationally accepted principles and practices for FLW reduction, that takes into consideration and reflects country diversities and the views of all key stakeholders related to FLW, an inclusive consultative process has been launched to develop the CoC. It is in this regard that a side-event was organized on 10 October 2019 during the 1st Latin America and Caribbean Summit for the Reduction of Food Loss and Waste, in Bogota, Colombia. The side-event had the following objectives:

- Discuss and gather inputs from different stakeholder groups on the guiding principles and practices that should be covered by the CoC.
- Identify priority FLW issues relevant to the region of Latin America and Caribbean (RLC) context that need to be addressed by the CoC.
- Raise awareness about the CoC among RLC stakeholders.
- Obtain guidance on the applicability of the CoC within the RLC context.

The programme of the side-event is presented in Annex I, while a list of participants is in Annex II.

2. MAIN CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The following are the main points that emerged from the event.

2.1. The need for and applicability of the code of conduct in the RLC context

There was consensus that a CoC is needed. In fact, reference to “one” CoC was one of the conclusions, also based on some discussions that has taken place at country level. Some strong comments were made to justify that the CoC should be different to some others agreed before (e.g. CoC on fertilizers, pesticides) in the sense that these CoC must focus/target to sought solutions, rather than spending time addressing controversial issues. Moreover, some discrepancies were found among participants regarding the level of the recommendations. While most participants thought that the CoC recommendations should remain “macro” some participants thought in some cases it should be at the “meso” and in a few cases at a “micro” level, particularly to indicate the importance of sharing responsibilities as in the end FLW is done at all levels.

2.2. The main FLW issues in RLC and measures to address them

2.2.1 Policies and strategies

The participants noted the absence of policies, and even strategies, to enhance the bargaining power of the small holders in the region. The association of small holders is in this case a forever challenge, but there are few successes that indicates a promising outlook. Food losses should not be seen as an area that deserves separate regulations but rather be addressed through broader laws, policies that seek for functional food systems or as part of a sustainable circular bio-economy. Policies should note the importance to reduce food losses even in remote areas (must be geographically inclusive).

2.2.2 Access to finance

Also linked to the previous point, the financial challenges are affecting mostly small producers and smallholders. Access to tools/machinery/facilities for harvesting, transportation, preservation, storage, are all key components for reducing FLW and continue to be of major impediment for small farmers. The situation also seems to benefit the bigger players as small farmers continue to have difficulties to access credit. Financial leverage risk is a barrier for smaller actors. The credit entities appear to have low trust on the payback of small producers. One option is leveraging support of capacity building entities - (NGOs, UN Agencies, National entities), which can validate technical capacity of producers and help improve managerial capabilities. The latter can be used as a mechanism to support credit leverage, as technical capacity increases the potential to pay back loans. Creating trust funds in countries with public-private sector contribution, and administered by a third party, was suggested as one possible ways to address this area.

2.2.3 Private sector

The poor relationship among players in the supply chains are causing FLW, due to unexpected delays in the trading of products and in some cases, overestimated projections and product rejection based on existing quality and safety standards. This occurs at all levels of the supply chain. The private sector is called to transmit information regarding FLW reduction in a transparent manner and with a clear reporting protocol that is consistent with other instruments (e.g. Protocol led by World Resource Institute). Transparency, fair trade, corporate

responsibility are examples of instruments that the private sector can be incorporated to permeate not only into their internal productive activities but towards the value chain as well.

2.2.4 Data

Evidence is consistently brought to the discussion of FLW as “you cannot reduce what you cannot measure.” However, in LAC there is the belief, that while lack of data impairs accuracy in targeting, the over emphasis on data acquisition may also impair the ability to solve issues that are obvious and governments need quick wins. In summary, it was mentioned that both data-based evidence and information-based evidence (many times through quick exercises) are important to advance an agenda to reduce FLW. In fact, in LAC, there is much data being developed and still actions are scarce. Clear standard definitions/terminologies were mentioned as needed along with data, which can be monitored by a national entity with the capacity to monitor overall statistics. In this sense, and in consequence of 2.2.3, reporting is not only a private sector responsibility (although it can trigger those data collection actions), and mechanisms to quickly improve data, data quality and estimations throughout the whole FSC are needed to support better interventions and monitor the improvements on the matter.

2.2.5 Technologies

There is consensus that technology can help with reducing FLW, particularly for preventing postharvest losses. However, selection/acquisition of technology requires some initial investment that is not often affordable for many, and that may be higher than the benefit. Moreover, the cost may be associated to undesirable environmental impact (especially when energy efficiency is poor or the technology is obsolete and cause contamination) or economical value that may be subsidized in some cases only for selected groups, which causes social gaps as well. The type of technologies may also have impacts on gender inequality as in many cases the use of certain machinery is not women friendly. Some technologies may not be available for people with disabilities and/or only targeted to certain groups above certain levels of education.

2.2.6 Infrastructure

The status of facilities (e.g. aggregation, storage, processing, preparation) at all points of the supply chain as well as roads, water, telecommunication infrastructures are known to impact FLW. In RLC, the concern is that investment on infrastructure continues to favour the larger players of the food system and any efforts to change this pattern may be difficult to pass given the expected disagreements it will create.

2.2.7 Poor linkages to market

While RLC has made progress in connecting farmers with markets, still a number of issues are limiting a solid growth in this respect. Among others are little access to market information for a number of small producers, limited access to direct marketing technology platforms, and prominence of large brokers and retailers that prefer businesses with fewer suppliers.

2.2.8 Awareness

Food waste volumes are perceived as extremely high in RLC, particularly those generated at the household level. Awareness raising is suggested as one effective measure to reduce wastage. A way to cascade down information from public to private sector to civil society should be a constant norm.

2.2.9 Research and innovation

Research and innovation are needed for developing the cutting edge technologies of the future. Those must emerge from a bio-circular perspective for optimizing supply chains and for efficiently revalorizing by-products and coproducts of food processing, with a holistic perspective to ensure sustainability. Research is also important for clarifying issues related to food safety and for more effectively reporting and food traceability. Use of packaging for reduction of FLW carries concerns, but alternatives are still in infancy. Climate technologies used during postharvest handling needs more promotion, including ways to dry, refrigerate, freeze and store food. Innovation should also sought new forms to combine public intervention for reducing rejected food from markets and creative business models. For example, public procurement is an instrument that can absorb a good portion of safe food that is thrown due to non-compliance with market standards. This may be difficult in most countries with present regulations where standards are similar for both public and private. Alternative (private-social-solidarity schemes) systems have proven good results in other regions, which could also be of help in LAC. However, for this to happen well targeted social economy policies set by governments will be needed.

2.2.10 Training and extension

RLC has a number of post-secondary schools and institutions with capacity to transmit the “know how” to reduce FLW, and particularly postharvest losses. However, firstly these institutions may not necessarily exist in all countries. Secondly, it appears the expanding demographic growth in the region is going at much higher pace than the upscaling for advisory services to reduce FLW. In addition, most countries have shown economic growth, which in principle is associated with higher food waste: an area which is not well addressed in general, from the advisory and training service angle. Online courses should be available for extension services and extensionists should obtain certification with refreshing courses on a regular basis. Some countries in RLC (notably Argentina) are enforcing good agricultural practices accompanied with advisory services to build capacity particularly among small farmers. Medium and large companies are in a better situation to pay for extension services. In parallel, school food-gardens have been promoted by FAO for a while now, and they seem to have potential in improving awareness and empowering younger generations (as agents of change) regarding FLW reduction (and particularly food waste) and the value of food, as part of the efforts for more sustainable agri-food systems.

2.2.11 Multi-stake holder platforms

A participatory process is the call made by the Agenda 2030 acknowledging that is an effective way to avoid affecting a sector by acting toward improving another. A governing body that is consultative and create space for dialogue would be instrumental for approaching FLW

in a systemic way. FAO can support the creation of multi-stakeholder platforms at national levels, but other UN agencies should also play a role as their mandate.

2.2.12 Access to information

LAC is highly affected by climate shocks. Moreover, weather conditions has been highly fluctuating in the last decades, which has implications on FLW. Attention to these and other issue mentioned in previous sections of this document such as FLW monitoring, market relations among actors, access to research outcomes, and training must rely in good access of information by all actors.

2.2.13 Sociocultural issues

These are issues that may be having effects on both ends of the supply chain. Best practices based on popular wisdom (e.g. modality to harvest, fish, hunt) inherited within certain groups of the society may not be effective for reducing FLW on certain occasions, but can also hold relevant learned lessons. Therefore, tailored research and extension, service learning and farm science addressing underutilized foods, including indigenous, mountain products can aid into more sociocultural yet science-based solutions. Consumption patterns in the region associated with changing habits for preparing and storing food (e.g. increase area of refrigerators in households) observed in the last decades is likely correlated with increased FLW. Recommendations were given to engage with interested parties in the Gastronomy world as good gastronomical practices should be encouraged. For example, creating better links of professional gastronomy with school cafeterias, which may enhance both palatability of nutritious food and improved planning of raw food use that will result in FLW prevention. The rescue of traditional diets and identity together with healthy eating habits can trigger interrelated actions towards FLW awareness and reduction.

2.3. Most desirable solutions to address food loss and waste (priority and quick wins)

While in RLC great progress has been achieved on raising awareness, it still needs much enhancement. Following a solid campaign of sensitization, probably one of the most feasible ways in the short term to construct a “theory of change” is through capacity building to all actors in the food supply chain (and beyond for those that can profit from byproduct and co products). Capacity building should contemplate diverse disciplines, including postharvest handling, marketing, finances, and social behaviour. It is of paramount importance to tackle FLW with simultaneous actions that start with well trained professional in the supply chains. The involvement of public-private alliances are a must, with particular focus on the role of private actors which far from being the biggest cause of problems in the FLW dimension can become big solution triggers.

2.4. Achieving FLW reduction while respecting three pillars of sustainability

Sustainability rests on economic, social and environmental pillars, and it will not be achieved in the region if FLW are not addressed adequately. This means stakeholders should take into consideration the following when planning, strategizing and implementing actions:

- Elaboration of policies, and the overall implementation programs should derive from a consultative process that involves voices of all interested parties. Of particular interest

would be to ensure simultaneous strategies for addressing the people that may be affected by the prompted changes (e.g. relocation of informal vendors in public markets, should be done with a good set of opportunities for them to grow in the new environment, challenges for the national budget to execute programs to improve certain sectors performance in contrast to less income in that budget due incentives for FLW reduction e.g. tax exemptions).

- All actions to reduce FLW should adopt the identified principles for the CoC (below)
- Emphasis must be placed on nutritious food, and those that contribute to a healthy diets, from production to consumption, making sure it is accessible by vulnerable populations
- Improved planning based on market intelligence, with a consistent public-private dialogue, so that risks for over offer in the market is prevented (e.g. after usual excitement caused by high price in previous production seasons)

2.5. Guiding principles to be followed for FLW reduction.

FLW must always be seen with a sustainability lenses, that considers the “5 Ps”: people, planet, prosperity, partnership, peace. In this regard it was acknowledged the importance of including the following principles:

- The *right to food*, understanding that all food suitable for human consumption must be consumed, supported by a system of solidarity and reciprocity that transcends relation between players and with the State taking a prominent role for an enabling environment.
- *Social equity and equality* must be ensured at all levels, promoting business interactions such as Fair Trade. Moreover, the private sector can support movements that target the wellbeing, providing emphasis on nutritious food.
- *Resilience and sustainability of the food systems*. The life cycle approach needs to be introduced more strongly to enhance FLW efforts, or to determine what is the best valorization route for the food produced if it cannot stay longer within the human food supply chain.
- *Integrated (holistic) approach to FLW reduction*. Laws, policies, regulations for reduction of FLW are not exclusively done for FLW (and should not). Decision about infrastructure for example are not done for this purpose. The reduction of FLW is a matter of interest for different sectors and is impacted by different actions that target economic development in the rural-urban transformation. The consequences of actions towards FLWs must be seen in the context of the overall sustainable transformation and efficiency, conversely selected actions in other sectors must be assessed against their impact in the food system and subsequent FLW.

2.6. Framework of practices and generic measures

In terms of the framework of practices and generic measures that can be used to later define practical technical guidelines for FLW reduction, the following points were advanced:

- *Preventive approaches frameworks* should be developed around the hierarchy model to emphasize consumption, redistribution, reutilization first.

- *Well accepted set of measures for ensuring food safety* ought to be considered when establishing holistic programs. These include HACCP, good agricultural practices, good handling practices (including livestock), but special treatment should be given to small farmers. Important to note that certification is normally unaffordable for many, so it should be case specific and not mandatory.
- *Guidelines on good practices for managing workforce/addressing the workspace* (e.g. issued by ILO) can add fairness in food system-related businesses but also can add to reduce FLW. This is particularly important where payment of labour wages is by weight/unit as supposed to by hour.
- *Standardized reporting mechanisms*, not only at national level (where suggested mechanism is FAO's methodology for SDG indicator 12.3.1, and for waste eventually the UNEP's methodology for 12.2.2), but at meso and micro level (for which WRI-led Standard may be used).

2.7. Areas of contention that need to be negotiated.

Establishing contracts among players of the supply chain to ensure effective scheduling of harvest and handling would likely be a major area of disagreement. In this regards, great part of the business relations in many countries is informal, and as such there is much uncertainty about many of the food transactions that are taken place and the associated FLW. The transition to formality, for reducing FLW should be seen in a broader sense. While transition to formality can allow better controls and the implementation of measures for ensuring food safety and reducing FLW, it can also be a movement that marginalize many low-income holders behind if not appropriately accompanied with an effective capacity building process and mechanism to open new opportunities. Transition to formality in principle could reduce FLW (and ensuring food safety), however the risks for social marginalization exists.

Defining one modality for selling products, whether by weight or units, on the basis of FLW reduction, may be difficult, in part because it is not clear whether one of them can be applied across the supply chains, and what the real benefits are. In principle, selling by weight could reduce some losses in upstream of the supply chains (farm, aggregation) by making more flexible size of units, however, this is complex as large food products could cause waste later in the supply chains. What many seems to accept is that shifting from paying employees by units/weight (depending on commodity) to pay them on an hourly basis can add to FLW reduction. This measure can prevent the typical physical damages observed for handling product without care, and is the source of much postharvest losses. In RLC, some supply chains/places have adopted this and produce good results. In any case this is an observation for further discussion.

Issues related to food safety are expected to become another big issue of disagreement as a number of food safety regulations today are not necessarily based on sound science, and in general the more strict the food safety regulation, particularly those that require "knowledge-intensive" practices, the more the small holders will be affected. Investing in programs that

foster capacity building for the latter and in processes to elaborate policies based on science is critical. However, this opens another potential area of disaccord, which is the selection of where to place public budget. For example, the dilemma in many cases is whether to invest where higher return per investment exists, or rather to target those that are behind.

While attempts to reduce food waste at the retail and HORECA (Hotel, restaurants, catering) are ongoing much caution is to be taken given the great risk for damaging images of businesses that donate due to food consumed in poor conditions. For example, clear labelling for expiration date and donations need to be well addressed through legislation. The main issue is that shelf life rely on specific life span conditions including effective handling at all times, but this is not always the case (e.g. labelling for perishable food is established under the assumption that good storage practices are followed). The good will to reduce FLW must be encouraged, protected through schemes that are clear about donor protection liability.

FLW reduction incentives and the governments income (e.g. directly from taxation) to respond to sectors need more support. Large scale actors can have access to technology and infrastructure that would decrease FLW and can still have a tax exemptions or better access to credits to finance those improvements. The less money from taxes or credits mean less availability of resources to be allocated to establish intervention programs for small-family farmers who would be needing support in training, education, technology, capacity building, etc to reduce FLW.

2.8. Moving into the future

The emphasis of the CoC, from the RLC perspective, should focus much on how the different sectors can put initiatives for action. The mechanisms can come from both enabling policies but actions derived from commitments of the private sector and the civil society. Networks for actions, based on pledges of key actors, can trigger a momentum for scaling up actions. Political will is fundamental to convene influencers in the key sectors. Well targeted programs, that understand what should be the feasible minimum losses, need to be designed.

Annex I: Programme of the side event (actual)

14:00 - 14:30	Introduction and Ice breaker
14:30 – 14:45	Presentation of objectives of the Side Event
14:45 – 15:00	Overall discussion in Plenary
15:00 - 15:45	Working groups – Question 1 & reporting from each group
15:45 – 16:30	Working groups - Question 2 & reporting from each group
16:30 – 17:30	Working groups – Question 3 & reporting from each group
17:30 – 17:45	Final discussion en Plenary – gaps/Q&A
17:45 – 18:00	Concluding remarks

Annex II: Participants

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS OF THE SIDE EVENT ON CODE OF CONDUCT FOR THE REDUCTION OF FLW				
Nº	COUNTRY	NAME	INSTITUTION	E.MAIL
1	CUBA	Michely Vega León	Instituto de Investigaciones Fundamentales en Agricultura Tropical "Alejandro de Humboldt")	fpostcosecha@infat.co.cu
2	ECUADOR	Byron Santiago Sánchez Montaluisa	Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería de Ecuador	bsanchezm@mae.gob.ec
3	ARGENTINA	Natalia Basso	Ministerio de Agroindustria	nbasso@magyp.gob.ar
4	ARGENTINA	Mercedes Nimo	Ministerio de Agroindustria	mnimo@magyp.gob.ar
5	CHILE	Catalina Giraldo	Cadenas de Valor Sustentables - CaVs	cg@cavsustentables.com
6	COSTA RICA	Laura Brenes	Save Food Costa Rica	labrenes@itcr.ac.cr
7	ECUADOR	Jorge Luis Morillo	Observatorio Comercio Exterior	jorge.morilloerazo@gmail.com
8	MÉXICO	José Luis Hernández	INEGI	jose.hernandez@inegi.org.mx
9	REPÚBLICA DOMINICANA	Rommel Vargas	CONASSAN	mirthaurbaez@presidencia.gob.do
10	REPÚBLICA DOMINICANA	Bristol John Lawrence	Dexia Esport	blawrence@dexiaexport.com
11	TRINIDAD & TOBAGO	Majeed Mohammed	West Indies University	mohd2332@hotmail.com
12	USA	Melissa Shapiro	HARVARD Law school	mshapiro@law.harvard.edu ; melissashapiro@gmail.com
13	USA	Kai Robertson	WORLD RESOURCES INSTITUTE (WRI)	robertson.kai@gmail.com
14	COSTA RICA	Francini Araya	Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería de Costa Rica	faraya@mag.go.cr
15	GUATEMALA	Jairo Flores	Gobierno de Guatemala	jjajofd@gmail.com ; jflores@congreso.gob.gt ; analeog@gmail.com
16	GUATEMALA	Orlando Blanco	Gobierno de Guatemala	comandoune@gmail.com
17	COLOMBIA	Ángela Rivera	FAO Colombia	Angela.Rivera@fao.org
18	CHILE	Manuela Cuví	FAO RLC	Manuela.Cuvi@fao.org
19	ITALIA	Alicia English	FAO ROMA	alicia_english@fao.org
20	COLOMBIA	Ana Catalina Suárez	Banco de alimentos	asuarez@foodbanking.org
21	COLOMBIA	Nicolás López	Gobierno de Colombia	cornab29@gmail.com
22	COLOMBIA	Huerlis Manuel Peña	Gobierno de Colombia	huerlis.sena@camara.gov.co ; huerlys2010@hotmail.com
23	CHILE	Joao Intini	FAO	Joao.Intini@fao.org
24	CHILE	Nicol Barahona	FAO	Nicol.Barahona@fao.org
25	CHILE	Sara Granados	FAO	Sara.Granados@fao.org
26	ITALIA	Jorge Fonseca	FAO	Jorge.Fonseca@fao.org
27	PERÚ	Alicia de la Rosa	FAO	maria.delarosa@fao.org
28	COLOMBIA	Olga Garzón	FAO	Olga_GarzonCastro@fao.org
29	COLOMBIA	Michela Espinosa	FAO	Michela.EspinosaReves@fao.org
30	ITALIA	Marco Sánchez	FAO	Marco.SanchezCantillo@fao.org

Annex III: Proceedings of the side event

The introduction was led by Mr. Jorge Fonseca, Joao Intini and Alicia de la Rosa.

In an ice breaker exercise the entire group was asked to pair with an “unknown” participant. Then later the participants introduce to each other in panel highlighting professional and personal aspects. Following was a presentation, with background and explanation of the work ahead in the event. Some of the highlights of the presentation included:

- SDG targets 12.3 look to reduce food loss and waste by 50% by the year 2030
- Code of Conduct (CoC) draft must be presented at the next COAG (October 2020).
- The work on FLW is moving in the Latin America and Caribbean (LAC) where at least 11 national and international committees are already acting in different ways and sectors. The countries are no longer at the point of sensitization, but are now focused on concrete actions. FAO instruments are currently focusing on promoting regulatory frameworks, governance, synergy, harmonizing the issue and directing efforts towards broader issues such as Circular Economy, Climate Change and in general the same SDGs.
- The question was asked as to what are codes of conduct about? Reference was made to the code of pesticides that was of global concern and the risks that these chemicals pose, where the principles were worked on together, providing visions of the different countries which were collected and agreed upon after 2-3 years of consultation. These codes of conduct have become frameworks of reference for countries to develop national and regional standards, harmonizing regulations (registration and post-registration of pesticides, etc. as an example).
- The code was presented as:
 - Global, internationally agreed-upon, locally adaptable voluntary principles and practices that different stakeholders involved with FLW should adopt
 - Benchmark and framework to guide country strategies, policies, legislation and programmes towards FLW reduction
 - Provides guidance as to what constitute acceptable practices against which stakeholders can gauge their actions
 - Facilitates harmonization of approaches and the assessment of progress in the reduction of FLW
- The target audience and users of the codes were presented as stakeholders who deal directly or indirectly with FLW, including:
 - Government agencies, ministries and national, sub-national and local institutions
 - Food supply chain actors: producers; processors; SMEs and other agribusiness operating in the private sector; and consumers
 - Civil society organizations
 - Academic and research institutions

- Bi-lateral and multi-lateral agencies, including international financial institutions
 - Philanthropic organisations
 - UN agencies and intergovernmental and regional organizations with a mandate on issues related to FLW.
- The goals and objectives presented at the discussion were to:
- Raise awareness of the CoC among stakeholders of the Region of Latin America and Caribbean (RLC)
 - Gather inputs and build consensus among different stakeholder groups on the content of the CoC
 - Obtain guidance on the applicability of the CoC in the RLC context.
 - Identify priority FLW issues in the RLC context to be reflected in the global CoC

Mr. Fonseca explained the process of the CoC so far with a brief mention on what to expect after the consultation. He provided some examples of general principles stating that the actions should be well informed by them (if confirmed), and should be included in the CoC with a good sense of what is feasible, as to construct an effective road map. In this regard, it is important to identify potential barriers and disagreements that may arise in applying the CoC. Moreover, when possible the roadmap should be clear on what are priorities, and identifying responsibilities at the Macro, Medium and Micro levels. The latter was the basis for the group exercises which consisted in responding to the questions below..

- **Overarching questions that were addressed in the event:**

1. What should we consider when making recommendations? What are the general principles that should be followed for FLW reduction in the region while respecting the three dimensions of sustainability which are the Social, Environmental and the Economical.

2. How can we do a practical CoC (readily available for implementation), recognizing the risks of it not being successful?

a) The need to identify areas of disagreement that should be negotiated between interested parties (eg unfair marketing practices).

b) Recommendations must be useful to the different regional and national actors.

3. What is needed in food systems to reduce FLW?

a. Identifying the main problems that exist in the RLC region.

b. How can it be measured at the macro, medium and micro level to address FLW reduction.

Some suggested guiding principles that may be used in FLW reduction are:

- The right to food.
- Social equity and equality must be ensured.
- Resilience and sustainability of the food systems.
- Integrated (holistic) approach to FLW reduction.

Before the working groups session an open interaction session with questions and suggestions took place:

- The presentation prompted some discussion on how to define the term “principle”. It was agreed that it can be seen as an ideal motive that is based on norms, references or action points, and initiatives. The usefulness of the principles, and particularly in normative terms, is based on their nature to be crosscutting to all sections of the CoC. The principles, in other words may be taken as the "guiding parameters" of the CoC, in which all actions suggested must “adhere” to the set of principles.
- It was suggested to include private sector actors in the development stage of the CoC as it was indicated that they are already involved in the reduction of waste especially from an economic standpoint. In response, Mr. Fonseca mentioned that the draft of the CoC will be circulated to the private sector for their inputs and feedback.
- The challenge is to identify the link between concrete actions on the (micro, medium and macro) level with the CoC. An example was given regarding the Pesticide Code where a clear risk was identified in the use of pesticides that resulted in specific suggestions such as having a (national) registry, responsible management of manufacturers /company, agreeing upon recommended doses (for users). It was noted that not all specific actions must necessarily be included the final CoC and that there will be room for improvement.
- It was suggested that the food safety component is of fundamental importance for the CoC. Questions were asked as to how to identify risks, how to evaluate them, how to act upon them. It was also suggested that there should be no proposed predetermined actions in a CoC but rather generate inputs that will facilitate countries to determine road maps to act on FLW reduction. However, the recommendations should better guide at the micro level and not leave only broad directions that don’t specify concret action plans for the reduction of FLW. It was mentioned that CODEX could have some extended responsibility on FLW because the rigorous (often not necessarily based on food safety evidence) international standards produce much discard (from the early stages of the supply chain) due to non-compliance, and the food is not necessarily used within the country..
- Suggestion was made to find out the results of the online consultation that was made to the table of contents in the middle of the year, and what will be the results at the end of the year. However, this consultation had about 50 interventions that largely generated the questions.

Following this, four groups were created to provide answers and recommendations to the questions stated above. Noting that participants were representatives from different governments (Legislators, National Institutes), research and academia (economics, law, biological sciences), private sector (retailers, exporter), NGOs, civil society, and food banks, the assignment of individuals in groups was done with a criterium to maximizing interaction within the groups. A fifth group consisted of the organizers and late comers which also provided inputs in the panel discussion. The groups discussed each of the questions and immediately after Ms. Nicol Barahona moderated inputs from each group and discussions to clarify issues that were raised.

Question 1. What do we need to consider when formulating recommendations?

- What are the overarching guiding principles that should be followed in FLW reduction in RLC, while respecting the three dimensions of sustainability?

GROUP 1	GROUP 2	GROUP 3	GROUP 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shared and approved vision of the FLW: definitions, methodologies, cooperation and sector, national and regional commitment to the provision and exchange around the FLW- • Life cycle approach • Contextualization (location) of the actions contemplated in the CoC. • Innovation in its broad concept: market, technology, governance, society. • Action, transparency and efficiency • Fair Trade 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All food suitable for human consumption must be consumed if possible. • Every process of the food supply chain must have a clear impact on the reduction and prevention of FLW. • Every food should be linked to the wellbeing of people, directly or indirectly – appreciation for food will increase chances for reduction of FLW <p>Note: The group suggested that the CoC must be specific and candid when addressing issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should be easily adoptable for the fisheries sector and the different value chains. • There should be a component of shared liabilities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreed to keep all four principles suggested as basis prior to the consultation. Those were: i) right to food; ii) equity and social equality; iii) resilience and sustainability; iv) Integrated perspective (holistic approach to reduce FLW). However, the principles should be more explicit so that that message is clearer. For example: i) the principles should indicate the responsibilities and obligations of the different stake holders during the entire life cycle of the food; ii) the principle on equity should be balanced with economic aspects; iii) the principle on resilience should emphasize the effect of climate change on FLW <p>In addition, it was mentioned to add:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preventive approach • Solidarity and reciprocity and that transcends relations between players • Optimal and rational use of resources. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain food in the human food supply chain • Find the best value if the food cannot remain in the human food supply chain and this should be country specific base on countries priority (e.g. if the country doesn't visualize more production of livestock, do not invest on more animal feed)

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Narrative that can be inclusive to the differentiated needs of different populations and sectors (eg local public purchases, family farms, artisanal fishery), so that the code fits with all. 	
--	--	--	--

Summary and concluding remarks and overarching question 1: Three groups agreed to keep the main principles in a simple and concrete narrative. For example “maintaining the use of food in the food supply chain as intended to be food for humans or parts for value addition”. Participants suggested harmonization of the terminology of the code and the need to create linkages with the way forward. The latter is not being seen as a conflict of interests but rather ethical harmonization, innovation, inclusion. It was suggested that in addition to the four principles already brought to the table, a few additions may be needed to better cover the “inclusiveness” of the nature of the code. Two of the groups emphasized the need to develop this Code with a narrative that is direct and candid when needed.

Question 2. How to make the CoC practical? - Recognizing the risks of not being successful.

- Indicate areas of disaccord that need to be negotiated to seek convergence of the views of different stakeholder groups.
- Provide recommendations to make the CoC useful for different stakeholders at national and regional levels.

GROUP 1	GROUP 2	GROUP 3	GROUP 4
<p>An area of disagreement is contracts between suppliers and buyers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One of the most critical disagreements may be in public and private budgeting and investment to address FLWs. Large investment on infrastructure and IT will be an issue if not well justified economically and socially. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Food safety criteria must be based on evidence • Harmonize actions to donate vs. destroy, on criteria for marketing. • Price speculation: destruction of inventory to improve price. • High dependence on intermediation that 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tax benefits can be inconvenient for the government to the detriment of state budgeting. • Food destruction can be less costly than donation or alternative use. • Food labeling generates misinformation resulting in food discarding, inappropriate consumption, and excessive purchasing. • Discrepancies between the expiry time margins of food and donation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perverse inventions and international trade rules are potentially causing FLWs. • Avoiding potential liabilities especially if they are in relation to food safety.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Labeling discrepancies and expiration / expiration dates • The more standardized access to certain resources will be a point of disagreement due to the lag of certain actors in the agri-food sector, for example, portions of the rural sector outside of technology, internet access, data transfer. • In addition, there will be a greater demand for services to institutions and private companies when trying to address the difficulties of the lagging sector: infrastructure, roads, flexibility of certain qualities, quantities • The disagreement may be in public and private budgeting and investment to attack FLW. • Referring to sectors as the “bad guys” will not help. One example is found in certain subsector of the food processing industry: are good solutions to the reduction of FLWs offering better nutrition? • Sometimes antagonistic behaviors between consumers and suppliers: example possibility of access to food • An obstacle is in the information (how it is transmitted in both directions). 	<p>reduces the capacity to prevent FLW</p>	<p>actions, for example, this can cause burden to businesses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Donation interests vs. commercialization as well as difficulties and costs associated with the donation: if the donation is made, who assumes the costs? • Definition of the roles and capacities of the public institution to include the prevention of FLW in the practices of production: training, extension, infrastructure • Rural hinterland is behind in data and technology, they are basis for sustainability. Thus, tailored investment is needed. Balancing finances means targeting also family farming, indigenous groups, youth, and clearly not always the industries agree with this. 	
---	--	--	--

How to make a code for country, for companies, for people?			
<p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lessons learned about tax incentives and regulatory frameworks that encourage actions that prevent destruction and optimize the use of food (donation, etc.) should be adopted. • Have a strong focus on prevention through training, financing for technological improvements that prevent FLW (eg for suppliers). • (social) acknowledgments of the practices that are implemented. • That the actions / orientations be practical and concrete • Regarding expiration labeling, an example would be the designated areas/shelf space that are used in some supermarkets when the products are ready to expire. However, there is a substantive discussion that is not resolved by this as most retailers are inclined to continue to discard food. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote product traceability. • Campaigns focused on nutrition vs esthetics. • Sale by weight at consumer level, if possible by unit during postharvest • Promote planning, developing a potential production indicator by item • Direct marketing technology platforms. 	<p>Standardize and optimize the redistribution process so as to prevent the lack of donations to beneficiary before expiration date.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Present the useful and different recommendations by sector to cover each of the discrepancies. • Report on scope and size of the problem <p>Some other ways to address the above include: i) transparency in informing about the problems; ii) put the theme in the political agenda (and not just technical recommendations); iii) differentiate recommendations according to actors (could be as presented in question 3); iv) recommend use Code as to inspire different narratives according to the different contexts, but provide example. In this regard, the code is general, but each country should prioritize according to its internal conditions, that is, leave flexibility for countries.; v) be clear with the recommendations that are good practices according to the principles.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improvement in the exchange of information between supplier and purchasers through collective planning • Invest in post-production practices and the use of primary products • Promote alternative markets for over-supply. • Provide significant incentives to promote actions: tax exemptions for eg. • Clarify food safety laws

Summary and concluding remarks to overarching question 2: Where to apply stimulus and who should be benefited from financing mechanisms and where will continue to be areas of potential disagreements. Regardless, the CoC should address concerns with the most vulnerable. For example, SMEs and family farming and rural agribusiness should have some extra support to balance opportunities. In terms of food safety: there is an interest in clarifying expiration dates and quality standards on real scientific basis.

Question 3. What exactly is needed in the food system to make a reduction on FLW?

- What are the main FLW issues in the RLC context?
- What could be the key measures to be implemented at micro/medium/macro level to address FLW in RLC?

GROUP 1	GROUP 2	GROUP 3	GROUP 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of fair trade • Little bargaining power of some actors. • Difficulty in accessing certain resources, information, visibility. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Lack of roadmap for prevention and reduction of FLW (National Plan). •Absence of incentives that promote FLW. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Donation law to make it mandatory to Donate. Clarification as to who will cover the cost of donations. •Selling commodity not by units but by weight to eliminate some of the reasons why some small food stay back. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Awareness building to know where we are and what are the root of the problem. •Monitoring of the progress and challenges to improve processes. •Implementation of best practices.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •ALL: Measurement at all levels. Micro: Promote representation, associativity and “clustered” action for better coordination, greater bargaining power, etc. •Macro: Disclosure of measurement information •Macro / Medium: awareness campaigns, training, shearing of information. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Macro: Institutional creation to empower the FLW issue •Accountability and empower civil society to act on FLW •Visualize FLW as an action within the food system, circular economy, etc. Use of FLW in other sectors (e.g. bioenergy) through strengthening competences at country level to propose macro solutions. •Animal welfare may be helpful to improving performance in animal products, therefore it may be favorable to reducing FLW. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Macro Governance: have a governing body, consultative and dialogue space •Establish defined competences and roles mandatory Good practices (handling, agricultural), assisted by the State as it is mandatory, with clear deadlines seeking support of the chamber of producers •Implement advisory services for the producers, with innovative schemes such as online courses. Extensionists need to be certified to assists producers, food handlers. •HAACP are obligatory 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Micro; Development and monitoring of FLW reduction strategies •Macro; Quantification of FLW and less estimation for better decision making. • Medium; Use of unfit but useful products. •Macro; Attention to natural disasters and adaptation / resilience to Climate Change.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Good “gastronomy” practices are implemented •Not only FAO is part of the FLW reduction efforts, but rather a number of the UN Agencies •Make an effort to reduce losses during distribution (e.g. more investment in roads, enable acquisition of refrigerated trucks when necessary, according to principles). 	
--	--	--	--

Summary and concluding remarks to overarching question 3: There was much emphasis given to make fair trade across the board. This should include better access (for all) to certain resources, information, and policies to enable agro-Industry at all scales. Among the main issues comes the need to target specific populations. In fact, there are a number of local products that should be given special attention as they may be related to indigenous culture. RLC has many people relying on mountain food products. Good practices has been seen when Municipal governments in those areas get together to agree on roads and points of aggregation for expediting logistics of these foods. It was stated that there may be more FLW due to the elimination of use of plastics, but the latter has become a serious problem for not having a robust system for reusing-recycling. Solutions are scenario specific. Biodegradable plastics (when actually tested that are degradable) for packaging that are produced from vegetable fibers may be an option. Other topics should be brought to the table, such as circular economy and bioeconomy, blockchain, internet of things and photometry as tools and guideline to tackle FLW. Considering approaches that “close the loop” such as those seen in Food Distribution Centers are good examples, where valorization is already occurring.

