

CFS Policy Convergence Process: Rapporteur's Proposal – Comments from New Zealand

We would like to thank the Rapporteur for his proposal and for the efforts in responding to comments from New Zealand and others on the original HLPE report recommendations.

While we are pleased to see that comments have been taken on board regarding the need to streamline and shorten the report's original recommendations and provide more focus, we note that some important elements of the original recommendations have been lost in the process.

Our comments on the Rapporteur's Proposal are as follows:

- 1 **Trade** – the original HLPE recommendation 5(a) contained a reference to the importance of trade rules for SAD for FSN. This point is not reflected in the Rapporteur's proposal. Trade has been acknowledged in various declarations over the past two decades as being important for ensuring global food security. Efficient and robust international trade rules will also lead to a more rational use of finite natural resources and therefore will assist in improving the sustainability of the global agricultural system.

We would like to see these points reflected in the text and would propose the following language:

Ensure the implementation of robust, effective and market oriented trade rules for agricultural products at a multilateral and regional level so as to foster global food security and assist in improving the sustainability of agricultural production systems.

- 2 **Innovation, research and development** – New Zealand believes that innovation, research and development are critical to achieving SAD for FSN and we were pleased to see references in both the original HLPE recommendations and in the Rapporteur's proposal. However, we believe that the current formulation in the Rapporteur's proposal (recommendation 6a) is too narrow and has diverted away from the intent of the original recommendation (HLPE 9a).

We would propose the following language:

Encourage strengthened co-ordination and co-operation in support of research, development and application of innovative agricultural practices, technologies, metrics and institutions to improve resource efficiency, strengthen resilience and help secure social equity/responsibility in diverse livestock farming systems.

- 3 **Improving animal health and welfare** – New Zealand welcomes the inclusion of a recommendation on animal health and welfare. We would note that the Rapporteur's Proposal mixes three different concepts: biosecurity; surveillance

and control of livestock diseases; and use of anti-microbials. We think it would be useful to separate out these concepts into separate (but linked) recommendations. We also note that the Rapporteur's recommendation on "securing access to veterinary services" has diminished the importance of capability and capacity building as expressed in the original HLPE recommendation 8(d).

New Zealand would like to suggest the following amendments to the Rapporteur's proposal:

- Combine the original HLPE recommendation 14(d) with HLPE recommendations 8(a) and 8(b) as follows:

Support and advance animal health and welfare by promoting good practices and by implementing the World Organisation for Animal Health's (OIE) One Health approach to improving the surveillance of and response to diseases emerging from livestock systems, including co-operating to provide transparent reporting for early warnings on transboundary diseases and zoonosis.

- Revert to original recommendation 8(d) and add in last clause in Rapporteur's recommendation 7(a)

Provide financial and technical support for improved animal health and welfare in agricultural development, including for capacity building programmes, and noting the importance of securing access to veterinary services.

- Retain recommendation 14(e) from the original HLPE recommendations.

Explore and implement approaches for the reduction of anti-microbial use in livestock.

Finally, we note that the Rapporteur's proposal has used different terminology for the classification of livestock production systems from that used in the HLPE Report making it difficult to contrast and compare the recommendations across the two documents. While there is a footnote referencing the classification system that has been used, this is of limited use without additional information regarding the terminology used. In particular we would note that the recommendations under 10 with respect to "industrial systems" would seem to also apply to the other livestock systems covered in the report.

Thanks again for the chance to comment and we look forward to engaging in the discussions on 8-9 September.