

FTA comments on the Draft One of the CFS Voluntary Guidelines on Food Systems and Nutrition (VGFSyN).

The following contribution has been prepared by the Forests, Trees and Agroforestry research program of the CGIAR (FTA). It follows a previous contribution on the V0.

We welcome this V1 draft and congratulate CFS secretariat and the Chair of the OEWG both for its content and the inclusive consultation process followed. The draft is considerably improved from V0, well covers the range of issues that need to be considered and addresses the comments we made. This broad coverage needs to be preserved in next versions.

Hereunder some more specific comments:

- In para 20, there would be value to add as an objective of the VGFSyN addressing the diversity of food systems. This could be done by adding “diversity” in the 2nd sentence as follows: “expected to address the diversity and complexity of food systems”.
- In para 21, 2nd line, suggest to delete “all” which is not totally exact for all topics in all issues mentioned.
- Para 24 a) add an “s” to “natural resources”. Replace “soil” by “land” which is broader, or if there strong willingness to conserve soil, add land in “land and water” for instance.
- Para 26. The focus on major products of CFS is welcome and understandable. However, given the breadth of the guidelines it would be good to add a reference to CFS policy recommendations, either as a whole, or at least on some of them that are particularly relevant, including on water, fisheries, forestry, climate change, food losses and waste and social protection.
- Para 34 d) The principle is welcome but seems to consider, implicitly, that there are always synergies between the pursuit of these objectives. Unfortunately, it is not always the case. For instance, Netherlands recently modified in its Food Based Dietary Guidelines the recommended amount of fish consumption in order to protect the resource. The wording of the principle should allow for the consideration of trade-offs, the case being. For instance replace the 2nd half of the sentence by “as well as sustainable food production and consumption to protect natural resources, ecosystems and biodiversity.”
- In 3.1.1 a) replace “national researchers” by “research”. The way it is currently formulated research is the only category for which international organizations are excluded.
- In 3.1.2 b) the need to “assess the full cost of addressing malnutrition in all its forms” is acknowledged. It should be accompanied by a corresponding improvement of the costs of not addressing malnutrition (including its consequences) so that decision makers can properly compare costs and benefits.
- In 3.2.1 c) The present wording is extremely conservative. What is needed is not only to protect biodiverse landscapes but to increase them. It can be done in the text by deleting in

the first line the words “the protection of” and also by replacing in the last line “conserve” by “enhance”.

- In 3.2.1 e) in the first line you may want to consider replacing “crops” by “plants” to be broader and more in line with “animals” that follows
- In 3.2.2 c) after “aquatic systems” need to add “agroforestry” that has exactly the same benefits.
- In 3.2.2 d) after “seeds” it could be useful to add “and other genetic material” in order to better cover roots and tubers, seedlings...
- In 3.2.3 b) replace “and animal source food” by “and other animal sourced foods”.
- In 3.2.6 c) makes a list of means of protection measures against climate change for which farmers and food producers are to be assisted by States. This list is too limited. It should cover the broad range of measures that can be appropriate according to local conditions and include “agroforestry” explicitly mentioned in the CFS policy recommendations on Food security and climate change (CFS 39: 2012). This could be done by adding after “through” the following words: “appropriate adaptation measures including agroforestry,” , rest unchanged.
- In 3.3.4 c) Given the role of the CODEX standards the link of this section to environmental sustainability is not clear at all. We suggest to delete the words “with regard to environmental sustainability” to avoid confusion.
- In para 43, add an “s” to “build”.

Finally, the first principle of the guidelines is “Systemic, holistic and evidence-based approach”. Such an approach requires strong knowledge and research to provide countries with the means to identify and prioritize issues to be considered, assess potential impacts of options and address potential trade-offs. This would deserve to be more present in the text.

To show the importance of evidence for decision making could be added in 3.1.1 a “d) National and international research organizations should provide governments and other stakeholders knowledge and evidence on all dimensions of food systems to enable them to prioritize issues to be considered, assess potential impacts and address potential trade-offs”.

Given the growing importance of scientific cooperation to address global challenges it would also be good to add, in para 47, the word “research” in “research and technical cooperation”.