

1. We very much appreciated the contributions by the members of the Technical Task Team. The fruitful discussion we had on the 28th of March highlights the importance of the more thorough and comprehensive planning is needed on CFS Policy Convergence Work on Nutrition.
2. It is generally agreed that the main objective is to change our food system and make it more sustainable. This is why our answers to question 1 is to have a comprehensive approach covering the whole food system and not to limit or restrict the scope to food environment. In fact, it sounds nonsense to consider food and nutrition without considering the sustainability of production, processing and retail of food. Consequently, we would support expanding (or we should rather say, not limiting) the scope, and focus of ToR, to have a holistic food system approach.
3. We consider this is as a historic opportunity for all of us to have a really impactful and meaningful set of Voluntary Guidelines in the spirit of the Agenda 2030. In this regard we think we do not need to rush. **It is more important to have a good product than to have it early.** We agree with the principle that it is essential that while elaborating Voluntary Guidelines, due attention are paid to existing studies and rely on CFS and other policy papers related to food systems.
4. Moreover, we would like to see the Voluntary Guidelines as comprehensive, as much as possible, and to provide very concrete linkages to, and interlinkages among SDGs with the inclusion of having a stocktaking at the UN (more specifically RBA) level. In particular, since the main objective of agroecology is to transform our agriculture and food system and make it more sustainable, synergies with agroecology should be identified. We wish to mention in this regard the Agroecology Symposium on 3-5 April 2018 and the HLPE report on agroecology to be presented to CFS in 2019.
5. In addition, we would like to support the proposal to include reference to the role of biodiversity (especially agrobiodiversity), and of the short food supply chains (including local markets with territorial approach).
6. Responding to question 3 we think there are some further areas to be covered. We miss, in particular, a clear reference to the need to consider the positive and negative externalities of various food systems. **This should be one of the entry points**, the basis of any further discussions and analysis. Studies show that the so called “hidden” costs of the negative environmental externalities (such as soil degradation, water pollution, biodiversity loss, plastic pollution, etc.) can be translated in figures. According to an analysis of the KPMG audit company, these environmental externalities take as much as 224%(!) of the profit of multinational food corporations. There are estimates that the negative public health impacts (and indirect costs) of low quality food are even higher. Internalizing these costs (which are paid currently by all of us), it turns out that local food produced by smallholders (including organic food) is not only more sustainable but also competitive, many times even cheaper, than highly processed, industrial food. This demonstrates, that having a clear picture on the real costs of food is strongly linked also to the affordability of healthy food products.
7. On the food quality and safety dimension of food environments, we would like to echo the need for a holistic approach and not to restrict food quality to certain aspects. In this regard it is necessary to care about the importance of fresh (local and seasonal) fruit and vegetable intake in order to address all forms of malnutrition. Also with this respect we propose changes regarding the policy relevant areas of food quality improvement. While acknowledging the need for food fortification in crisis situation and fulfilling prevalent micronutrient deficiencies,

it should be clearly stated, that it can only be a temporary, short term solution. It should be accompanied by a long term strategy which addresses the root causes of insufficient nutrient uptake.

8. Malnutrition should not be addressed through health approach only, since poverty is one of the main reasons of it.
9. SBCC programs are needed (especially nutrition education) to be able to see the positive outcomes of a good food environment.